

Planning Services

NSW Department of Planning & Environment

GPO Box 39

SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: Rye Park Wind Farm Project Application – Application Number 10-0223

Attention: Executive Director, Resource Assessments & Business Systems.

I object to this project.

I would like to state I have many major concerns about the proposed wind turbines. Our property is situated in the valley between 2 proposed wind farms with one being sited 3km to the east (Rye Park Wind Farm, 109 turbines), another one 3km to the west (Bango Wind Farm, 122 turbines) as well as the Rugby Wind Farm (52 turbines) 20km to the north of our home. Our property is not only our home but also our livelihood as we run a sheep stud.

A major concern relates physically to our inability to live on the property due to reported ill-health caused by the effects of the wind turbines. The magnitude of possible health effects is not known as there are no conclusive research studies into the **cumulative effects** of being exposed to multi-directional industrial turbines and certainly not to the high number of turbines proposed in this area. With us being surrounded by these it will not matter which direction the wind is blowing from we will be impacted by them. The Trustpower EA states that the NHMRC reported that there is no evidence that wind farms cause medical problems. However the NHMRC actually states that:

*“After careful consideration and deliberation of the body of evidence, NHMRC concludes that there is currently no consistent evidence that wind farms cause adverse health effects in humans. Given the **poor quality of current direct evidence** and the concern expressed by some members of the community, high quality research into possible health effects of wind farms, particularly within 1,500 metres (m), is warranted.”* NHMRC Statement: Evidence on Wind Farms and Human Health February 2015 NHMRC ref # EH57.

The NHMRC CEO Professor Anne Kelso stated that *“existing research in this area is of poor quality and targeted funding is warranted to support high quality independent research on this issue”*. The operative words being “high quality” and “independent” as most of the opinions quoted by wind farm proponents are made by ‘interested parties’ with no medical qualification only a degree in sociology. The response to the previous EA submission cites the Nov 2014 judgement of the Environment Resources and Development Court of South Australia were witness Professor Wittert referred to a study which looked at all 51 Australian wind farms with a total of 1634 turbines. Professor Wittert (an Endocrinologist) who undertook the ‘research’ said that the methodology in the study was robust. A search in Google Scholar identified that this ‘research’ was conducted by **accessing data from the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme to compare medical prescriptions of people living in areas with and without turbines**. *This study purportedly involved 12,000 people living within a 10km radius around wind farms in South Australia and Victoria and concluded that “There is no hint of any effect on a population basis **for an increased use of sleeping pills or blood pressure or cardiovascular medications** whatsoever”.* *This cannot be classed as robust research as for this to be relevant the groups compared would have to be identical in all aspects including physical, psychological and socio-economic. Other writers have described Professor Gary Wittert as the paid medical expert for Acciona.*

Researchers, commissioned by Pacific Hydro, took sound measurements near the company's Cape Bridgewater wind farm, in south-west Victoria. A correlation was recorded between the noise made by the turbine and the sensations felt by residents. It was the first time reactions like this had been included in a

wind farm study. "What we found was that previously they were complaining about the noise, but it wasn't really the noise, it was sensations." Pacific Hydro external affairs executive manager Andrew Richards said it was not the company's role to contribute further reports about the noise made by wind turbines, including medical studies.

\$3 million in research grants has been allocated and surely no approvals for these projects should be given until the research has been presented.

Visually the turbines will be a huge blot on our views devastating our enjoyment of the landscape from every direction. The proposed Rye Park turbines are 157m tall and the Bango ones 192m. There will be no escape from the sight or the sound of them!

In Section 6:1:4 (page 77) Trustpower states that:

*"The revised LVIA has determined that the Rye Park wind farm would have an overall **medium** visual significance on the majority of non-associated and associated residential dwellings within the projects **10 km** viewshed". If it is medium at 10km and we live within 3km surely 'visual significance' is much higher? How do they judge this when we live and work on the property? On Page 193 Deterioration of visual amenity states "following the commencement of construction, the Proponent will implement visual impact mitigation measures within 12 months of receiving a written request from any non-associated residence that is located within 4 km of any wind turbine". What can possibly be done to mitigate this impact?*

I reserve the right to submit further submissions

Attached are the views we currently see. The homestead is in the centre of the first photo.



Looking East to the range that is the proposed site of the Rye Park turbines



Looking North East towards Rye Park village showing the range that is the proposed site of the Rye Park turbines



Looking West to the proposed site for the Bango turbines. The wind test tower can clearly be seen. How much more invasive a turbine will be.