

Submission Senate Inquiry 2015

Select Committee on Wind Farms.

Melissa Ware

3/25/2015

This submission addresses the terms of reference from perspective as a neighbouring resident to an IWEP (Industrial Wind Energy Plant) and from direct personal experience covering a span of six years enduring adverse exposure to the noise, vibration and sensation (NVS) emissions of 29, 2MW turbines at Cape Bridgewater, Vic. NVS emissions and problems have been confirmed by three separate independent Acousticians to exist within my home, problems which from pre-construction and to this day remain unfixed. Regulations of the renewable wind industry are unsatisfactory while neighbours endure adverse impacts to health, well-being and quality of life. A moratorium should be placed on any further developments of wind energy until the 7 recommendations of the 2011 Senate Inquiry are met and particularly until the health impacts known as Wind Turbine Syndrome caused from turbine emissions are resolved.

Table of Contents

<u>1. SUMMARY</u>	3
<u>2. CAPE BRIDGEWATER ACOUSTIC STUDY 2014</u>	4
<u>3. CAPE BRIDGEWATER COMMUNITY CONSULTATION MEETINGS (CCC'S)</u>	14
<u>4. COMPLIANCE</u>	15
<u>5. WIND FARM REFUGEE</u>	18
<u>6. Two Km SETBACK DISTANCE should be extended, not removed</u>	19
<u>7. DoP/DPCD/DPTLI</u>	21
<u>8. GLENELG SHIRE COUNCIL (G.S.C.)</u>	24
<u>9. GP's, Department of Health, ABA</u>	25
<u>10. Policy and planning</u>	26
<u>11. BATS</u>	27
<u>12. CONCLUSION</u>	27
<u>Appendice 1.-Letters to L.Crockett</u>	
<u>Appendice 2- Planning Dept. Map</u>	
<u>Appendice 3- Emails R.Watson, W.Grainger re: complaint, July 2014</u>	
<u>Appendice 4.- letter L.Crockett re: letter & conditions for acoustic testing,12.8.13.</u>	
<u>Appendice 5.- Submission to Planning Panels Vic- C55 Heritage Overlay-Feb</u>	
<u>Appendice 6.- 13PH Communications Register.</u>	
<u>Appendice 7.- Melissa Ware Diary excerpt -25.3. 2012</u>	
<u>Appendice 8- Letters from Departments.</u>	
<u>Appendice 9.- Health related Letters.</u>	
<u>Appendice 10- Letter to L.Crockett 2015</u>	
<u>Appendice 10- MDA- Noise Impact Assessment CB- p12-Site Layout.</u>	

1.SUMMARY

A minimum setback distance of 7-10 km is required depending on the size and power of the turbines to provide some protection from exposure to industrial infrasound.

Change is urgently required to wind farm monitoring and regulations, which are currently failing to protect people from noise, vibration and sensation emissions and wind farm harm.

As turbines increase in size, number and cumulative impact the permit regulations should adapt to protect the health and wellbeing of residents and ensure farm and home workplace safety is met.

Review old EES projected, predicted noise levels; using Mr Coopers WTS method of measuring and compare to actual infrasound and audible noise - emitted by wind developments.

Review wind developers responsibility to resolve complaints of noise, vibration and sensation (noise nuisance) and their failure to resolve the proven imissions causing harm.

Noise, Vibration and Sensation and full spectrum acoustic monitoring of homes within 10 kms of a wind energy production plants needs to be constant, on-going, long term and turbines and operations adjusted accordingly to prevent cumulative impacts on humans.

Adverse impacts from wind energy plants require full independent epidemiological health studies.

There has been no compensation for loss of amenity, lowered house value, 'un-saleability' of homes and farms, for the health impacts nor the financial costs rising from broadband noise, vibration and sensation impacts on my family and community.

Review how PH (pacific hydro) and other wind developers conduct community relations and meetings, to discover how little transparency, honesty and openness there actually is in this process.

Investigations are required as to how authorities are allowing health and noise nuisance problems being reported to them by residents to remain unresolved i.e. Department of Health, Department of Planning, local Shire Councils and the EPA etc.

Cape Bridgewater (CB) is deemed an area of cultural, historical significance to Victoria, it's rugged beauty, its aboriginal history and of the earliest days of white settlement; How could a four stage wind farm be approved for this incredibly special area of three beautiful Capes?¹

Where do we draw the line on the number of turbines in Victoria? Like in Scotland,² if turbines can be seen from half the places in South West and Central Victoria, that is too many.

A Royal Commission is needed to fully investigate Wind Farms in Australia.

- CCC's (Cape Bridgewater Community Consultation Meetings) were a waste of the communities' time and effort.

¹ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u6_nDrRnccw –video showing before and after turbines at CB

² <http://www.scotsman.com/news/environment/wind-turbines-now-visible-from-half-of-scotland-1-3710550>

- Have the Marshall Day Acoustics (MDA) permanent monitoring trial results been peer reviewed by independent acousticians?
- Sensation is now used by residents to describe adverse impacts of wind facilities.
- PH dismissed the world recognised scientific findings of emissions & impacts in the joint CB Acoustic Study.
- Who actually owns the contents and data of the collaborative CB Acoustic Report?
- It has been my experience there is callous disregard and I believe deceitful actions by wind power developers, and PH towards residents and communities.
- Dr Sarah Laurie or the Waubra Foundation cannot be blamed for measurable wind farm emissions and impacts.
- 'Standards' and planning laws are inadequate with ineffective monitoring and guidelines.
- dBA measuring standard applied to industrial wind energy plants is useless.
- Mr Cooper's dBWTS detects anomalies and can help preventative action to be initiated such as noise optimisation or shutdown of turbines.
- 1-5 rating of noise, vibration and sensation and trendlines measured at wind facilities should assist to set the standards required to protect from harm.
- Professor Chapman's nocebo effect is nonsense based on outdated and biased material.
- PH agreed to discover the problems and try to restore us and our home to its previous happy state but instead have dismissed our complaints and have not fixed the CBWEF problems.
- Have any CB wind turbines ever operated in *noise optimised mode* to meet the requirements of the NZ noise Standard and the CB Permit?
- Visual Screening was inadequate.
- We have never been compensated for the intrusion and loss of amenity.
- Suffer ongoing long term impacts from and hyper sensitivity to infrasound.
- We complain about the issues being experienced and the Department of Planning and the Glenelg Shire Council (GSC) say they are not responsible and direct me back to the other and nothing is done. The Health Department and the EPA does nothing about the impacts.
- No more discussions. Fix or remove the turbines at CB.
- The problems existing for neighbours of wind farms are impacting so many others across Australia and the world, nothing is being done to prevent the problems and a Royal Commission is required to investigate and resolve the issues.

2.CAPE BRIDGEWATER ACOUSTIC STUDY 2014³

The renewable industry has much to profit by ignoring the plight of those like me whom are horribly impacted by wind energy generator emissions. Unlike coal fired energy power stations the impacts of wind energy power stations emissions remain unseen without the use of specialised noise and vibration monitoring. For PH and supporters to conclude there is no noise, vibration and sensation (NVS) impacts from wind generators on people is to harshly deny the reality that infrasound and powering up and down of turbines occurs at IEWF's which makes us sick, and stop us from sleeping properly.

³ <http://www.pacifichydro.com.au/english/our-communities/communities/cape-bridgewater-acoustic-study-report/?language=en>

Summary of Mr. Cooper's findings at Cape Bridgewater:

- 1 The impacts from noise and vibration generated by wind turbines include sleep disturbance – defined by the WHO as, in and of itself, an adverse health effect.*
- 2 In addition, those impacts include a range of other adverse sensations, such as: headaches; pressure in the head, ears or chest; ringing in the ears (tinnitus); heart racing; or a sensation of heaviness.*
- 3 The impacts are most pronounced when turbines start up, are at full power or changing load by more than 20 per cent up or down.*
- 4 The trigger for the adverse sensations suffered is turbine noise measured inside homes in the 4Hz to 5Hz frequency range at sound pressure levels as low as 50 decibels – well below the hearing threshold for those frequencies (i.e., what is termed “infrasound”).*
- 5 The audible noise measure (i.e. dB(A)) – used in the noise guidelines is irrelevant.*
- 6 The sensation impacts correlated with infrasound generated by the turbines and measured inside homes.*
- 7 Turbine generated infrasound is readily distinguishable from infrasound generated by natural sources, due to the “signature” produced by wind turbines.*
- 8 The results accord with the work done during the 1980s by Neil Kelley, et al, which proved that very low frequency noise generated by wind turbines caused the adverse effects suffered by wind farm neighbours.*

In 2010, I reached a limit to silently enduring these impacts after allowing ample time over two years for the turbines ‘to settle in’ and for something to be done about the problems as promised pre-construction. We had communicated with and made complaints to PH since 2007, nothing had improved, changed or been investigated and I started to document issues and writing letters appealing for directives and assistance. Responses are unsatisfactory as problems and issues remain unresolved.

