

Patina & John Schneider
101 Carbine Road
Forest Reefs NSW 2798

18th December 2011

Mr. Toby Philp
Department of Planning and Infrastructure
GPO 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Dear Sir,

Re: FLYERS CREEK WIND FARM PTY LTD MP08-0252

We Patina and John Schneider strongly object to the proposed Flyers Creek Wind Farm (FCWF) and are lodging our objection on the following grounds.

NOISE, INFRASOUND AND HEALTH IMPACTS:

The noise and infrasound, and its reported negative impacts from established wind farms around the world, has been an issue for some years. This has constantly been denied by the wind energy industry and government authorities and can no longer be suppressed or denied. Please refer to Flyers Creek Wind Turbine Awareness Group Inc. rebuttal.

We built our home in a peaceful rural setting to escape the pressures of everyday life and to give our family a peaceful and tranquil rural lifestyle. We know that the intrusion of an industrial wind energy development, on the scale planned by FCWF, will severely disturb our way of life and impact severely on our personal reasons for being in the country. It could also affect our health and well-being, due to industrial scale noise and infrasound created by wind turbines of this stature.

Our youngest daughter is a victim of government departments ineptitude when it comes to putting appropriate regulations in place. She has a complex congenital syndrome caused by organophosphates now banned in Australia. Her health and well-being is of paramount concern and importance to us, and is one of the main reasons we choose to live a more holistic rural lifestyle and to give her the healthiest life we can possibly provide her, without added industrialisation where guidelines and policies fall well short of protecting human life.

Whilst we do not know for certain who will or will not be affected by wind turbines, it only stands to reason that people with pre-existing conditions will certainly be amongst the first to be affected. Please see Explicit Cautionary Notice Attached.

VISUAL AMENITY:

Our house is number 144 on Infigen's maps (that fail to show all residences in our area). We chose to build our home on a ridgeline to take in the beautiful rolling hills and undulating valleys. Our home design incorporated many windows and glass doors to maximise our view. So what we stand

to lose visually to us is paramount, with our downstairs toilet and bathroom being the only rooms in the house that we won't be able to see 30 turbines. Can you imagine the complaints if wind developers were allowed to place wind farms at the Heads in Sydney Harbour? Although the nearest turbine to us is 3.8 kilometres, many more of these hideous white elephants will be visible to us. We cannot see for one minute why we should have to put up with having our visual amenity ruined by industrial monstrosities towering in our rural view and ruining the landscape.

LACK OF COMMUNITY CONSULTATION:

The community consultation has been less than adequate and cannot be considered as consultation but merely a directive of what Infigen had planned to do if the proposed development was passed.

I only found out about the proposed development around September 2010, when an elderly neighbour invited me to her home as she thought a man from the council was coming to talk to her about a property situated between our properties and where they wanted to install a single 22 metre turbine. This meeting flushed out Jonathan Upson from Infigen, advising my neighbour of what they intended doing with FCWF. Not once was she asked for her feelings or input. At this time my home was approximately 2.8km from the nearest proposed turbine.

A short time later, I received an invitation to the Community Consultation days on 19th and 20th November 2010 at the Tallwood Hall. I am sure I only received this invitation because of the meeting with Jonathan Upson some weeks earlier, at my friend's home. I had another neighbour visit my home the same afternoon I received the invitation, and I asked if they had received the invitation and they were shocked to find out about the proposed FCWF and had not received the invitation. They then checked with other residents of the street and soon became aware that not one person besides myself had received this invitation for the community consultation. It is of great concern that Infigen have continuously underestimated the number of residences on our road and on their maps.

On attending the consultation days it was soon apparent that Infigen and Aurecon representatives were there to tell the community what they were doing and not to ask for opinions, as any opinions were quickly met with oppressive statements to nullify any negativity. The information on maps and montages was inaccurate and when pointed out to the wind farm representatives, we were told that they would rectify, but continued to suggest that the montages were accurate. We live in the same area of the existing Blayney wind farm, where turbines are supposedly half the size of turbines planned for our area. Unfortunately, we are not privy to the exact size or type that Infigen intend to use if FCWF is passed. We can see for ourselves that the visual impact of the turbines planned are far greater at further distances, than the turbines in the montages that Infigen boast.

CARING FOR OUR ENVIRONMENT:

Our family has always been mindful of our planet, environment, landscape, flora and fauna and the well-being of humans throughout the world.

We have seen through our own research and investigation of wind developments throughout the world, that great harm is done to our planet, environment, landscape, flora and fauna, and the well-being and health of humans is compromised by not only the effects of the wind turbines but the destruction of community cohesiveness, greed of developers, all based on excuses and whims directed by wind power.

How can any authority, that supposedly has the power to change things for the better, stand back and watch as wind power destroys our communities, lifestyles and landscape?

We will not sit back and allow this to happen in our community.

DEVALUATION:

It is noted from reports around the world and logical, that properties do devalue as a consequence of wind farm developments. Who would want to live next to one?

We have invested heavily in building our home out of non-toxic and environmentally friendly products, paid a premium price for our land with magnificent rural views and now if this project is allowed to proceed, could consider our property virtually unsaleable, or saleable at a considerable loss if FCWF was to proceed. On this alone we would seek compensation.

