Supplementary Submission No 15b

INQUIRY INTO RURAL WIND FARMS

Name: Mr Jim & Mrs Noreen Marshall

Date received: 19/08/2009

09/08/09.

The Director,
General Purpose Standing committee No. 5,
Parliament House,
Macquarie Street,
Sydney. 2000. NSW.

Dear Director,

Re; Inquiry into rural wind farms. One would trust that until the outcome from this is determined NOT one approval for further wind industry developments will be granted.

Reducing green house gas emissions. How can this be? Currently the major components for these huge machines are made overseas. Where does the steel come from? Has it been transported to the overseas factory where these machines are made? Aren't they then imported into Australia? Wouldn't there be massive amounts of fuel used in the transporting? Isn't there plastic used in the making of the nacelle? (which I believe is extremely inflammable). I believe the concrete required to stand these enormous machines upright is considerable – concrete produces considerable GHG emissions that are not kind to the environment. The list goes on.

The life expectancy of these things appears to be around 15years from overseas research. After 5 years they usually present with a major breakdown such as a gear box failure, a rotor problem, any of which can take up to 18 months to 2 years to replace. As they only produce 30% of the time maximum (even Professor Mark Disendorf who thinks they are "benign" states that, plus the ability to store what little power they do produce is up to several decades away). ABC Radio 08/09, it would appear that the possibility of producing off peak and base load power is somewhat of a "furphy". (Article enclosed indicating concerns).

Whilst we appreciate that both State and Federal Government would have us believe that the promotion of these Industries are for the greater good of the community I seriously question that. Why? Because at no stage has there been any commitment by either government to slow down the mining of coal in this valley. Joe Tripodi made the statement on ABC radio "highlight of his political career – ensuing the future expansion of mining in the valley". The greens come out and state that "people will be able to be re employed in the renewable energy sector". ABC 29/07/09. Where do these people resource their information? Pamada themselves say once the initial development is completed there maybe 10-12 positions. So is this massive transfer from mining jobs to renewable jobs going into building factory's to produce these ineffective turbines, concrete plants to supply their huge footings etc, all of which I believe in the making, emit GHG's.

Property values: From information coming out of Victoria it would appear that property values are impacted by these monsters. John Jess, land valuer states from his experience the loss can be as much as 30%. I have spoken with the gentleman. Rural residential is affected more so than farming land. The impact there is around the 15-20%. This gentleman has spoken at "panel" hearings in Victoria. If you had a choice to purchase in a turbine free zone wouldn't you? I doubt you'd buy near 41 wind turbines that are 150m high!

In regard to 4/5: Personally I feel that this technology is "old hat" and if Government wishes to spend large amounts of money in subsidizing renewable technology try solar thermal, geo-thermal.

Other relevant issues: health concerns have to be addressed and taken seriously because they are becoming more apparent with each situation that is developing. People are suffering! Governments have NOT the right to inflict ongoing misery on numerous families all in the name of a "green" ineffective industry. As a registered nurse I am horrified at the way people are being treated. Enclosed is an article which should be enough to make any rational person stop and think "are we allowing this to happen to numbers of people?".To even one person would be too much.

I trust you will seriously consider the issues I have mentioned. When Pamada themselves have made the statement "that in the scheme of things, produce very little unfortunately" why are we destroying so many people's quality of life.

The DoP themselves state in the potential for mining strategic assessment December 2005, that people be compensated in the "affected zone" and the "secondary affected zone" for noise and vibration! So what is the difference? How come one section of the community is given the option to relocate and the other is ignored? We want to be treated every bit as fairly!

Yours faithfully,

Jim and Noreen Marshall.