In March 2012 we CB residents were interviewed about our situation by a reporter, Anelia Blackie, from the Border Watch newspaper^{4 5}. We spoke out about the negative impacts of the CB IWEF and requested full spectrum noise and vibration monitoring in our homes to determine the truth of what is occurring in order for the noise nuisances to be fixed.

Senator Madigan and Senator Xenophon had recently conducted a wind farm forum in Mt Gambier and we were concerned for some time that no independent wind farm health or noise studies were being undertaken and nothing was being done by the Government or PH. More and more turbines were planned and approved without heeding the warnings of impacts to our health that we had been reporting.

We’d been asking for independent testing and investigation for some time. It was incredulous to me that full time monitoring was not conducted at the wind farm to detect what I was feeling and experiencing near turbines. This was my first contact with media to talk about the CBWEP issues.

⁴ <http://www.borderwatch.com.au/story/261982/wind-farms-fan-health-fears/>

⁵ ‘Residents sound wind farm alarm’-News Extra, The Border Watch, May 2, 2012

Sensations are the physical and mental response, traumas and adverse wind farm impacts people experience and were importantly recognised and acknowledged in Mr Cooper's acoustic study. Noise and vibrations are continuously emitted from the CB and other wind farms and we now have a correct label to describe impacted peoples often indescribable experiences and it's 'sensation'.

Victims of the impacts like me, do not always hear the whole range of wind farm noises i.e. infrasound and LFN or have the misfortune to 'feel' vibrations travelling through the ground and air and through our houses. We all experience responding sensations of differing human degrees to the 'noise' or the NVS inflictions and these sensations are the basis of our complaints and it's not just 'noise', as commonly defined and understood by most people.

Which authority oversees PH's noise complaint and evaluation procedure in Condition 18 of planning permission originally outlined in Attachment 17 of PH's Development Application?

Complaints about wind farms are dismissed partly through the use of incorrect measuring and monitoring methods, which totally fail to rectify or remove the noise, vibration and sensation issues at CB and other wind farms. Current practice of monitoring of dBA at wind developments and use of outdated methodology is useless for protecting people from harm but perfect for continuing operations unhindered by any obligations or due consideration to neighbours. Complaints are easily dismissed because there is no obligation under permit conditions for operators to monitor their wind farm on a constant and seen basis.

Woken at e.g. 1am or 4am in the morning, disturbed by the wind plant thundering away, I feel and 'sense' it, the unwanted emissions or waste energy as a bombardment on my body. I do not exaggerate this bombardment and am inclined to under report the conditions we live with. These acoustic emissions which I constantly feel were and are detected by Mr Cooper's methodology, extensive equipment and the dBWTS recognised and used in the Cape Bridgewater Acoustic Study.

As much as the wind industry, its supporters and the AMA believe it to be, **it is not** simply disturbance in my mind, subconscious or otherwise and I have **not** somehow been brainwashed by an anti-Windies mob. My partners (and my) complaints are recorded in PH's communication register as early as 2007. See Appendice 6. The complaints register kept by PH was inadequately maintained by PH, some communications were not documented as per my records, particularly the calls and visits made by Rikki to PH, prior to their first entry to the register in 2007.

Lane Crockett stated in ecogeneration May/June 2011, '*it was good to get the real facts out on the table*' (at the previous Senate Inquiry 2011) and '*it had not been their experience to have complaints at their wind farms*'.⁶ Ignoring our phone calls, visits and complaints prior to 2011 surely contravenes the complaints process and conditions of the Planning Permit.

This article included the proposed guidelines set out by the Victorian Liberal Government⁷. Mr Baillieu intended that people living within 1 km of a wind farm would be compensated through a shared payment system for landowners and for public availability of all data on the energy output of wind farms and also place restrictions on the Bellarine Peninsula, National Parks, and the Wilsons Prom. etc. Mr Crockett strongly objected to those proposals.

⁶ 'Lane Crockett-the future of wind energy in Australia.-featured May/June, Ecogeneration.

⁷ www.vic.liberal.org.au/webData/policies_others/Planning.pdf

Our house is less than 900 metres from the nearest turbines and we have never been compensated as no policy has been enacted to do so.

For the first time access to the SCADA was provided by PH to us and used in the Cooper Acoustic Study 2014. (SCADA is wind turbine supervisory control and data acquisition, or information about how the wind farm is operating, performing and for compliancy purposes or detecting malfunction).

These environmental acoustic disturbances are measurable by scientific procedure and were also detected in acoustic testing conducted by Mr Les Huson and Dr. Bob Thorne⁸ within my home. Residents' observations, previous acoustical investigations alongside Mr Coopers monitoring of the facility inside and around our properties; using the best and properly calibrated equipment proves beyond doubt, the CBWEF (Cape Bridgewater Wind Energy Facility) disturbances and acoustic impacts on residents exist and side by side together.

Full co-operation enabled Mr Cooper's intensive acoustic study for 8 weeks inside our homes to identify noise, vibration and sensation problems we excruciatingly experience. My contribution, and the contribution of five other residents was to voluntarily observe and note personal experiences in a diary, every daylight hour and during the night when disturbed by the wind energy facility.

The depth of input, the time involved to document the issues, for TAG to decipher it all and 'see the patterns' in the data, to understand and show cause of the problems has been phenomenal and nothing as intense or co-operative had been done like this ever at a wind farm before.

The diaries of observations I had previously kept are much less informative and seem inadequate without the 1-5 rating of the noise, vibration and sensation impacts. I had been noting 'noise' episodes as they occurred, and usually when the situation was bad, otherwise I felt I would be writing all the time as the disturbances were so frequent and wouldn't stop or ease for days on end. Very rare are conditions at the wind energy plant favourable to not cause any disturbance or distress to me.

Noting of observations into a diary since 2012 (Appendice 6.) was an outlet and register for the truth of what happens to me, it was an outlet for my frustration, anger and despair, it was a record of observations on better days and bad days.

No-one in authority seems to be listening to the human and animal impacts and absolutely nothing is done off paper to protect us from harm. In six years not once has the CBWEF been turned down or off due to our complaints of noise or vibration or sensation; during high fire danger days; for Christmas (see Appendice 1.) or other special family times; or during severe lightning storms...not at any time unless they eventually shutdown during extreme high wind speeds or the couple of times of complete shutdown over the six years for maintenance or upgrades.

NVS disturbances were documented in Mr Coopers Acoustic Study but you cannot imagine the continued and constant impacts from vibrations travelling through and from the towers and blades that eventually hit and shudders like a relentless unheard, but felt and extremely disturbing air and ground tsunami through our home.

⁸ <http://waubrafoundation.org.au/resources/thorne-r-victorian-wind-farm-review-updated-june-2014/>

I once 'officially' complained of this experience to PH and explained that it felt like an earth tremor. I think of it as the 'perfect storm' but not at sea; there are no warnings, you can't see it and most times can't hear it coming and it lasts for days, weeks and months on end for years.

Most people seem to fortunately not feel the tsunami like pressure or energy pulses but those of us that do, have an uncontrollable, autonomic, fear response to it. It is terrifying being jolted awake by something that is occurring externally and internally and words sometimes cannot describe the impacts and symptoms to and on my body.

Some deem these autonomous physiological responses to be the result from Professor Simon Chapman's 'nocebo effect'; his unfounded theory of scaremongering anti-wind farm tactics that I have supposedly been exposed to. I object to his unfounded theorising and irresponsible assumptions. He is not a Doctor and he has not examined me or studied the conditions I live with and am impacted by.

I believe that anyone supporting this nocebo theory without hands on investigation in impacted homes is callous, unprofessional and supports the marginalisation of the growing rural population exposed to this energy production industry.

