



university of
 groningen

faculty of mathematics and
 natural sciences



UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG



umcg

Science Shop for Medicine

and Public Health

Applied Health Research

Project WINDFARMperception

Visual and acoustic impact of wind turbine farms on residents



FP6-2005-Science-and-Society-20

Specific Support Action, Project no. 044628

Final report

WINDFARMperception

Visual and acoustic impact of wind turbine farms on residents

Final report

June 3, 2008

FP6-2005-Science-and-Society-20

Specific Support Action

Project no. 044628

Authors:

Frits van den Berg, Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, University of Groningen

Eja Pedersen, Department of Public Health and Community Medicine, Göteborg University

Jelte Bouma, Science Shop for Medicine & Public Health, University Medical Centre Groningen

Roel Bakker, Northern Centre for Health Care Research, University Medical Centre Groningen

SUMMARY

This report gives the results of the EU financed study WINDFARMperception on how residents perceive a wind farm in their living environment as far as sound and sight are concerned. The study includes a postal survey among Dutch residents (n = 725, response rate: 37%) and an assessment of their aural and visual exposure due to wind farms in their vicinity.

Respondents in the survey and calculated exposures

The study group was selected from all residents in the Netherlands within 2.5 km from a wind turbine. As the study aimed to study modern wind farms, wind turbines were selected with an electric capacity of 500 kW or more and one or more turbines within 500 m from the first. Excluded were wind turbines that were erected or replaced in the year preceding the survey. Residents lived in the countryside with or without a busy road close to the turbine(s), or in built-up areas (villages, towns). Excluded were residents in mixed and industrial areas.

The sound level at the residents' dwellings was calculated according to the international ISO standard for sound propagation, the almost identical Dutch legal model and a simple (non spectral) calculation model. The indicative sound level used was the sound level when the wind turbines operate at 8 m/s in daytime -that is: at high, but not maximum power. The size of the turbines was calculated as the viewing angle between the lowest and highest part of the biggest turbine, and also as the fraction of space above the horizon occupied by all wind turbines, both from the perspective of residents' dwellings.

Respondents were exposed to levels of wind turbine sound between 24 and 54 dBA and wind turbines at distances from 17 m to 2.1 km. The (angular) height of the biggest wind turbine ranged from 2 degrees to 79 degrees, with an average value of 10 degrees (the height of a CD box, looking at the front at arm's length). The wind turbines occupied on average 2% of the space above the horizon.

Attitude and economic involvement of respondents

Almost all respondents (92%) were satisfied with their living environment, though many reported changes for the better and changes for the worst. One in two respondents were (very) positive towards wind turbines in general, but only one in five were (very) positive towards their impact on the landscape scenery.

Fourteen percent of the respondents had economic benefits from wind turbines by owning them or having shares in wind turbines or otherwise. They usually lived closer to the wind turbines, were higher educated, less old and hence healthier compared to the other respondents, and they relatively often worked at home. Respondents with economical benefits were less negative to wind turbines in general and their influence on the landscape scenery.

Response to wind turbine sound

The percentage of respondents noticing the sound of wind turbines increased with increasing sound level, ranging from 25% at low sound levels (less than 30 dBA) to 80% and more at

higher sound levels (above 35 dBA). Percentages were the same for those who had benefits and the other respondents.

The percentage of respondents that were annoyed by the sound also increased with sound level up to 40 to 45 dBA and then decreased. Respondents with economic benefits reported almost no annoyance. This in part explains the decrease in annoyance at high sound levels: above 45 dBA, *i.e.* close to wind turbines, the majority of respondents have economical benefits. The percentage of respondents without economic benefits that were rather or very annoyed when outdoors increased from 2% at low levels of wind turbine sound (less than 30 dBA) up to 25% at levels of 40 to 45 dBA.

In general respondents perceived wind turbines as being louder in wind blowing from the turbine to their dwelling (and less loud the other way round), in stronger wind and at night. The majority (75%) of respondents that could hear wind turbines think that swishing or lashing is a correct characterization of the sound. The second most typical characterization was rustling (for 25% of the respondents). Other characterizations were chosen by less than 10% of the respondents.