DECOMMISSIONING:

If FCWF did proceed, the lifespan is approximately 20 years, in which time we would still hope to call this area home. We are sure that when all the subsidies are paid and the tax breaks are depleted, the wind developers will have disappeared and the wind project abandoned, who will be left to clean up the mess? Before 20 years passes and wind energy is found to be of no assistance to the energy crisis, these turbines will become superfluous and due to decommissioning costs and the inevitable battle on ownership, they will become derelict on the hillsides for generations to come and the community must face the prospect of watching the decay of these "white elephants" as they remain scattered on the hillsides and landscapes.


CONCLUSION:

We ask you to please consider our objection and to reject the Flyers Creek Wind Farm as an unnecessary development and a blemish on the Australian landscape.

We ask that you consider our lifestyle and visual amenity, our health and the right for us as Australians to fight for what we believe.

Do not be caught up in the nonsense that wind developers have concocted that wind farms are effective renewable energy sources. This is being widely debated internationally that wind farms are not viable and do not contribute to the energy crisis.

Yours sincerely,



POA.

Patina and John Schneider

EXPLICIT CAUTIONARY NOTICE TO THOSE RESPONSIBLE FOR WIND TURBINE SITING DECISIONS

Including Specifically Directors of Wind Developers, Publicly Elected Officials from Federal, State and Local Government, and Bureaucrats in Relevant Departments

BE ADVISED that, as a result of information gathered from the Waubra Foundation's own field research, and from the clinical and acoustic research available internationally, *the following serious medical conditions have been identified in people living, working, or visiting within 10km of operating wind turbine developments.* The onset of these conditions corresponds directly *with the operation of wind turbines:*

- chronic severe sleep deprivation;
- acute hypertensive crises;
- new onset hypertension;
- heart attacks (including Tako Tsubo episodes);
- worsening control of preexisting and previously stable medical problems such as angina, hypertension (high blood pressure), diabetes, migraines, tinnitus, depression, and post traumatic stress disorder;
- severe depression, with suicidal ideation;
- development of irreversible memory dysfunction, tinnitus, and hyperacusis.

Other symptoms include those described by Medical Practitioners such as Dr Amanda Harry, and Dr Nina Pierpont in her landmark Case Series Crossover Peer Reviewed Study (submission No 13 to the Australian Federal Senate Inquiry into Rural Wind Farms) and published in Dr Pierpont's book entitled "Wind Turbine Syndrome, A Report on a Natural Experiment", 2009, published by K-Selected Books, Santa Fe.

These serious health problems were also identified by Australian GP Dr David Iser in 2004. Dr Iser formally notified the Victorian Government of the time after his patients became unwell following the start up of the Toora wind project. His warnings were ignored without being properly investigated by the authorities and politicians.

All this and supportive material has been made available to the Boards of the major developers, State Ministers for Health and Planning and senior health bureaucrats. The time for denial, and of using the Clean Energy Council to shoulder the increasingly difficult task of denying the link between adverse health and operating wind turbines, is over.

At the Toora and Waubra wind projects, some seriously ill affected residents have been bought out by the developers; but only after they signed confidentiality agreements specifically prohibiting them from speaking about their health problems. This buy-out activity would support a conclusion that developers are aware of the health problems.

Meanwhile, wind developments have continued, with developers asserting that their projects meet acceptable standards, and thereby implying that they cannot be causing health problems.

The Foundation is also concerned that Vibroacoustic Disease, as recorded and described by Professor Mariana Alves-Pereira's team from Portugal, will develop in people chronically exposed to wind turbines. The disease has already been identified in the occupants of a house with levels of infrasound and low frequency noise identical to levels the Foundation is recording in the homes of

affected residents in Australia.

The Foundation is aware of over 20 families in Australia who have abandoned their homes because of serious ill health experienced since the turbines commenced operating near their homes. Most recently, five households from Waterloo in South Australia have relocated, where the larger 3 MW turbines have had a devastating impact on the health of these residents. Some of these people have walked away from their only financial asset, to live in a shed or a caravan on someone else's land. The Foundation notes the mid-2010 advice from the National Health and Medical Research Council that a "**precautionary approach**" be followed. We are not aware that either industry or planning authorities have adopted this exceedingly valuable and important advice.

The Foundation's position, as the most technically informed entity in Australia upon the effects of wind turbines on human health, is this: *Until the recommended studies are completed, developers and planning authorities will be negligent if human health is damaged as a result of their proceeding with, or allowing to proceed, further construction and approvals of turbines within 10km of homes. It is our advice that proceeding otherwise will result in serious harm to human health.*

We remind those in positions of responsibility for the engineering, investment and planning decisions about project and turbine siting that their primary responsibility is to ensure that developments cause no harm to adjacent residents; and, if there is possibility of any such harm, then the project should be re-engineered or cancelled. To ignore existing evidence by continuing the current practice of siting turbines close to homes is to run the dangerous risk of breaching a fundamental duty of care, thus attracting grave liability.

The Waubra Foundation, 29 June, 2011

Enquiries: Dr Sarah Laurie, Medical Director, 0439 865 914

Email address: sarah@waubrafoundation.com.au