The goal of my participation in the acoustic noise study of 2014 at CB was ultimately to have PH fully acknowledge the problems and how they occur, take preventative action and resolve long term exposure of six years to noise, vibration, and sensation caused by this energy plant built too close to our home.

The GSC Planning Map of Cape Bridgewater Jan 2012, Appendice 2, shows the proximity of turbines to our home within a blue lined zone, which likely depicts the area of predicted unacceptable noise levels. (When I have asked the Planning Dept. at GSC what the blue area is they directed me back to PH. It never has been properly explained to me what the blue line buffer depicts).

I don't believe PH can say they are transparent when they failed to meet their own goals by irresponsibly obliterating our complaints of the past six years and have offered no compensation for the harm, proffering no resolution and no fix for the mechanical and acoustic interference and abuse they cause adversely impacted neighbours.

PH have halted the CCC (CB Community Consultation) process and proffered no steps of action as to how future complaints of noise, vibration and sensation will be resolved and remedied. PH show no interest or concern of the economic impact of their energy plant on our house and land value or the now 'unsellability' of our property due to the proximity of the facility. This issue was raised to Mr Lane Crockett who has informed me twice over the years, "he'd get back to me on that", and neither he nor anyone else at PH has done so.

PH has no interest or concern for our deteriorated mental and physical health and blame 'the Doctor' (Sarah Laurie) for our problems. There is no Doctor causing my symptoms such as headaches nor shaking or vibrating the floor, windows, walls and foundations of my house.

An 1800 complaints number has been recently initiated but we're told by the PH community liaison officer, there is nothing she can do to help us. PH recently started offering relocation for

one nights' accommodation excluding travel etc expenses as respite from the noise, vibration and sensations. See Appendice 3- Email R.Watson, W.Grainger.

Left to cope and deal with the torment and agony of industrial intrusions that rarely cease, our health impacts worsened to the point we have locked the door, vacated our house and emotionally and physically can't return. When I do the impacts are increasingly felt within half an hour of returning and within four hours I feel like I haven't left the area. On visits home turbines have operated at minimal output, there's been little wind and impacts to me occur during these 'quieter' times also.

The 6 residents involved in the CB Study originally requested a team of independent acousticians, epidemiological health studies, testing for EMF's and testing of our drinking bore and tank water supplies to occur simultaneously. Our requests were made in a letter and resident's document of conditions sent to PH via Senator Madigan's office; our requests were mostly refused or ignored by PH. (See Appendice 4- Residents letter & conditions-12.8.13)

PH's final response to the collaborative efforts between residents and PH are very different to what was believed and expected by us.

Agreements and the contract made between PH and Mr Cooper were without the six residents' inclusion and it was our expectation this investigation was to be an open and transparent collaboration between PH and Residents. I feel it was not. We had to repeatedly request information be forwarded to Senator Madigan's Office to keep him informed of PH's progress or lack of; PH's discrepancies often differed from the reality i.e. PH would accuse Mr Cooper for delaying the release of information and often it was PH causing delays. They would accuse me of frustrations with Mr Cooper when my feelings of frustration lay completely with PH.

PH commitment to resolving problems occurring at their wind facility was simply for appearances.

Community consultation meetings⁹ (CCC's) were established and if we didn't attend, I believe PH said at the first or second meeting the acoustic study was not to proceed. These CCC's were controlled by PH from the start; minutes were to be recorded by them and residents were told no audio or visual recordings were allowed and no media or journalists were permitted to attend. Some of us could not attend meetings due to other commitments or could not hear what was said at meetings and a recorded version was needed and vital to clarify the discrepancies between what was discussed at the meetings and what ended up on the PH website.

These minutes did not always accurately document what was being said by the residents and wider local community and it says as much in the CCC terms of reference, created by PH following the second meeting. Minutes from the very first meeting with residents at a CCC are not available or acknowledged on the PH website. Although inwardly detesting it and against my better judgement, I attended these CCC meetings for over a year to assist achieving resolution of the problems. A huge amount of Cape Bridgewater residents' personal time and effort was wasted in this process.

⁹ <http://www.pacifichydro.com.au/english/our-communities/communities/cape-bridgewater-community-consultative-committee/?language=en>

Futureye were employed by PH to facilitate these meetings, and supposedly to assist in trust building. Futureye disappeared from the process with no explanation whatsoever provided to CB residents by PH and the changes of staff involved were never noted in the minutes of the CCC Meetings. We endured the whole process attending the meetings, while staff rotated or changed, having a break usually meant they had not read the minutes of their own meetings and had no idea of the lack of progression or care for the run-around we participants were being given.

The CCC Meetings also included discussion of the MDA (Marshal Day Acoustic) permanent monitoring trial which was to be located on our property also and when I questioned about the equipment to be used etc. the testing and MDA equipment, Ph decided it was to be sited elsewhere.

This MDA trial was conducted throughout the period the Cooper testing was being conducted. What was the actual purpose and result of this trial and was it conducted using properly calibrated and appropriate equipment?

Firsthand knowledge of what occurs inside our homes as adversely impacted residents steered the direction of the study to assist PH to get to the bottom of and to understand our complaints. Three households and families experience similar and also different impacts from the facility. Mr Cooper listened to us and has ably discovered and documented what is occurring at Cape Bridgewater and has determined, with utmost integrity and for good reason that clearly further studies are required at wind energy facilities. He has expertly laid the groundwork and bravely worked with both the company representatives and the limitations they imposed on the work and met the varying needs of the residents all have been discounted and derogatively dismissed for too long¹⁰.

Pacific Hydro's Andrew Richards stated he wanted to show the residents through this study, they are a compliant wind farm; we already knew that fact after being repeatedly told by PH for years. PH didn't believe our complaints because of supposed compliancy to the regulations; In a letter to me following my submitting a complaint re the 'unbearable rumbling vibration noise', 28th May 14, A. Richards wrote to me '*they hoped the results of Mr Coopers testing and analysis in and around the wind farm will shed light on what weather and or operating conditions are causing the wind farm to create an issue for you*', and also, '*we would like to resolve the situation so that you can live happily in your home, so I am sorry that we are not able to rectify the situation for you immediately*'.

27th Jan. 2015 '*Picking apart a weak wind farm report*'¹¹ was published in the Business Spectator by Ketan Joshi. His comments are unfair. The Cape Bridgewater Acoustic Study was supposedly a collaborative, open and transparent process to get to the bottom of the problems we experience inside and outside our homes. The study was restricted by the parameters set by PH and was limited to a small yet very intensive study which does not detract from the value of the findings as Mr Joshi suggests. Although small in participants, the lengthy eight weeks worth of full spectrum measurements taken inside and outside our homes, and during a complete shutdown; gives

¹⁰ <https://www.wind-watch.org/news/2015/01/21/wind-energy-study-finds-links-to-impacts-reported-by-residents/>

¹¹ <http://www.businessspectator.com.au/article/2015/1/27/wind-power/picking-apart-weak-wind-farm-report>

enormous scientific and acoustic insight into the Cape Bridgewater wind farm and the levels of infrasound and LFN we residents are exposed to.

Infrasound and impacts already determined to exist by previous investigations undertaken in our home by Mr Huson and Dr Thorne. Bob Thorne's psychoacoustic investigation and study in our house confirms mental and emotional impacts of infrasound and unbearable industrial 'noise' conditions inside our home.

An epidemiological study called a "case series cross over study" is not affected by size or a small number of people, so the CB Acoustic Report 2014 cannot be discounted because of sample size. Investigation of individual responses to wind turbine infrasound & low frequency noise, or the "exposure dose" being the amount of infrasound being measured (or low frequency noise, or vibration) was undertaken and human response recorded separately in my diary. Our diaries were detailed and give valuable information on human response and impacts.

This study demonstrated to me there was a correlation or trend-line between what was happening at the wind farm and my responses. What I was sensing and perceiving as the noise, vibration and sensations were compared to operational changes at the wind farm and were occurring simultaneously in our home and in and to my body, over the eight weeks duration of the study and other times.

