

Susan Crosthwaite

Ailsa Cottage, Cosses,
Ballantrae,
Girvan,
Ayrshire
KA260LR

01465831598 / 07876873343

12th October 2022

susancoss@live.co.uk

Dear Mr Ferrie (Chief Reporter) and Mr Buylla (Principal Reporter),

Mr Melvin Grosvenor and I have been third party witnesses in a number of inquiries, hearings and objections involving industrial windfarm planning applications in South West Scotland representing communities whose residential amenity is threatened by these developments.

In particular we focus on potential noise pollution. In our team we have a number of experts in this field (see WIN-370-3 Precognition Wind Turbine Noise (WTN) Submitted: 10.05.21 by Susan Crosthwaite paragraph 1).

We also assist those communities and individuals subjected to noise pollution, when they become, through no fault of their own, windfarm victims due to their homes being in close proximity to operational turbines.

During the inquiries and hearings we have put before the DPEA reporters a considerable amount of scientific evidence which demonstrates that the current planning guidance on environmental noise is not fit for purpose and does not protect the health and well being of windfarm neighbours with regard to noise pollution through current Scottish planning and UK legislation. Planning is devolved, yet noise is not!

Robust planning conditions are supposed to be designed to protect the amenity, health and well-being for all residents subjected to

developments close to their homes. Due to the vast number of windfarm planning applications across Scotland, thousands of lives are being impacted. It is a failure of responsibility for reporters accountable for the planning conditions, to ignore substantial evidence which demonstrates that the guidance ETSU R 97 and the Good Practice Guide are not delivering conditions to **protect local residents from adverse noise generated by the operations of windfarms.**

In our experience reporters ascertain that inquiries and hearings are not the forum to discuss these inadequacies, yet the DPEA and Consent Departments of the Scottish Government are the very forum where these life changing decisions are made.

I would like to refer you to the recent Mochrum Fell hearing:
https://dpea.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/668651
<https://www.dpea.scotland.gov.uk/CaseDetails.aspx?ID=121722>
Dumfries and Galloway Council (20/01683/FUL)

Below is an extract from the transcript taken from this video.

7 hours into the hearing video, Reporter Ms Lynch asked:

Having said that, is there anyway a condition could be attached, to a consent such as this, that could be enforceable? I have/am still not having a concrete answer I would say, from you?

7:02:15 Professor Alves Pereira answered: *Well, how about monitoring the health of people?*

Reporter: *In terms of?*

Professor Alves Pereira: *Not cholesterol, their neurological respiratory response, monitoring their cognitive ability, which goes down the drain in these homes, monitoring other cardiac function. There's MRI's which can be produced after a year of residing in a contaminated home.....*

.....I would monitor, properly monitor, with medical people, not Environmental Health Officers. I have the greatest respect for them but, they are not trained in Medical Sciences, they are not medical diagnosticians.....

7:15.04 Reporter: *Whilst Mr Grosvenor is trying to rejoin, I am certainly not in disagreement with Miss Pridham and Ms Crosthwaite in terms of how desirable such a condition might be and how beneficial it maybe but*

my ability to impose such a condition is extremely limited and you should be aware of that and certainly not in disagreement with Ms Crosthwaite in terms of how desirable.

Glitch with my Mr Grosvenor sound.. aborted..

Ms Crosthwaite: *That was Mr Grosvenor calling saying he won't be rejoining, as he has too many problems.*

Mr Grosvenor did say you could put a note in your recommendations and express concern and suggest some kind of monitoring is done and suggest some kind of study is set up as well. I am about to speak to Generation Scotland and maybe if it came from you as well, it would help to set something up to look at the health, the general health of wind farm neighbours. 7.21.21.

Reporter: *Okay, okay, I will certainly reflect this discussion in my decision letter, absolutely I think that is a sensible solution .*

Yet when it came to the Decision letter the Reporter resorted to the usual ETSU-R 97 /Good Practice Guide as the excuse for failing to fulfil this commitment at the inquiry:

Extract from the Mochrum fell decision letter:

*84. I have noted the concerns raised in some representations regarding noise, but the evidence before me indicates that noise levels would fall within acceptable limits as set out in the guidance used to assess such proposals. The use of the ETSU methodology is a longstanding means of regulating the noise impacts of onshore wind. The Scottish Government has adopted this approach and I have no reason to question the standards that are applied by ETSU. I note the objectors believe that it does not take into account infrasound, amplitude modulation (AM) and excess amplitude modulation (EAM) and therefore the assessment of noise is inadequate. **However, there is no evidence to suggest that these issues are likely to cause unacceptable effects as a result of this proposal.***

*85. I have noted other concerns raised by objectors that relate to the potential impact of the proposal on human health. **However, there is no evidence to support these concerns.***

Even though this planning application was ultimately refused, the point is that reporters are failing in their duty to bring to the attention of the Scottish Government that there is a serious situation developing.

The attached letter to Argyll and Bute Council detailing the appalling on-going distress suffered by such wind farm neighbours illustrates the very shortcomings of such an approach.

Developers' environmental statements are being taken as gospel whilst third party objectors and their experts are being ignored.

You, yourself, Mr Ferrie took the word of RES in their application for Blary Hill Wind Power Station when you consented the application. I am told that you stood in the kitchen at Arnicle Farm and told the residents that they would only see three turbines and that the impact on their residential amenity would be minimal.

The families at Arnicle Farm, Mr Grosvenor and I would like to invite you and Mr Buylla as Chief and Principal Reporters to join us at Arnicle farm, at a time of your convenience during the week of 25th October. Your presence is fundamental to understand how lives (not just of people but of animals too) are impacted by turbines being built too close to homes.

We would like you to witness the devastation to the lives of these families and help us to solve the conundrum (described in the attached letter) with Argyll and Bute and RES before there is an unmitigated tragedy this family.

Yours faithfully,

Susan Crosthwaite