Respondents were more likely to be annoyed by sound from wind turbines when they noted changes for the worse in their living environment and when they had a more negative view on wind turbines in general or their impact on the landscape scenery.

Health effects

There is no indication that the sound from wind turbines had an effect on respondents' health, except for the interruption of sleep. At high levels of wind turbine sound (more than 45 dBA) interruption of sleep was more likely than at low levels. Higher levels of background sound from road traffic also increased the odds for interrupted sleep.

Annoyance from wind turbine sound was related to difficulties with falling asleep and to higher stress scores. From this study it cannot be concluded whether these health effects are caused by annoyance or *vice versa* or whether both are related to another factor.

Response to other aspects of wind turbines

Respondents were also annoyed by wind turbines in other ways than by sound: between 4% and 13% were rather or very annoyed by vibrations or the movement of rotor blades or their shadows in- or outdoors.

One out of three respondents could not see a wind turbine from their dwelling, especially when living in a built-up area or further away from the turbines. The visibility of wind turbines strongly affected the probability of being annoyed by their sound: when turbines were visible, respondents were far more likely to be annoyed. An unexpected result was that respondents living in a rural area with a main road within 500 m from the wind turbine(s) were less annoyed than respondents living in a built-up area, though the background sound levels from road traffic are on average the same in both area types and one would expect that wind turbines are more readily visible in a rural area.

Recommendations

In this survey sound was the most annoying aspect of wind turbines. From this and previous studies it appears that sound from wind turbines is relatively annoying: at the same sound level it causes more annoyance than sound from air or road traffic. A swishing character is observed by three out of four respondents that can hear the sound and could be one of the factors explaining the annoyance. Sound is therefore an important and negative feature of wind farms and we recommend that, in the planning of wind farms, the negative impact of the sound and sound reduction should be given more attention.

Nevertheless, people that have economical benefits from wind turbines are much less or not at all annoyed, even though they often live closer to wind farms and are exposed to higher sound levels. This lack of annoyance may be the result of several factors: *e.g.* the ‘benefitters’ have a more positive view on wind farms, they have an actual benefit and they have a measure of control on the turbines. These characteristics may show the way to more acceptance and less annoyance with other residents: residents may be given some benefits and a sense of control too. Discussion of the different views on the landscape, instead of opposition to other views, may help in reaching consensus.

Visibility of wind turbines enhances their potential to cause noise annoyance. When wind turbines are invisible, they cause less annoyance. Perhaps less visibility can also be the result of reducing the visual contrast between turbines and landscape. The possibilities to do this will depend on the landscape type.

The capability of busy road traffic to mask the sound of wind turbines is apparently not straightforward: a higher level of background sound from road traffic indeed reduces the probability of noticing the sound of wind turbines, but it does not have an effect on annoyance from the wind turbines. This may be due to differences between both sounds in pitch, in character (swishing) and in diurnal variation. This issue needs further investigation.

Tabel of Contents

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| 1. | Introduction | 1 |
| 2. | Selection of study group | 2 |
| 2.1 | Study group criteria | 2 |
| 2.2 | Wind turbine selection | 2 |
| 2.3 | Postcode selection | 4 |
| 2.4 | Address selection | 5 |
| 3. | Wind turbine data | 7 |
| 3.1 | Sources of information | 7 |
| 3.2 | Sound emission data | 8 |
| 3.3 | Wind turbine positions | 9 |
| 4. | Dose measures and dose data | 10 |
| 4.1 | Sound propagation models | 10 |
| 4.2 | Sound power levels of turbine types | 14 |
| 4.3 | Sound dose | 14 |
| 4.4 | Visual dose | 16 |
| 4.5 | Receiver – wind turbine distance | 18 |
| 4.6 | Background transportation sound levels | 18 |
| 5. | Survey preparation and implementation | 20 |
| 5.1 | Questionnaire preparation and handling | 20 |
| 5.2 | Response rate | 21 |
| 5.3 | Non-respondent analysis | 21 |
| 5.4 | Validity and reliability | 21 |
| 6. | Analysis model and method | 23 |
| 6.1 | Dose-response model | 23 |
| 6.2 | Method | 23 |
| 7. | Results | 27 |
| 7.1 | Exposures from wind turbines | 27 |
| 7.2 | Physical factors | 28 |
| 7.3 | Individual factors | 31 |
| 7.4 | Response to wind turbines | 36 |
| 7.5 | Response to wind turbines related to exposure | 39 |
| 7.6 | Influence of physical factors on response to wind turbine sound | 42 |
| 7.7 | Influence of individual factors on annoyance with wind turbine sound | 45 |
| 7.8 | Effects | 47 |
| 7.9 | Relationships between exposure to wind turbine sound and effects | 50 |
| 7.10 | Relationships between response to wind turbine sound and effects | 54 |
| 8. | Conclusions | 56 |
| 8.1 | Discussion of results | 56 |
| 8.2 | Comparison with annoyance from other noise sources | 58 |
| 8.3 | Main conclusions | 60 |
| 8.4 | Recommendations | 61 |
| 9. | Acknowledgements | 62 |
| 10. | References | 63 |