27th Jan, 2015 an article headlined, '*Why PH commissioned the Cape Bridgewater wind farm acoustic study*', written by Andrew Richards and appeared in the Climate Spectator. The Cape Bridgewater acoustic report 2015, is nearly 900 pages long. [Why did it take six years for PH to try to understand precisely what our concerns and complaints are in our homes at Cape Bridgewater?](#)

After PH final public meeting and comment on the Report, I feel PH did not fully commit to working with the residents to resolve problems emitted by their wind facility. We chose Steven Cooper as the investigator and also requested a team of independent acousticians. Pacific hydro may have allowed Steven Cooper but I twice refused their previous offers of noise testing in our home by MDA. To be serious about discovering the problems, it had to be by working with an independent and ethical acoustician, of the residents choosing and it was my understanding the Report could not be altered in any way by PH. Our consent had to be given before the release of any information or the report.

[What was PH's brief to Steven Cooper and did the company abide by the collective brief?](#) Andrew Richards states in the Climate Spectator, '*they felt they never had anything to hide*'... like their conclusion and outcome of the study they simply refuse to acknowledge the direct correlations between emissions and impacts that we residents and acousticians tell them exist at the wind farm and in our homes.

He also said the study '*was the right thing to do*'....

The absolute wrong thing to do at the end of such a groundbreaking study is refuse to see the correlations, the links, and the patterns and dismiss we residents' complaints of the past six years without resolution. How is that 'right' and 'working with the residents'? Hours and hours of input by we residents and TAG, inputs and outcomes of a scientific investigation arrogantly and utterly dismissed by PH at Steven Cooper's final presentation in Portland. A scientific investigation globally

hailed as groundbreaking. The genie is truly out of the bottle now and ignoring it or simply dismissing complaints won't make it all go away.

Much was discovered going on at the wind facility at Cape Bridgewater by Mr Cooper, that PH's previous statements to residents that what we hear is '*wind in the trees*' or '*the ocean*' alone is ludicrous. Yes natural sound elements of the wind and ocean are present, but no, they are not the cause of the problems from broad band noise that we experience. PH's Lane Crockett opts to lay the blame of their turbine emitted noise, vibration and sensation disturbances at the feet of a Doctor whom supposedly somehow causes it.

Lane Crockett said at a private meeting, (following the Final Acoustic Presentation), with Rikki and me, that everything was fine at the wind farm before 'the doctor' came along. He accuses Dr Laurie of increasing anxiety in the area when he responded to Anelia Blackie's article in the Border Watch¹².

Hog wash! We had been complaining about the wind farm from the start of the commissioning of the CBWEF, prior to attending any meetings regarding wind farms or even hearing anything of Dr Laurie.

The fact is that the wind energy factory itself is causing the anxiety and a panicked flight fight response and not by the Waubra Foundation which is assisting rural people and professionals through education and support.

Mr Richards states frequencies detected are unable to be heard by the human ear; as though this somehow exempts the trend between the existence of infrasound detected at Cape Bridgewater homes and the higher severity levels of sensation experienced by residents. It is these infrasound emissions and severity of sensation that is the problem at wind farms and CBWEF which require urgent epidemiological medical studies to be initiated.

Many including Mr Richards, refuse to realise studies already confirm infrasound negatively impacts humans.¹³ PH acknowledges further studies are required at their wind factory and negligently refuse to initiate these required further studies recommended in the Cooper study. Natural infrasound by the way has different impacts on people, usually positive rather than negative. And negatively impacted sensitive people like myself are often further impacted by these natural sources of infrasound due to our hypersensitivity from long term exposure to wind farm broadband noise and infrasound.

PH refused to allow this Study to involve medical experts. A medical study and a sleep study, was requested by the residents, to be conducted in conjunction with the acoustic study. We wanted to really find out what was occurring in and to our bodies as well as in and to our homes. We wanted the problems we experience recognised for all the other people around Australia trying to cope with similar sensations and problems. Sensation as you now know, is a descriptor for the noise we don't hear but feel and are impacted by.

¹² <http://www.windturbinesyndrome.com/2012/australians-victims-of-wind-turbine-syndrome-abandoning-their-homes/>

¹³ <https://www.wind-watch.org/documents/wind-turbines-and-ghost-stories-the-effects-of-infrasound-on-the-human-auditory-system/>

To be serious in getting to the bottom of the problems, why didn't Pacific Hydro encourage this scientific work to be peer reviewed? Why didn't they allow medical experts and testing we volunteered to undertake during the study to improve understanding of health impacts?

Mr. Coopers' work is being hailed around the world and is supported by Dr Bob Thorne, Dr Paul Schomer, Standards Director of the Acoustical Society of America, George Hessler, the President and Principal Consultant for US Acoustics specialist Hessler Associates, Robert W. Rand, ASA, INCE, RAND ACOUSTICS, Stephen E. Ambrose, ASA, INCE, Board Certified Principal Consultant.

Mr Coopers' methodology is important and required to assist in resolving problems at wind energy plants. The dBWTS should be the standard and accepted acoustic curve used within the industry to assist in prevention of harm through unwanted noise, heard and unheard in our previously quiet, natural and non-disturbing rural environments.

The study results were I thought meant to belong equally to the residents involved and not solely to PH the financial sponsors of the acoustic study. Although not legally clarified by PH at the beginning of the study, it was the residents' early understanding that even though we weren't paying for the acoustic study it would be equally ours to have an input into and not only the study itself; but to also review it prior to the public release and be included in decisions regarding the outcomes.

We residents reviewed and gave our permission for release but who owns the information or the CB acoustic report and why wasn't that clarified to us at the beginning of the proposal?

It seems PH had no intention but to dismiss our complaints as they have always done and not remedy the problems. Six years of detrimental impacts warrant further action and not further negotiation. Mr Richards speaks of a 'broader program' with local communities and working with the Cape Bridgewater community, what and how and to what purpose? If they wish to act in a publically acceptable manner and garner social licence to operate and build trust in the community then why not proffer total support for the medical and acoustic studies required at their wind facilities.

We were never at any stage told that the Study would only result in the opportunity for more discussions and no resolutions. We thought it was an opportunity for real problem solving by getting to the root of the problems and addressing them through changes to the CBWF operations.

I do not wish to have or be involved in any further discussion with this company; six years consulting with them is enough. Their standards are publically unacceptable and their actions have been a lie. PH has proven to me you cannot have '*mature, informed discussions*' with arrogant, dismissive and lying corporate bodies and personnel meeting their own needs to ignore everyone else's.

It is no longer a time to consider '*further mature informed discussions*', it is beyond time that if these turbines cannot be fixed then they should be totally removed to prevent further damage to communities, the buildings and people and animals in them. Our Government at all levels must not continue to turn a blind eye to these problems and the actions of these renewable companies, particularly PH.

Wind farm operators should not continue to be supported economically, or socially; they should be arrested for the appalling conditions we neighbours and communities are expected to live under; constant and I believe criminal acts of torture is taking place at my home and at many isolated rural

houses and homes all around Australia, the whole situation requires legal investigation in a Royal Commission.

PH does not concede there is an urgent need for regulatory review and investigation of the NZ: 1998 standards they operate under. Not finding solutions, dismissing and marginalising us confirms they never worked with us honestly or on open terms and do not act transparently. There is no commitment to being a decent corporate institute abiding by ethics to assist in the safety and protection of people within 7km's let alone 1km of their turbines.

Following the Presentation of the Report and PH finally revealing how they would deal with the discoveries at CB, after all the effort put in by the residents and at further risk to health, I was not only disappointed, I was shocked. I wrote to Lane Crockett following the private meeting held the morning after the Presentation. See Appendice 10.

Why should this business be permitted to operate like this? Why should they receive taxpayer funding or access to superannuation investment funds or be funded by Banks or the CEFC? Without social licence to operate how can the renewable business be supported to maintain the port?

Protective acoustic, health and economic IWEF standards need to be established and enforced.

3. CAPE BRIDGEWATER COMMUNITY CONSULTATION MEETINGS. (CCC'S)

- Residents and communities are uselessly encouraged to provide 'feedback' to wind developers. As a result of the CCC's being closed down, I refuse to co-operate any further in providing feedback or being 'open' with PH representatives. Trust and faith in the 'renewable industry' especially PH has been completely obliterated.
- Meetings cancelled i.e. August 14,
- Meetings of the CCC's posted up on PH Website are inaccurate and not all have been posted.
- Final Report was finished in Nov 14, released in Jan and not presented until Feb 15.
- We agreed to participate on the understanding that the final report and findings would belong not to one party but to all
- That the process be on an open and transparent basis with equal, open sharing of information.

