



A Quiz

Which of the following statements is True?

*Courtesy of Dr Euan Porter Cameron
Windfarm Developer*

1. "The turbines will be 40 metres in height, with three blades....."
2. "The development is small in scale and has been carefully designed to minimise any visual impact."
3. "The site will generate electricity for about 4,500 homes in the area."
4. "The electricity will be cheap to produce...."
5. "The design and control systems will ensure that there will be no noise nuisance or effect on TV or radio reception at any property in the area."
6. "It is our intention, as far as possible, to place the major construction contracts with local contractors to ensure maximum benefit to the area."

Answers on page 2

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

- 1 A quiz – TRUE OR FALSE
- 1 Quotes - Fill in the missing word(s)
- 2 Answers - TRUE OR FALSE
- 2 Answers - Quotes
- 3 WindBluster - "Dear Householder letter"

Quotes (1)

Can you fill in the missing word(s)

*Courtesy of Matt Britton
(Powergen Renewables)*

1. "Wind Turbines are"
2. "The inevitable consequence of living next door to a wind farm is"

Quotes (2)

*Courtesy of Mr Bernard Beckett,
ex director of development,
Barrow in Furness Borough Council*

3. "On the grant of planning permission, (for the wind farm) the area changed from rural to mixed rural/industrial and consequently the residents expectations of noise are now....."
4. "If a minority have to suffer for the good of the majority then....."

Quotes (3)

*Courtesy of District Judge
Peter Wallis*

5. "Audibility and annoyance are not to be equated with....."
6. Despite 26 noise nuisances, 14 borderline noise nuisances and 1 breach of original planning condition in a 22 month period:- "I find... the evidence given on behalf of the informants"

Answers on page 2

Answers

True or False

They are ALL false!!!

1. The turbines are 63.5 metres tall - after the developer (somehow) forgot to include the radius of the rotors, (which are 47 metres in diameter.)
2. These turbines are situated on or near the top of the highest elevation in the area, rising to 180 metres from sea level in less than 2k. They totally dominate the vista from 3 settlements. They were also so "carefully designed" that that they were built in the wrong place and do not benefit from any planning permission!
3. Using their own formula - the actual figure is nearer to 2,900 homes - a significant overstatement of the benefits
4. Electricity from wind farms is believed to be between 2 and 3 times more expensive to produce than from conventional sources
5. In a 22 month period (just prior to our court case) the Environmental Health Department of the local authority substantiated 26 "Nuisances", 14 "borderline noise nuisances" and 1 "breach of the (*unenforceable*) planning condition." Their ONLY action was to "inform the developer"
6. After repeated questioning by MaiwaG - the developers eventually admitted that less than 10% of the manufacturing contracts were awarded to "local" contractors.

How many did you get right?

Answers

Quotes (1)

1. "INAUDIBLE" - when challenged he went on to redefine this word, with a definition that is not compatible with the Oxford English Dictionary, (meaning - incapable of being heard) but obviously is in the Powergen Authorised "Wind Speak" dictionary
2. "NOISE" - would appear that he has changed his mind - this quote is from his evidence given on oath at the court case - you will have to decide which version is misleading.
3. "TOO HIGH/UNREASONABLE" - For whom?
4. "SO BE IT" - have you ever heard anything so sanctimonious and pompous? Who does he think he is?
5. "NUISANCE" - it was because the noise was extremely audible and annoying that we maintained it was a nuisance, and on 26 occasions the EHO totally agreed, on a further 14 he thought it a borderline and on 1 other the noise breached planning conditions. What do we have to do?
6. LACKS SPECIFICITY AND DETAIL. I beg your pardon - we had the instances listed above (41 in total) We had 6 informants who gave verbal evidence. We had a further 7 residents who provided evidence of their own nuisances. We also had the chief EHO who declared that he believed we had no other course of action to take to resolve these issues. We had an EHO who presented his findings and we had the ex director of development of the local authority who confirmed the site has no planning permission and that the conditions on it were unenforceable

UNBELIEVABLE?

NO!

It happened to us.