Appendices

| | |
|--|----|
| A Questionnaire text | 2 |
| B Available spectral sound power data | 8 |
| C Sound power levels and wind speed | 9 |
| D Sound power data used in calculations | 11 |
| E Sound power data sources | 13 |
| F Transformation of response to wind turbine sound | 16 |
| G Comparison with previous Swedish studies | 18 |
| H Annoyance from road traffic noise | 20 |
| I Remarks in the questionnaires added by respondents | 22 |

1. Introduction

There is general public support for sustainable energy, but less support to actual plans to build wind farms as a result of local opposition. In the Netherlands growing public resistance to onshore wind turbines obstructs wind energy development. This opposition is now the main bottle-neck in wind energy development.

There is increasing evidence that the local impact of wind turbines may be more negative than expected. The experience gained in the 1980's and 1990's may not apply to the tall, modern onshore wind turbines with peak electric power outputs up to 3 MW and tower heights of 80 to 100 meters. Research in the Sweden countryside showed that visual impact and noise are factors affecting residents living close to wind turbines [Pedersen *et al* 2004]. In that study it was shown that the noise is more annoying than equally loud road traffic noise and that the annoyance due to noise and to visual impact are interrelated. In a further study [Pedersen *et al* 2006] in other types of environments (now including suburban areas and complex terrain) less annoyance was found. Also, it has been shown that, due to atmospheric conditions assessments of wind turbine noise exposure have been underestimated [Van den Berg 2004, 2005]. As a result both the sound exposure level (in relation to the wind speed) and the character of the sound are not predicted correctly. A British report confirmed this in part by concluding that, in agreement with the recent research, complaints near three UK wind farms can be explained by a modulation of the sound [Hayes McKenzie]. These new findings seem to be related to modern wind turbines and were not established earlier when smaller wind turbines were common.

For modern wind farms the local environmental impact may therefore be significantly different from what was expected from older environmental impact studies. The need to investigate environmental impact is shared by the International Energy Agency (IEA). One of the research priorities identified in the IEA 2005 Wind Energy Annual report is to 'minimize environmental impacts'.

The purpose of this study is to gain insight into the perception of a modern wind farm by residents living nearby such a farm. The objective of the WINDFARMperception project is:

- to provide knowledge on the perception of wind turbines by people living close to wind farms;
- to evaluate human responses to audio and visual exposures from wind turbines and to give insight in possibilities to mitigate the local impact of wind farms.

To investigate the impact of wind farms on residents, the following steps have been followed:

- criteria for dwellings and wind farms to be included in the study were defined;
- relevant data for the selected dwellings and wind turbines were collected;
- residents were asked how they perceived wind farms as part of their living environment;
- the impact relevant for aural and visual perception was calculated;
- the results were analysed.

These steps will be described in detail in the following chapters.

2. Selection of study group

2.1 Study group criteria

The following preliminary criteria were determined from the material available at the start of the project:

- four exposure groups: 25-30, 30-35, 35-40, 40-45 (immission sound level at residence due to wind farm in dBA at 8 m/s 10-m wind speed in a neutral atmosphere).
- three environments: A. quiet countryside, B. countryside with main road, C. built-up area (A and B refer to dispersed residences and small villages, C to large villages and towns).
- equal numbers –if possible- of the population in each exposure group.
- in each of the 4x3 groups (at least) 50 respondents: if so, the results are expected to yield statistically reliable results to be able to determine differences in annoyance between groups.
- response rate at least 30%.