Andrew Richards from Pacific hydro told me following a CCC meeting to "be patient, Melissa". Patience with anything to do with PH was stretched to the limit. Instead of grieving a family loss, I was forced to attend a consultation process that has been fairly one sided. Instead of normal family life, with quality time spent with the extended family, years have been consumed with trying to have wind farm issues heard, trying to find rest and normality within my own house.

PH controlled the community meetings, set the referendum, made the rules, banned the media and full public attendance, set the agenda, 'doctored' the minutes, made it difficult to have residents points added to the reviewed minutes and did not document or make public the very first community meeting.

Trying to discover from Richards what the company was planning to do to resolve the problems we have been experiencing from the wind farms emissions and I was not looking to be told to be patient. For six years I have been remarkably patient. Not once has the wind farm been turned off or down because of the CBWEF NVS problems being experienced. According to the company and government regulations PH operations at CBWEP are compliant! It is time the regulations correctly addressed the impacts.

4. COMPLIANCE

Who is currently acting as the Responsible Authority regarding the enforcement of noise conditions at CBWEF?

The Marshall Day Acoustic PWEF 2 Noise Impact Assessment for Cape Bridgewater, 11 Sept 2006, on page 10, table 4, lists House 2, our house, as being **non-compliant without noise management**.

On page 12 of this Assessment, Appendix A is the CB Site Map. The map is attached below in Appendice 11 and shows six turbines closest to our house WTG's 12, 13, 14, 15, 27 & 29 needed to be operated at 5B Noise optimised mode to be compliant to NZS 6808:1998. This extract of 4.1 here explains the versions of noise management i.e. type 4B and 5B.

4.1 sound power of a WTG

The Repower MM82-2MW variable speed WTG has been selected for this project. This WTG is available in different versions or settings for noise management purposes. For PWEF 11, two noise managed settings have been provided by RE Power in addition to the standard (default) setting where no noise management is applied. These managed settings are identified as Type 4B and Type 5B respectively. Other settings are available and further environmental work may lead to adjustments being made to the settings applied here.

Table 2, 4.7 shows the variable output of a WTG when noise management settings are in place. Appendice 11.

There are 29 turbines at CB Stage 11 of PH PWEF and MDA predicted that 13 of the 29 or 44% would operate in excess of the NZ Standard and breach permit conditions unless operated correctly at 4B or 5B settings. Not once have PH mentioned to us they have operated in the correct manner using 5B mode.

So if PH have not operated the wind farm with these noise optimised adjustments then by MDA admission and with PH's knowledge our house has been exposed to audible noise that exceeds permissible noise levels in the NZ Standard and is in breach of planning consent.

If all turbines are operated in 'normal' mode then resident's homes are exposed to unacceptable higher levels of audible noise and also to higher levels of infrasound and LFN. With our access to the operational data from the wind farm, it may now be determined if the CBWF has ever been operated in noise optimised mode. We believe it has not and has not met permit conditions.

Pacific Hydro knew their wind farm might not comply and would likely cause nuisance as they required a noise agreement form to be signed by us that would indemnify them against any nuisance the wind farm would cause. We never signed the noise agreement form below in Appendice 11.

Here is a copy of a Landlord Agreement.

5.12 New Zealand Standard

- (a) The Landlord acknowledges that:
- (1) Generators may generate noise on and over the Land which may exceed the New Zealand Standard;
 - (2) in particular, the operation of the Wind Farm may affect the use, amenity and development of the Land or the Property for residential or habitable use;

- (d) The Landlord on behalf of itself and its successors and assigns releases to the full extent permitted by law the Tenant and its contractors, employees and agents from all claims and demands of every kind resulting from:
- (1) noise produced by Generators in the immediate vicinity of the Property or the Land which affects the use or development of the Property, including any noise which may exceed the New Zealand Standard;
 - (2) any purported nuisance caused by the Generators in the immediate vicinity of the Property or the Land.

- (e) The Landlord on behalf of itself and its successors and assigns indemnifies the Tenant and its officers, directors, employees, agents, representatives and mortgagees against all liability arising from, and expenses incurred in connection with:
- (1) any breach by Landlord of its obligations under this clause 1;
 - (2) noise produced by Generators in the immediate vicinity of the Property or the Land which affects the use of the Land, including any noise which may exceed the New Zealand Standard;
 - (3) any purported nuisance caused by the Wind Farm in the immediate vicinity of the Property or the Land;
 - (4) any claim action or proceeding by a third party against the Tenant in respect of the matters contained in this Lease and indemnity, including any claim or complaint by any tenant, occupier, licensee or invitee on the Land.

Pacific Hydro had told the hosts, stakeholders, shareholders and the community there would be no noise and made recommendations for noise standards that don't measure LFN and Vibration impacts. They helped write the Victorian wind farm guidelines in 2002/2003. They submitted to the Senate Inquiry into the Social and Economic Impacts of Rural Wind Farms:

“achievement of compliance with the existing standard NZS6808:1998 provides protection against “sleep disturbance”, “noise levels” and “health and amenity” and “we contend that well designed wind energy facilities have a very low impact on the immediate environment.” and We submit that the health impacts associated directly with wind farms are tenuous and existing guidelines provide sufficient balance for both developers and communities”.

Pacific Hydro acknowledges that CB residents in the immediate environment of the WF suffer negative impacts including impaired quality of life and sleep deprivation. PH have publicly apologised in the Portland Observer for the noise impacts; so Cape Bridgewater must be what PH considers a poorly designed WF and must not comply to the 1998 NZ Standard.

Under the Planning and Environment Act 1987- Sect 126, it is an offence to contravene a scheme, permit or agreement.

The Planning Department, the previous Planning Minister Mr Guy, and currently Mr Wynne, (See Appendice 8-letters from Departments) have never confirmed compliancy of the Cape Bridgewater Wind Farm and do their utmost to avoid dealing with problems at CB at all.

I had been informed by a Dtpli officer in the one visit to our home that all records and my correspondence had been 'lost' in the transition from the DoP to the Dpcd which became the Dtpli and now the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning. A lot of corresponding to them, a lot of name changes yet still nothing is done to resolve our situation at CB.

The NZS6808:1998, 2010 noise standard for wind farms is outdated and useless in the light of the acoustic studies undertaken in my home and evidence using updated methodology verify our complaints of nuisance, vibration and sensation and disturbances.

The Cape Bridgewater Wind Farm planning conditions only required 12 months of self-monitoring by the company Pacific hydro itself to prove 'compliancy'. Employing Marshall Day Acoustics, and using dodgy equipment that recorded nothing for weeks on end, with probably incorrectly calibrated equipment of inferior quality and inadequate methodology; how can PH be deemed a compliant wind farm based on this data provided to the Planning Minister?

The Senate Inquiry of 2011 into the Social and Economic impacts of wind farms, made 7 recommendations that have not been enacted. The most important of which was independent noise monitoring of wind farms and live moment to moment availability of wind farm SCADA. Through the CB Noise Study we now know what occurs at the wind farm and hopefully prevention of NVS problems can be attained through implementation of correct monitoring and regulation. There is acoustically and human detection of turbine disturbance even when the wind farm is fully shut off.

For too many years people living near wind farms have been exposed to WTS and infrasonic emissions as a result of what I believe deliberation on the part of our Governments to erect wind turbines at all costs regardless of the well known impacts. The methods of obtaining social licence to operate or condone these industries emitting infrasound or LFNS have failed and will fail whilst such ridicule and denigration of we, the local resident's observations and complaints continues.

The Department should set up a compensation fund through a mandatory levy put on REC's received by all wind power generators. This compensation should be paid to IWEP neighbours for all incurred or anticipated losses caused by the IWEP operations. We should be compensated for loss of amenity, not being able to live in our house, the added cost of relocating, and the likely inability to sell our property, the added housing expense, medical, schooling and travelling expenses. We should be compensated for the agony we have endured in our own home, for years of lack of sleep, adverse health impacts and for the whole inconvenience and destruction of our previous way of life.

5. WIND FARM REFUGEE

Which authority has the statutory duty of care to respond to the significant nuisance that the operation of the unregulated IWEF causes me?

