

From: [Vanessa Lake](#)
To: [Deanna Snair](#)
Subject: FW: Following Up After Summer Break.
Date: September 10, 2024 12:07:04 PM
Attachments: [image926075.png](#)

From: Protect Vaughans Community

Sent: September 10, 2024 11:57 AM

To: Mark Phillips <MPhillips@westhants.ca>; Alexander Dunphy <ADunphy@westhants.ca>; Jim Ivey <jivey@westhants.ca>; Mark Fredericks <MFredericks@westhants.ca>; Vanessa Lake <vlake@westhants.ca>; Abraham Zebian <AZebian@westhants.ca>; Shelleena Thornton <SThornton@westhants.ca>; Rupert Jannasch <RJannasch@westhants.ca>; Mark McLean <mmclean@westhants.ca>; Scott McLean <smclean@westhants.ca>; Jeff Hartt <jhartt@westhants.ca>; Debbie Francis <DFrancis@westhants.ca>; Bob Morton <bmorton@westhants.ca>; Ed Sherman <esherman@westhants.ca>; Paul Morton <PMorton@westhants.ca>; John Smith <JSmith@westhants.ca>; Laurie Murley <lmurley@westhants.ca>

Subject: Following Up After Summer Break.

Caution [External Email]

This email comes from an outside sender. Verify the sender and use caution with any requests, links or attachments.

Good morning, West Hants Council Members.

I hope you all have had a wonderful summer and enjoyed the lovely weather that we have been blessed with. I am writing today to pick up where we left off back in July to clear up a couple rather important points stemming from the July 23rd, 2024, Council meeting.

The first point I would like to address is a statement Dr. Christopher Olsen made to the council regarding wind turbine setbacks. Dr. Olsen Stated - **“We have over 15000 residents living in the municipality, you do not produce electricity for your needs. You are effectively asking other municipalities to produce the electricity required here in West Hants”.**

I choose not to believe this was an attempt to SHAME the Council into submission, but rather an error in Dr Olsen’s calculations that led him to this accusation of inaccuracy. So, I chose to do a math

exercise on West Hant's behalf to "clear the air" so to speak.

Below you will see the Wind and hydro- electric projects operating, under construction or approved for construction in West Hants -

Avon River Hydro - 7 MW

ST Croix Hydro - 5 MW

Ellershouse Wind 1 and 2 – 23.5 MW

Ellershouse Wind 3 - 66 MW

Martock Ridge - 6 MW

Benjamin Mills Wind Project - 150 MW

When totaled: 257.5 MW of generating capacity.

According to the calculations of wind industry professionals, a total of 313 homes can be powered per MegaWatt. (Confirmed by South Canoe Wind farms statement of fact that their 102 MW wind farm powers 32000 homes). **West Hants currently has generating capacity for 80598 homes.** Additionally, it would be reasonable to add the 102 MW capacity from South Canoe's wind farm to West Hants total, although this generating facility's footprint is not in West Hants, it is constructed along the county line with the overwhelming majority of nearby residents living in West Hants. Hence, the reason they sought approval for the wind complex from West Hants residents.

With the new total of Mega-watts standing at a whopping 359.5, West Hants residents have graciously provided power for **112523.50 Homes.**

According to a 2021 Stats Canada poll. There are 19500 residents in West Hants residing in 9100 homes. Without including the South Canoe Wind complex, we are/will be generating electricity for 8.86 times as many homes as we have in our municipality. When including the South Canoe Windfarm we are/will be generating electricity for 12.37 times as many homes as we have in West Hants.

I believe the residents that are requesting slightly further setbacks are being very reasonable, when considering our record of welcoming Electrical Generating Complexes to our community.

My Second Point:

Regarding setbacks: Wind Industry experts have openly stated to Council the current 1km from residents is too far, but manageable. Even though, according to West Hants By-laws a hobby farm must base their chicken coop off adjacent property lines.

I would like to share with you a response I received from a wind farm proponent regarding why there is a need for 1.5-1.8 km spacing between turbines in the prevailing wind direction (NE / SW for this proposed generating facility in the southern region of West Hants.)

“The optimal spacing of wind turbines is influenced by a number of factors, including the characteristics of the wind resource, topography, and various constraints. At Bear Lake, the project team

has thoroughly modeled and optimized the turbine layout considering these various elements.

Our energy resource team has carefully analyzed the prevailing wind directions and seasonal trends, among other factors, to design the best possible layout for balancing energy production while minimizing potential environmental and other impacts. The resulting layout reflects a balance of these considerations, ensuring an efficient and effective arrangement of the turbines”

With additional research I discovered the following; Turbines need to be spaced 1.5-1.8 KM apart in the prevailing wind direction to accommodate the wake effect produced from the adjacent turbine. (Turbulence of the wind created by turbines)

No matter how you shake it, wind is weather. I do not believe it should be reasonable to allow a company to alter the weather on your property without even so much as asking permission.

I am sure that all Wind farm companies prefer the current setback of 1KM from a habitable dwelling. However, you must ask yourself, what do the residents deserve? Allowing the residents of West Hants the opportunity to discuss and negotiate on their own behalf is the most responsible thing our council could do for their constituents.

As we embrace a greener future, it's crucial, council gives West Hants landowners the ability to have their say on their own property.

2.5KM setback from a property line is a reasonable request considering the wind farms themselves need 1.5 KM and prefer 1.8 KM set back between turbines on their own project layouts. The residents and landowners are simply asking for the chance to negotiate with the proponent, not be dictated to.

Included, is an attachment of a screen shot taken from South Canoe Wind Farms website explaining why they chose 1.2KM setback from dwellings. Consider this, If a decade ago, and 38% smaller turbines, 1.2km was their pick for distances from a dwelling, it seems reasonable that this number must get larger as the turbines grow.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Yours truly,

Steve and Jason Hart



3. What study did the developer use to determine their 1.2km setback?

At the outset, the South Canoe Wind Project team set a goal to implement the largest setback of any setback by-law in the Province. The Halifax Regional Municipality has the largest setback distance in Nova Scotia at 1km and South Canoe is 20% further than this distance at 1.2km. Modelling was done to determine the safety of the 1.2km setback and how turbines would impact residents at this distance. The results of research on ice throw, shadow flicker, and sound all indicate that the 1.2km setback is a safe setback for the South Canoe project. In comparison with other setbacks in the Province and in Canada, our 1.2km setback is much larger – in fact, Ontario's setback guideline is 550m from residents.