These criteria lead to a study sample of approximately 2000 residents ($= 4 \times 3 \times 50 / 0.3$) and an equal number of questionnaires to be sent out.


2.2 Wind turbine selection

A list of all onshore wind turbines in the Netherlands was provided by Wind Service Holland (WSH). The first list gave the status quo of March 1, 2006, the second one of February 26, 2007. From the difference between both lists changes could be determined that had occurred in the year preceding the survey.

As the project aims to study perception around modern wind farms, we have excluded small wind turbines (criterion for ‘small’: less than 500 kW; 679 of all 1735 turbines in March 2006) and single wind turbines (criterion for ‘single’: no other wind turbine within 500 m) from our selection. To be able to obtain results for the three different environments without overlap, wind turbines on large industrial estates and in ‘mixed areas’ (residential, business and countryside within the same area) were also excluded. This was determined from detailed (1:50 000) topographic maps.

As we wanted to rule out short term, transitory effects, residents living near a wind farm completed within one year before the survey (in fact 14 months: completed after March 2006) were excluded, as were situations with changes in the wind farm (replacing and/or and dismantling older turbines) in the 12 months preceding March 2007.

In figure 2.1 all wind turbines are plotted on a map of the Netherlands. Wind turbines markers overlap in the figure and as a result the dispersed, isolated turbines seem more numerous than the turbines standing closer together in wind farms. The figure shows that the northern, coastal parts of the Netherlands accommodate most wind turbines.



2.3 Postcode selection

The Netherlands are divided in approximately 4000 four-position postcodes, of which approximately 1000 are in urban areas. In a medium sized town ($\approx 100\,000$ inhabitants) there are up to 10 four position postcode areas. In a six position postcode area, with two letters added to four digits –e.g. 1200AB, there are 15 to 20 addresses (dwellings, buildings). The six position postcodes with their geographical coordinates (in the Dutch triangular system) have been downloaded from the KPN phone guide 2007 on CD. The area of one postcode is relatively small in densely populated areas and relatively large in sparsely populated areas. The geographical position of one six position postcode area is therefore not the precise position of addresses in that area.

With the GIS application Arcmap 9.2 postcodes were selected in relation to their distance to the closest wind turbine. Table 2.1 gives the number of six position postcodes in distance classes of 500 m from the nearest (selected) wind turbine. From these postcodes a number were not suitable for the purpose of this project. Therefore postcodes in the following areas have been deleted:

- mixed areas, where different area types are close to a selected turbine and it is unclear in which area type a postcode or address should be classified. These mixed areas were near three towns (Bergen op Zoom, Zutphen and Waalwijk) and consisted of overlapping or very close near-town, countryside, residential and industrial areas.
- industrial estates in three towns (Delfzijl, Culemborg and Zeewolde); an industrial area type is not chosen in this project, because very few people live within the lower distance ranges. Also, other sound from industrial sources is likely to be present that could interfere with the wind farm sound.
- in some cases there were larger villages/small towns in the higher distance ranges of the rural areas. These would increase the study group size of the built-up areas, but only in the lower sound level classes where it is expected the study group is already large enough.
- in the city of Leeuwarden a large number of people live within 2500 m from one of the wind turbines in a business area surrounded by residential areas. Leaving all the postcodes in the study sample would bias the final study group in the built-up area heavily towards this one city. We have therefore selected one suburb (Camminghaburen) and deleted all other Leeuwarden postcodes.

Table 2.1: number of 6-position postcodes per distance range

| <i>Distance to nearest wind turbine (m)</i> | <i>number of 6p postcodes present within range</i> | <i>number of 6p postcodes deleted</i> | <i>number of 6p postcodes retained</i> |
|---|--|---|--|
| 0-500 | 148 | 12 | 136 |
| 500-1000 | 704 | 121 | 583 |
| 1000-1500 | 1557 | 443 | 1114 |
| 1500-2000 | 3057 | 1613 | 1444 |
| 2000-2500 | 3852 | 2559 | 1293 |

Within 2.5 km from the selected wind turbines we finally had 4570 six position postcodes. For these postcodes we have requested the Land Registry Office (Kadaster) the related addresses from the Dutch address coordinates file (adrescoördinatenbestand Nederland, ACN), only those classified as permanent or holiday residences.