My family have fled our home at Cape Bridgewater after 6 years enduring noise, vibration and sensation emissions from the Cape Bridgewater Wind Facility. The noise and epidemiological health studies which have funding to be conducted have not yet occurred and my tolerance to endure the impacts is exhausted. Occasions when disturbance and sensations became so bad particularly after a long period of exposure without relent and we're forced with no options but to leave the area for a break for a few hours or for the weekend and now permanently.

After participating in the 8/9 week study undertaken by Mr Cooper and extensively contributing with 1-2 hourly observations and documentation in a diary and with the conclusions drawn from the study there should be full cognition and understanding of what we have been experiencing for so long. And no doubts held of the further investigations required.

It is difficult to return home. 5 days in Sydney away from NSV impacts at Christmas time, I totally relaxed and after some time being away from the turbines and industrial NVS, I have restored energy, better sleep, regained normal weight, blood pressure has stabilised and my state of health is improved.

I am extremely sensitive to city traffic noise and infrasound from a nearby by-pass and my sleep is disturbed by it. I have experienced a mild headache during the day from this new exposure to noise and when higher levels of disturbance on public holidays or when it is raining and the traffic is busier and noise is louder. The headache does not require pain relief and mostly does not make my head or ears feel like exploding from feelings of external pressure as they do with wind turbine interferences.

Sometimes I wake in fright thinking I am back home and the turbines won't stop, (PTSD?) then I realise I am not near wind turbines and able to return to sleep without a fear response or feelings of barometric type heaviness from the 'acoustic' pressure that occur back at CB. At home to attend PH meetings or to mow grass and attempt to maintain the house, the impacts are unbearable and I have to leave. Often I was unable to and would have to endure the constant bombardment. Our health and quality of life and quality of our family life suffer to the intolerable point of having had to escape our own home. I cannot live there.

Unacceptably: going home is utterly dreaded and awful as there is no sanctuary in or outside it.

Broadband noise, vibration, energy pulses, seismic waves are all emitted by the 29, 2MW turbines of the Cape Bridgewater Wind Farm. The nearest group of turbines are located about 850 m from our front door and roughly 550 m from the back fence of our 6 hectare property.

Vibrations are detected in the walls of our historic pre 1850's built home and these vibrations are felt through the floor, the furniture, the bed, my body and rarely cease and I am physically violated. These energy plant vibrations and emissions drive me mad from distress and the physical impacts to my health. I have discovered depths of endurance and am often driven beyond despair and

wretchedness. It is a cycle of relief when the wind changes direction or drops speed, relief that doesn't last long as impacts are variable and unexpected from one moment to the next.

Nothing may be done to relieve the pressure put on my body. It is torture. I have tried to sleep in every room in the house, I have tried to find peace and quiet on the front veranda, I have tried to block the noise by all means possible and nothing works. Medication does not work.

Night after sleepless night the solid wooden bed vibrates and 'noise' through the pillow and air can't be turned off or blocked out. Day after restless day spent in pain with headaches, ear aches, heart aches, bone aches and on and on extends the list of symptoms as more time is lived in unprotected exposure to these turbines.

When will the Government recognise our plight? When will our health and safety be protected from wind farm harm? When will Pacific Hydro be held to account for prolonged suffering by their inept responses to our complaints of noise and vibration emitted by their turbines and causing such sensation disturbances in our bodies and to our home and property?

It is terribly important this Panel realise the extent of damage being inflicted on many rural Australians forced to live in unsustainable circumstances near wind energy production plants. Conditions are torturous.

Mr Baillieu intended to establish compensation for people forced to live within 1km of an IWEP, what happened? There is now systemic failure to protect those of us being bombarded by the harmful noise emissions of this industry and other industries like it. This systemic failure is being permitted through institutional corruption which actively defends poor conduct and utter lack of NVS protection for rural residents.

We have the right to be free from the chronic annoyance from wind farm emissions.

6. Two Km SETBACK DISTANCE should be extended and not removed.

In 2007, Frey and Hadden released a document called '*Noise radiation from wind turbines installed near homes: effects on health*'¹⁴; they concluded 2MW wind turbines should be no closer than 2 kilometres from residences and have greater distances for larger turbines. They found turbines in combination produce acoustic radiation that consequently results in health problems such as sleep deprivation and stress. The whole body can have a physiological response to not only audible noise but inaudible also. '*These injuries are considered in the context of Human Rights, where it is contended that the environmental noise pollution destroys a person's effective enjoyment of right to respect for home and private life, a violation of Article 8 of the European Court of Human Rights Act.*'

Planning Minister Matthew Guy is quoted in this Age article¹⁵; '*They have been more restrictive, principally because putting wind turbines of 160 metres just a few hundred metres from people's*

¹⁴ <https://www.wind-watch.org/documents/noise-radiation-from-wind-turbines-installed-near-homes-effects-on-health/>

¹⁵ <http://www.theage.com.au/victoria/victoria-state-election-2014/victorian-state-election-labor-promises-to-loosen-wind-farm-rules-20141113-11m2xi.html>

homes is not a good outcome. Although he recognises that turbines are not good close to people why then did Minister Guy change the wind farm planning laws to permit wind farm developers and operators the leeway to increase blade lengths of turbines without further review of planning permits?¹⁶ Building higher towers with longer blade lengths, bigger more powerful turbines creates more impacts on the local population, not less.

There are no good outcomes for us at Cape Bridgewater residing less than 2kms from the IWEP. The 2 and 5 km **protective** buffer zones (Not '**anti-wind farm laws**' as described by Friends of the Earth etc.) should not be removed. Victorian Labor Premier Mr Andrews's proposal as stated in the Nov. '14 article, actually opposes scientific views and studies like those above that wind farms should be located no closer than ten kilometres from homes. Adverse wind farm impacts have meant vacating our home, our property has devalued; time is consumed raising awareness of our plight and also has impacts on our personal life and goals.

It remains difficult to believe that after complaining of the NVS issues that last for such long periods without cease that our complaints of 'noise' are still not recognised by the Planning Department, by P H or local Government or the Health Department and many GPs etc. Obviously there are serious problems, now confirmed by Mr Coopers study at Cape Bridgewater where changes in the wind farm operations have a direct impact on me inside my home to the extent I 'sense' those operations Mr Cooper described, "With 100% accuracy", and my body involuntarily physiologically responds and my health deteriorates. It is time the Planning Department (and Department of Health etc.) caught up to the knowledge of what is occurring at the frontline of wind farm interactions and matched the regulations to protect the public from harm.

One of the last instructions from PH to the attendees at the CCC meetings was we the residents were "not to name names". I questioned what did they mean by saying it and if this had been done by anyone and who specifically had been named already?

What gives PH (and renewable energy supporters) the right to behave as they do towards the residents and then not expect to be held accountable?

Andrew Richards from PH told me following a CCC meeting to "be patient, Melissa". I was grieving the loss of a family member, my patience with anything to do with PH was stretched to the limit. Instead of grieving or honouring life, I was forced to communicate with and attend a consultation process fairly one sided in honesty and collaboration. Instead of normal family life, with time spent with the extended family, years have been consumed with trying to be heard, trying to find rest and normality within my own house.

PH controlled the community meetings, set the referendum, made the rules, banned the media and full public attendance, set the agenda, 'doctored' the minutes, made it difficult to have residents points added to the reviewed minutes and did not even document or make public the very first community meeting. I was trying to discover from Richards what the company was planning to do to resolve the problems we have been experiencing from the wind farms emissions and not looking to be told to be patient.

¹⁶ <http://www.weeklytimesnow.com.au/news/politics/wind-companies-question-planning-office-response/story-fnkerdda-1226997709510>

For six years I have shown much patience. Not once has the wind farm been turned off or down because of the problems being experienced. According to the company and government regulations PH operations at CBWEP are compliant! It is time the regulations correctly addressed the impacts.

7. DoP/DPCD/DPTLI/DELWP

Why is the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning and its previous incarnations, not looking after our reasonable interests?

21.5.14 I received a response to my email of 16.4.14, I explained no-one was dealing with my complaints about the CBWF. The Senior Planning Officer at Dtpli reconfirmed a previous email stating the Glenelg Shire is responsible for enforcement of the conditions of the incorporated document that the wind energy facility is required to operate under. The GSC tells me it is the Dtpli responsibility and has done since my first complaint to them. A recent letter from the CEO of the GSC tells me my complaints must be submitted to Will Grainger at Pacific Hydro. He to date just dismisses the issues without evidence of investigation. I informally call this the royal run-a-round and I have included related correspondence in Appendice 8-letters to Departments.

