

Wind ... apparently it makes you annoyed

Canonical: <https://northmoregordon.com/news/wind-apparently-it-makes-you-annoyed/>

Details:

[Summary](#) | [Article](#) | [Current use](#) | [Related guidance](#)

About this update

This dated news record has been reorganised for clear reading and connected to current guidance.

Publication date: December 8, 2014.

Status note: Present-tense statements, market figures, deadlines and program details in the archived record belong to its publication date. Check current official sources before making a decision.

What this article reported

It makes me very annoyed that rather than looking at a broad range of health effects from existing and new forms of energy generation, the scope of Australian Government directed research is just to look at health effects from living close to wind turbines. At least the Climate Council is doing a study (crowd funded) on the health effects of living close to a coal power station.

Wind turbines don't make you sick, says MIT study - just annoyed

<http://reneweconomy.com.au/2014/wind-turbines-dont-make-sick-says-mit-study-just-annoyed-85831>

also see <http://www.climatecouncil.org.au/health-effects-of-coal> and NHMRC advice on wind farms and human health

How to use this information now

For current use, confirm the applicable scheme rules, regulator notices, market date and reporting period. Keep historical prices or forecasts separate from present quotes and verified outcomes.

Separate source-reported facts from forecasts, targets and commentary. For a current project, retain the official source, version, effective date, assumptions and decision record in the evidence file.

Related guidance

[Carbon advisory](#)

[Current articles and guidance](#)

[Contact Northmore Gordon](#)

Why does the Northmore Gordon article criticize the Australian Government's research approach to wind turbines?

The article argues that the government directed research narrowly at health effects from living close to wind turbines, rather than examining a broad range of health effects from existing and new forms of energy generation. This selective focus misses the opportunity for comparative analysis of health impacts across different energy sources, including coal power stations, which the Climate Council investigated separately through crowd-funded research. A comprehensive approach would evaluate health outcomes holistically across the energy portfolio.

What does the MIT study referenced in the article reveal about the relationship between wind turbines and human health?

The MIT study found that wind turbines do not make people sick but do make people annoyed. This distinction is significant because it separates physiological health effects from psychological or social responses. Understanding annoyance as a separate outcome from illness allows for more nuanced policy discussions about wind energy deployment. The finding suggests that opposition to wind projects may reflect social factors rather than documented medical harm, which has implications for community engagement and project planning.

How does Northmore Gordon's commentary on this topic relate to its broader energy advisory work?

Our critique of selective research approaches aligns with its service model emphasizing comprehensive assessment and evidence-based decision-making. When advising clients on renewable energy projects or energy strategy, we apply similar principles: examining complete system impacts rather than isolated variables, comparing alternatives using consistent methodology, and basing investment decisions on robust evidence. This perspective supports transition planning and renewable energy procurement services offered to industrial and water clients.

What practical implications does the annoyance finding have for renewable energy project development?

If wind turbines trigger social annoyance rather than documented physiological harm, project teams should address community engagement, visual impact assessment, and social license factors alongside technical feasibility. This affects site selection, consultation processes, and stakeholder management. For organizations planning renewable energy investments or transition pathways, understanding that opposition may stem from non-health factors enables more targeted community strategies. Our project assessment and feasibility work incorporates these social and operational dimensions when evaluating renewable heat and solar options.

Why is the Climate Council's coal power station study mentioned as a contrasting approach?

The Climate Council conducted a crowd-funded study on health effects from living close to a coal power station, demonstrating an alternative research model that examines actual energy generation infrastructure rather than speculative future technologies. This comparative approach highlights the inconsistency of focusing research resources on wind while neglecting documented health impacts from established coal operations. The contrast illustrates the importance of consistent, evidence-based evaluation across energy sources when assessing true health impacts and informing energy strategy decisions.

How might this discussion of energy-related health impacts influence industrial decarbonization projects?

For organizations considering decarbonization options, understanding the evidence base for health impacts across different technologies supports more credible transition planning. Projects involving renewable heat, electrification, or biomass alternatives can be evaluated on technical, economic, and community-impact grounds using consistent methodology rather than reliance on incomplete or selective research. Our role in assessing renewable heat options and feasibility studies incorporates these broader evaluation frameworks, helping clients develop defensible energy transition strategies grounded in comprehensive evidence.

What does the article's critique suggest about the importance of broad-based assessment in energy policy?

The article advocates for energy policy grounded in comprehensive, comparative assessment rather than selective research targeting specific technologies. This principle supports development of robust energy strategies at organizational and sectoral levels. When clients engage Northmore Gordon for carbon advisory services, energy management system development, or transition planning, our approach applies similar logic: examining complete system boundaries, comparing alternatives fairly, and basing decisions on total available evidence. This prevents policy or investment decisions skewed by incomplete information about relative impacts.