2.4 Address selection

The previous step yielded 50375 addresses with individual x and y coordinates. All addresses were divided into three types of environment:

- rural area (possibly with a major road at least 500 m from a wind turbine): 17923 addresses;
- rural area with a major road within 500 m from a wind turbine: 16826 addresses;
- more densely populated built-up area (in fact parts of four towns): 15626 addresses.

For all these addresses the immission sound level was calculated with a provisional list of wind turbine types (some with estimated sound power levels). The addresses were then classified in 5 dB sound immission level classes (<30, 30-35, 35-40, 40-45, >45 dBA) for each of the three environments (addresses at sound levels < 25 dBA were deleted from the sample). Each class should have approximately 150 respondents (see section 2.1 *Study group criteria* above). In some subgroups there were less than 150 addresses, but in most there were more. In the first case we selected all addresses for the study population, in the second case we took a random sample from all addresses in that subgroup.

As the agencies that enrich addresses with names and telephone numbers only have that information for just over half of all the addresses in the national ACN, we needed to send in more addresses to be enriched than the actual number of names we wanted. In the end we provided 3727 addresses, evenly distributed over subgroups (except when the subgroup was too small). Cendris could provide names and telephone numbers for 2056 of these addresses. From these we used only the 1948 addresses where a private name was given, not when the name was apparently of a business or organization.

Table 2.2: number of addresses per immission sound level range

| area type | sound class | all addresses present | addresses selected | addresses needed | % needed/ selected | addresses ordered |
|----------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| 1 built-up area | | | | | | |
| | >45 | 11 | 10 | all | 100 | 10 |
| | 40 – 45 | 103 | 91 | all | 100 | 91 |
| | 35 – 40 | 508 | 404 | 150 | 37 | 330 |
| | 30 – 35 | 2294 | 1785 | 150 | 8 | 330 |
| | 25 – 30 | 8563 | 6268 | 150 | 2 | 330 |
| | <= 25 | 15632 | 7068 | 0 | | 0 |
| 2 rural + main road | | | | | | |
| | >45 | 124 | 123 | all | 100 | 123 |
| | >40 | 302 | 177 | 150 | 85 | 177 |
| | >35 | 1545 | 1242 | 150 | 12 | 330 |
| | >30 | 4024 | 2478 | 150 | 6 | 330 |
| | >25 | 9280 | 5255 | 150 | 3 | 330 |
| | <=25 | 16835 | 7554 | 0 | | 0 |
| 3 rural | | | | | | |
| | >45 | 151 | 150 | all | 100 | 150 |
| | >40 | 358 | 206 | 150 | 73 | 206 |
| | >35 | 1151 | 792 | 150 | 19 | 330 |
| | >30 | 3713 | 2561 | 150 | 6 | 330 |
| | >25 | 9085 | 5371 | 150 | 3 | 330 |
| | <=25 | 17624 | 8538 | 0 | | 0 |
| | | | | | | |
| all | | 50073 | | 2024 | | 3727 |

3. Wind turbine data

3.1 Sources of information

The manufacturer and type of all wind turbines in the Netherlands are part of the information supplied by Wind Service Holland (WSH). As of March 2006, there were 1735 wind turbines in the Netherlands. One year later there were 1839 wind turbines, mostly because the number of large turbines ($P > 2$ MW) had increased. In table 3.1 these are classified in electric power ranges.

Table 3.1: number of wind turbines in 0.5 MW classes

| max. electric power P (MW) | number of turbines March 1, 2006 | number of turbines February 23, 2007 |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| $P < 0.5$ | 679 | 657 |
| $0.5 \leq P < 1$ | 698 | 704 |
| $1 \leq P < 1.5$ | 83 | 86 |
| $1.5 \leq P < 2$ | 138 | 138 |
| $2 \leq P < 2.5$ | 94 | 157 |
| $2.5 \leq P$ | 43 | 97 |

There are 78 different types of wind turbines. Most popular are the medium sized Vestas turbines (600, 660, 750, 850 and 900kW; 291 turbines) and the small Lagerweij turbines (75kW and 80kW; 241 turbines). For 30 types 5 turbines or less have been placed, totalling 63 turbines (or 2 turbines per type).