In May 2004, the PWEF Incorporated Document was incorporated into the Glenelg Planning Scheme suggesting the GSC is responsible for PWEF and noise. Condition 13 of the PWEF planning permission specifies noise compliance must be determined to the Planning Ministers satisfaction. The previous Planning Minister, Mr Guy never resolved the issues of NVS at the CBIWEP.

The Pyrenees Shire Council persuaded the Minister for Planning he is responsible for enforcement of noise conditions there. The Pyrenees Shire Statutory Planner, Mr Chris Hall had raised the matter at the 2011 Senate Hearing of Community Affairs Reference Committee inquiring into the Social and Economic Impact of Rural Wind Farms. Basically when landowners complained of sub-audible noise impacts the Department became unwilling to take on enforcement of Permit Conditions or dealing with the problems and put the onus onto shires as being responsible. This includes CB.

Neither the GSC nor the Department have acted as the responsible authority on noise related permit conditions at Cape Bridgewater over the past six years. My understanding is if no-one is monitoring the situation then who agrees the wind farm actually complies with Condition 13; therefore CBWF does not comply with the terms of its conditional consent and why is it operating?

Any complaint made under Condition 18 of the PWEF Incorporated Document to meet the determination of a 'valid' complaint, is subject to 5.3 or Complaint 'Valid' Procedure, .3: If Condition 14 agreement is not possible or too expensive PH will examine mitigation at source, by management of blade rotation cross over speeds by wind sector and wind sector management of generator operation (including shut-down) to comply with Condition 13. Have they ever operated the turbines in noise optimised mode at CB?

To my knowledge this has never been done and until recently I did not know what 'noise optimised' meant and not having seen the original permit conditions and did not know that a certain number of CB turbines in close proximity to our house had to be noise optimised because they could not be compliant without doing so.

Considering none of these Incorporated Document Conditions have been adhered to, have the complaints procedure and our officially submitted complaints to PH, to the DPCD, DPTLI or the GSC, been inspected by anyone other than the wind farm operator itself? Who is the regulatory authority forcing PH to take action to mitigate problems to comply with Condition 13?

It is unacceptable the electricity generator is operating and regulating the wind facility to its own benefit to our disadvantage and without review.

PH commissioned Marshall Day Acoustics (MDA) to meet Condition 16 that a pre-construction monitoring program to the NZ noise standard must be done, before the start of the development of the wind energy facility, and results forwarded to the Minister for Planning and are to the satisfaction of the Minister for Planning.

The Minister for Planning would be aware that the predicted noise levels in the MDA pre-construction noise report showed that our house (House 2) would be exposed to noise levels that exceed the standard and breach Condition 13 unless the IWEF was operated with 'noise management'.

Fortunately when PH engaged Mr Cooper to undertake advanced acoustical assessments at the CBWF, PH provided full details of the CBWF's operational data, from commencement, including evidence of turbine power output modes and SCADA data to us.

This information could easily identify the power output of the WTG's required to be noise optimised and which may be operating in noise optimised mode and used to form an opinion as to whether or not compliance is achieved. Non-compliance with condition 13 requires immediate action under Condition 18- 5.3 Complaint 'Valid' Procedure, .3.

It is concerning that no preliminary independent noise testing was undertaken at Stage 4 of the PWEF even though the emissions problems at Stage 2, CBWEF were being investigated by the independent acoustician Mr Cooper, hired by PH to get to the root of existing problems at CB.

Is any post-construction monitoring being conducted to ensure operations are within noise limits at Stage 4?

The 2004 Environmental Effects Statement (EES) Panel for the Bald Hills, South Gippsland wind energy development¹⁷ had evidence brought before it regarding the smaller Toora, South Gippsland wind energy development. The Panel responded thus:

'It is most unfortunate that Toora has no independent monitor in relation to its planning permit noise condition. It is most unfortunate that we cannot even discern whether for example any or all of the turbines at Toora have been noise optimised, or are still operating in power optimised mode, regardless of spreading discontent on the ground beneath. It is equivalently most unfortunate that South Gippsland Shire Council has hitherto not undertaken an investigation'.

¹⁷<https://www.yumpu.com/en/document/view/10276609/panel-report-bald-hills-wind-farm-project-ees-ees-supplement-and-/213>

'The Panel accepts that from the perspective of a rural shire, the possible expenditure of many tens of thousands of dollars on a single planning investigation may appear as bad value for money. However, if the Shire and indeed the State is to maintain its core value of fairness in the administration of its planning schemes and public confidence in approvals processes for major developments, potential noise complainants in good faith must be given the assurance that somebody is looking after their reasonable interests'.

Who is looking after our reasonable interests?

Did the Minister for Planning endorse the Landscaping and visual screening program at Cape Bridgewater? When Lane Crockett visited our house at the commencement of the Acoustic Study he asked if we had participated in the visual screening program and he then asked a very relevant question... 'Where is it'? The visual screening program was a joke; the trees and shrubs will never screen the turbines nor provide visual protection. Weeds were introduced onto our property and spraying of herbicides onto our organically and hand maintained property was ineffective because three times there were delays in planting and had to be sprayed again.

The plants do not address any visual impacts of the turbines anywhere at Cape Bridgewater particularly where the development looms over the Great South West Walk.

- Where is the CBWEF Environmental Management Plan that provides details of procedures for access, noise and pollution management?
- Where is the identification of all potential contaminants stored on site and an emergency plan for the neighbours within 1 or 2km of the storage site?
- Has routine testing been conducted at CB to test for water or air contamination and made available to the public?
- What happens to the rubbish at the site i.e. damaged blades and broken machinery and used chemical products?
- Are there airborne fibreglass spills when blades fracture and sit or hang mid-air for months awaiting maintenance and crane access?
- Was weed control conducted at the site for 2 years following construction? What sprays were used? Did the sprays blow over onto neighbouring organic properties?
- How may the neighbours be alerted to and protected from IWEF fumes and oil spills?
- How is the avifauna monitoring plan conducted and where is that data and what were the independent results of data collection?
- How many wildlife or livestock carcasses been removed from the IWEF area to date?
- Has anyone documented the changes to the types and number of birds and bats and the impacts of the CBWEF to the avifauna population?
- What is the purpose of attempting to lower emissions through a RET if life near wind energy generation plants are impacted and damaged in the process?
- What ongoing damage is being done to the limestone caves in the district through ground and air pulses created by turbines? Who assesses any ongoing damages?
- We live very close to the electricity plant, why were we never given a copy of the planning permit and pre-construction noise report prior to construction so we could know the correct complaints procedure and our rights?

- Did PH, Energy Equity, and Blue Wind Energy truly never know the existence of our house until we attended the community display of planning application, at GSC in 1997?
- Why have the noise complaints never been publically reviewed?
- Why is Lane Crockett permitted to say there have been no noise complaints at PH wind generated electricity plants when there have?
- What exactly are the response protocols to NVS complaints?

8. GLENELG SHIRE COUNCIL (G.S.C.)

- Which authority has the statutory duty of care to respond to my 'valid' complaints about the operation of the CBWEF?
- Does the GSC have a sound contour map provided with Marshall Day Acoustics pre-construction noise assessment, a requirement of the NZ noise standard?
- How does the GSC define the area of the "buffer zone" which restricts development around the wind farm?
- And how does the wind farm buffer zone impact on the Cape Bridgewater section of the Glenelg Strategic Settlement Plan? How does the detection of disturbances out to 7km distances from turbines impact the GSSP?
- Is the buffer area indicated in the Glenelg Settlement Strategy of June 2012 the same as in the PWEF Environmental Effects Statement dated Oct. 2002?
- Does the GSC accept that our home is sited inside the buffer area where WTG noise is emitted at levels in excess of the standard and in breach of planning permission?
- Does the buffer area adopted by the GSC suggest that both GSC and the Planning Minister are very much aware of the noise nuisance we are exposed to?

Confidentially said to me in 2014: "Some Glenelg Shire Councillors are employed within the local wind industry (i.e. Keppel Prince), and may not comment or 'put at risk' the 'jobs' of their fellow work mates".

27th May 14, CEO of GSC writes to say Council had not heeded my request in an email, 22.5.14 for Council to make a submission to the NHMRC review of Wind Farms and Health and the AMA informing the negative impacts of noise and vibration on public health occurring near the CBWF and in the district.

