

From:
To:
Subject: WIND TURBINE NOISE 2015 - INCE/EUROPE, Date: Monday 20th April to Thursday 23rd April 2015, Venue:
Radisson Blu Hotel, Glasgow, Scotland
Date: Wednesday, 6 May 2015 12:44:07 PM

For,
Jeanette Radcliffe
Committee Secretary
Wind Turbines Select Committee

Dear Ms Radcliffe,
This email is not so much a submission, but what might be termed a notification as to a source of information that might be relevant and useful to the Committee's deliberations.

Has the Committee been informed those acoustics experts who might have made submissions that the latest (bi-ennial) International Wind Turbine Noise Conference has just concluded in Glasgow?
Has anyone informed the Committee as to where to look to see a list of the conference speakers and topics?
Here are a few links and comments on them.

http://windturbinenoise.eu/?page_id=121

All the language there is very sanitised, but for those of us who know about wind turbine noise, this language shouts to the heavens that it is a problem that the experts now realise is far more serious than first believed.
In saying that, please note that for me, some of those listed as presenters at the conference such as Steven Cooper, Prof Colin Hansen, Bill Palmer, Mike Stigwood and Dr Frits van den Berg, are honorable exceptions.

Here is the conference presentations overview list:

http://windturbinenoise.eu/?page_id=1073

Again the presentations list indicates that it is accepted among the experts that wind turbine noise is a problem that has to be managed.
These papers' topics tell me that the acousticians generally now recognise that it's time to get on with the serious business of identifying the noise sources and proposing solutions.

Note that on the evening of day one, Dr Frits van den Berg was to introduce posters over drinks.
It might be of interest that my wife Glenda and I brought Frits to Australia back in 2005 to try to tell the NSW State Planning authorities that wind turbines have a noise problem.
It seemed then that no one in those authorities took any notice.
Now, clearly, Dr Frits is an icon among the noise experts, experts who have only more recently discovered that what he had to say all those years ago has proven correct: that wind turbine noise really is a serious issue.

Perusing the titles among the day-by-day speakers' list:

I note that "health effects" along with "wind turbine noise" are now regular sets of words in session titles.

That both sets of words now routinely appear in the papers' titles is a huge change since 2006.

Noting Day 1, Monday's papers' lists: http://windturbinenoise.eu/?page_id=967 .

There are quite a few papers there whose titles acknowledge that noise is a given, and a problem.

In particular, note the speaker and the paper's title set for 3.00 pm:

Professor Colin Hansen "Prediction of infrasound and low frequency noise propagation for modern wind turbines,
a proposed supplement to ISO9613-2".

Nice, polite language: to me that title is saying that Prof Colin is stating as a fact that infrasound as a component of
wind turbine noise is present as is a given.

He is also saying that ISO9613-2 never considered infrasound. That is precisely what Steven Cooper told the Committee
at Portland on Day 1 about the current SA and NZ wind farm noise guidelines.

Tuesday (http://windturbinenoise.eu/?page_id=973), has some interesting papers.

Frits van den Berg, Perkins, on amplitude modulation, for example,
Bill Palmer on a changed, (presumably regulatory), environment.

Wednesday (http://windturbinenoise.eu/?page_id=979) - lots of stuff on blade trailing edge noise.

How come this has suddenly emerged, presumably as a hot topic?

The wind industry told us in 2005/6 that noise, and in particular, to suggest that there would be noise effects

from wake turbulence from the blade tips was all just so much nonsense.

The industry told us that wind turbines are quiet, benign even. What has happened to change the minds?

Thursday (http://windturbinenoise.eu/?page_id=987) - here is a WHOLE day on Amplitude Modulation.

Note the paper by Robert Stigwood at 13.45 pm.

I think this would have been a day of lively, nay, even heated discussion, particularly after the paper by

Cassidy at 9.40 am - a paper from a developer's perspective.

Might I suggest then that the Inquiry consider seeking to hear testimony from the WTN Conference participants,
particularly from some of those whom I mentioned above, about the conference discussions and outcomes?

Best regards,
Paul Miskelly