For each type of turbine relevant to this project sound power data had to be obtained. These data are preferably the sound emission level per octave band and the total sound emission level as a function of wind speed. These data were obtained from various sources:


- the archives: those of the Science Shop for Physics (the University of Groningen partner, now discontinued) contained reports from various projects.
- the internet: manufacturers offer technical specifications of their turbines, though detailed sound emission data are often not included.
- local authorities: for licensing of wind farm projects local authorities often request acoustic reports that are, in principle, available to the public. We have contacted local authorities with wind farms to obtain the acoustical data from such reports. These reports form the main source of acoustical data. Most officials have been very helpful and supplied us with the available information.

Consultancies, wind project developers and manufacturers also possess the required data. However, consultancies and developers appeared to consider their reports as confidential information and felt therefore unable to supply the information. Manufacturers Enercon and Vestas were contacted by phone, then communication continued via e-mail because both manufacturers wanted more information about the purpose of our request. After that Vestas ceased communication. Enercon finally declared the project as they understood it was of no value to them, so they would not supply any information. Later we contacted the Dutch office of Enercon that did send us information on two turbine types.


3.2 Sound emission data

The spectral data that have been collected are included in appendix B. In figure 3.1 the available octave band data are plotted¹, as well as the (logarithmically) averaged value, relative to the total sound power level. The figure shows that the spectral form is very similar for all turbines, as Sondergaard has shown for another set of wind turbines [Sondergaard 2007]. Especially at the dominant levels in the middle frequency range (500 – 1000 Hz) all spectral values are in a relatively narrow range, indicating that the spectral signatures of modern wind turbines are very similar.

In appendix C all available total (broad band) sound power levels as a function of 10-m wind speed (in a supposedly neutral atmosphere) have been collected. In figure 2 the sound power levels have been plotted for the two 10-m wind speeds for which most data are available (7 and 8 m/s). If a turbine has several modes to reduce sound production, the mode with no sound reduction at that wind speed is shown.



¹ except for one spectrum provided by a Dutch consultancy, which is probably incorrect



The best logarithmic fits to the sound power levels in figure 3.2 are:

- 10-m wind speed = 7 m/s: $L_W = 9.9 \cdot \log(P) + 70.6$ dBA (correlation coefficient 0.84);
- 10-m wind speed = 8 m/s: $L_W = 10.0 \cdot \log(P) + 71.0$ dBA (correlation coefficient 0.89)

The difference between both fits is 0.7 dB over most of the electric power range.

3.3 Wind turbine positions

The list of wind turbines provided by Wind Service Holland (WSH) did not give accurate positions for all wind turbines. In the first stage of the project new and accurate positions as determined by the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (NMP) were available for most wind turbines. For the remaining (few dozens) turbines the positions were determined with Google Earth; the geographical positions in longitude and latitude thus determined were transformed to Dutch coordinates with software provided by the Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (KNMI). After delivering the dose calculations to the data base, Wind Service Holland provided us with all accurate positions of all wind turbines as determined by NMP. It is not known what the accuracy is of the positions of the turbines, but it is probably in the order of 1 meter.

4. Dose measures and dose data

4.1 Sound propagation models

For this project three sound propagation models have been used:

- the standard Dutch model as described in the ‘Manual to measure and calculate industrial noise’ [HMRI], in this report further referred to as ‘the Dutch model’.
- the model described in ISO-9613.2 [ISO], representing the international standard for acoustic calculations.
- a simplified model such as used in the New Zealand Standard for Wind Turbine Noise [NZS]; this model was used by Pedersen *et al* in their first study of wind turbine noise annoyance [Pedersen *et al* 2005].

4.1.1 Dutch model

The basic formula for the sound immission per octave band at a receiver point is:

$$L_i = L_{Wr} - \Sigma D$$

where

L_i = immission sound level per octave band

L_{Wr} = source octave band sound power in the direction of the receiver; in practice wind turbines are considered isotropic point sources and therefore have no directivity.