17th Oct 14, we object to paying Rates as 'our home is unliveable, unsellable and we don't get a full night's sleep most nights.'

In 2014 the Glenelg Shire created C52 Schedule 3 TO THE SIGNIFICANT LANDSCAPE OVERLAY¹⁸. This includes a 'Statement of nature and key elements to the landscape' declaring the area of Cape Bridgewater and Cape Nelson to be ***areas of State significance***.

I ask in relation to this document; how is the hinterland remaining free of visual clutter with the Northern and Southern section of the CBWEF, stage 2, and the Cape Nelson turbines, stage 3 & 4, dominating the landscape at CB. It seems to me the Glenelg Shire significant landscape overlay was at rest while the PWEF turbines were in the approvals and construction process.

What does confining any development to existing coastal settlements wherever possible mean?; when the proposed Glenelg Shire Strategic Plan allows for the expansion of Cape Bridgewater

¹⁸ http://planningschemes.dpcd.vic.gov.au/schemes/glenelg/ordinance/42_03s03_gelg.pdf

Township inside the 2 and 5km perimeter of an IWEF known to be causing problems for residents living closest to them.

15th Feb 2013 I made a submission to Planning Panels Victoria re: Heritage Overlay Cape Bridgewater. This overlay process had dragged on for years and I was concerned if our home was not made heritage then PH could well one day purchase the house and property and bulldoze it as happens at other wind developments. Destruction would be a loss as the house although altered does have some historical value. I am concerned that a wind facility was built in such an historical area and the detrimental impact it is having on the buildings from vibration issues. See Appendice 4- Submission PPV- CB Heritage Overlay- C55.

On p 13, Section 4.4 Wind farms and heritage¹⁹, the Panel reviewed our issues that the building of a wind facility next to our homes lowered the heritage values of the area and basically ruled that our concerns were irrelevant to the case. Our house was excluded from a heritage listing.

Current Planning and Development goals certainly differ from the May 1998 'The Victorian Coastal Strategy- Vision for the Coast in which Diane James the Chairman of the Victorian Coastal Council stated *"The coast of Victoria will be a pleasure to experience by both present and future generations, respected by all and recognised as one of the nations icons"*.

9. GP's, Department of Health, ABA.

12.2.2015. GP asked me *"Did I want to hear the findings of any tests at the wind farm"*, also implying that I wouldn't listen to or accept anything discovered in the investigations. I want medical testing and investigations done, I want to be told what is happening to me at the wind energy plant. I want to know what is causing my heart to have problems, why I can't get back to sleep and why I am feeling the impacts I do with 100% accuracy as determined by Mr Cooper, when there are changes in the operations at the wind farm.

I requested a referral to a psychologist and a mental health care plan. GP's appear to rarely listen and often reply in an attacking manner and not easy to talk to with limited time. I often feel a sense of helplessness and inability to cope when dealing with ongoing WF issues.

I had trusted being able to talk openly to my GP without fear of judgement but for six years I feel I haven't properly been heard by the Medical system as no-one from the Health Department takes responsibility for investigating the wind farm impacts on me and family. How would a GP's diagnosis of 'obsessed' assist isolated people in rural communities? The Health Department have known of the health impacts near wind energy production plants since Dr Iser started reporting and investigating the problems for people at the Toora Wind Farm.

Surely GP's are obligated to refer me on to a Specialist with expertise in environmental medicine or to someone who can assist me when he/she cannot.

What greatly concerns me is the likelihood that my GP's in Portland had been directly influenced by AGL when AGL sent letters to Medical Clinics in the South West District directing the clinic and GP to refer any patients complaining about wind farm impacts back to AGL. The AGL letter breaks peoples trust in the Medical System and shows the length wind industry companies take to suppress the negative health impacts present at WF's. This behaviour was made public by residents and Senator Madigan and documented in Parliament. Have wind farm companies had the audacity to approach

¹⁹ http://www.glenelg.vic.gov.au/Files/AmendmentC55_PanelReport_15May2013.pdf

other health providers such as psychologists, or laboratories or audiologists? Why haven't the AMA objected to this intrusion in the private Doctor/Patient relationship?

2.4.2014- See Appendice 7. I wrote a letter to Dr. Rosemary Lester the Chief Medical Officer to explain how difficult it to firstly experience life next to a wind farm and also to have the symptoms and health impacts I was experiencing heard and recognised. I explained about noise impacts in our home and how noise annoys us and sleep eludes us. I requested the abusive and torturous conditions near wind farms and in my home be stopped.

The only advice I have received from the Health Department was to report any symptoms experienced to my GP and my GP's and Specialists told me to move away and leave my home.

3.2.2015- See Appendice7. I read an article by the coordinator of the Victorian Wind Alliance, A. McFeeters in the local newspaper, the Portland Observer and upset by what I had read, wrote a letter, sent via e-mail, to the Australian Breastfeeding Association to object.

A volunteer from the ABA, with no expertise in acoustics, psycho-acoustics or medicine should not in my opinion be making public comment on the health status of noise impacted residents at Cape Bridgewater. Neither is she qualified to deride or dismiss the world recognised Cooper Acoustic Study.

We need health providers to be aware of wind turbine noise, vibration and sensation impacts and assist the community in providing the best care and attention to patients, especially new mothers and babes.

10. Policy and planning

The Cape Bridgewater Wind Farm is not required under current planning guidelines or Permit or Incorporated Document, to do any further demonstrations of compliance. The Minister has never to my knowledge signed that the wind farm is compliant. Without using the currently available peer reviewed data and analysis from the Cape Bridgewater Acoustic Study, which acknowledges impacts on residents, how may he do so?

The original noise data collected at CBWF post construction was inadequate with poor data collection and useless and poorly calibrated equipment. How can compliancy be determined based on faulty and shoddy practices?

Policy and planning guidelines for development of wind energy facilities in Victoria July 2012 states; Planning permit conditions should require post installation noise compliance to be monitored and demonstrated to the satisfaction of the responsible authority. Certification of whether a wind energy facility complies with the Standard and other applicable noise requirements must be undertaken by an acoustic engineer. The wind energy facility operator must provide the responsible authority with appropriate documentation signed by an independent, appropriately qualified and experienced person. The certifier must be able to demonstrate to the responsible authority appropriate independence, qualifications and experience to carry out the task.

Where is signed documentation by an independent, qualified experienced person and where is the Certification for CB?

11. BATS

Bat Ridge Conservation Park is within the range of ten kms. or so from the PWEF.²⁰ The Conservation Park includes fragile limestone caves explored by Cavers. Bat Caves on Cape Bridgewater cliffs are documented within the EES for Cape Bridgewater Wind Farm. It is well recognised that turbines are lethal to bats. We don't see the numbers of bats seen prior to the wind development. Who is doing a bat count of fatalities?

12. CONCLUSION.

'Soon we "celebrate" the 20,000th wind plant, without replacing even one single small plant of conventional energy'. —Ferdinand Fürst zu Hohenlohe-Bartenstein, Chairman, Bundesverband Landschaftsschutz (Federal Association for Landscape Protection.

Thousands of people are being disconnected from the main electricity grid due to the costs arising from the establishment of wind turbines. the infrastructure and subsidies needed to support them.

Useless, costly generation and transmission of electricity from wind generators from privately owned rural properties in farming areas force detrimental impacts on neighbours and communities and this economic and social cost to the general population requires full investigation by a Royal Commission.

Who is ultimately responsible to protect people in Australia from Industrial harm including when that harmful industry is touted as a clean green industrial revolution that somehow unbelievably protects the planet and saves people from belching coal mines?

Information shared here is the tip of the iceberg of documentation since I first officially read the application for permit notice in the Observer newspaper, 1997of a wind farm for CB.

How long does it take to get the issues and problems resolved?

How can the CB WF participate in the LRET under Commonwealth Law while these problems remain without full investigation and stay unfixed?

How can almost \$700 million dollars in Super Funds be written off by PH and people are not alarmed that money is still being handed out in REC's to this company and as Loans from the CEFC and Banks?

²⁰ http://wiki.prov.vic.gov.au/index.php/Submission_to_State_Wildlife_Reserves_Investigation_Committee_-_Proposed_Wildlife_Reserve_Bat%27s_Ridge