ΣD = $D_{geo} + D_{lucht} + D_{refl} + D_{scherm} + D_{veg} + D_{terrein} + D_{bodem} + D_{huis}$, representing all sound attenuation factors as the sound propagates.

Total equivalent sound power level at the receiver is the (logarithmic) sum of all octave band sound power levels from 63 to 8000 Hz.

The first term in ΣD assumes isotropic geometric spreading of the sound at all frequencies:

$D_{geo} = 10 \cdot \log(4\pi r_i^2)$, where r_i is the (slant) distance between source and receiver.

D_{lucht} (lucht = air) represents absorption by air: $D_{lucht} = a_{lu} \cdot r_i$, with a_{lu} the attenuation per unit distance in one octave band. a_{lu} as prescribed by the Dutch Manual is given in table 4.1.

Table 4.1: air absorption according to Dutch sound propagation model

| Octave band frequency (Hz) | 31 | 63 | 125 | 250 | 500 | 1000 | 2000 | 4000 | 8000 |
|----------------------------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|------|------|------|
| a_{lu} (dB/km) | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.25 | 0.76 | 1.6 | 2.9 | 6.2 | 19 | 67 |

D_{bodem} (bodem = ground) represents the effects from absorption, reflection and scattering due to ground effects and consists of three components: $D_{bodem} = D_{b,br} + D_{b,mid} + D_{b,ont}$ with:

$D_{b,br}$ = attenuation due to the ground area within a radius of $30 \cdot H_{br}$ from the source, where H_{br} = source height (hub height in case of a wind turbine; br = bron = source).¹

$D_{b,ont}$ = attenuation due to the ground area within radius of $30 \cdot H_{ont}$ from the receiver, where H_{ont} is receiver height (height of immission point; ont = ontvanger = receiver).

¹ The Dutch manual has an error in equations 5.19 and 5.20: r_i should be $\geq 30h_b$ or $30h_o$ respectively.

Db_{mid} = attenuation due to the ground area between source and receiver areas or ‘middle area’; this is the area between the previous two areas, if this exists; if source and receiver area are contiguous or overlap, $Db_{mid} = 0$.

If hub height is taken as 80 m, then the source area has a radius of $30 \cdot 80 = 2400$ m. In that case, for a source – receiver distance less than 2400 m no middle area exists.

The values for the three components depend on the surface’s absorptive properties, which is represented by a variable B , ranging from 0 (highly reflective) to 1 (highly absorbent). If part of the area is reflective and the rest absorbent, then B has a value between 0 and 1 and is equal to the percentage of area that is absorbent.

Vegetation may attenuate sound when the vegetation is of sufficient height and thickness to block the view of the source at the location of the receiver. This implies at least several rows of trees located relatively close to the immission point. As most trees in the Netherlands outside forested zones are deciduous and lose their leaves in winter, D_{veg} is usually taken zero.

ΣD consists of several more components: D_{refl} (reflection at vertical surfaces), D_{schem} (attenuation due to sound screens or obstacles), $D_{terrein}$ (attenuation due to added absorption over a terrain, such as industrial piping) and D_{huis} (attenuation to rows of houses). These components are not calculated in this project (that is: set to zero), as in most cases the receiver points are dwellings in flat and open countryside where there are no obstacles or screens, or built-up or industrial areas. In built-up areas there could be added attenuation due to shielding or reflection of the sound by nearby dwellings, but even here this contribution is relatively small as wind turbines are high sources and the sound in the downwind path, which is assumed to curve downwards in the Dutch model, will propagate over most objects. As a result both D_{refl} and D_{schem} can be taken zero without decreasing accuracy, unless a large object, most likely a building, is located very close to the receiver. To assess this would need very detailed information which was not available and not easy to collect. If a reflector is present, the sound level could be up to 3 dB higher if the reflecting object is large and behind the receiver (as seen from the source). The effect from a nearby screening obstacle can be larger and depends on the obstacle’s dimensions, distance and the sound source spectrum. It would always reduce the sound level. Because of this, the sound level at dwellings within built-up areas (not those on the outer edge) is probably overestimated and the real sound level is probably lower than the calculated level.

4.1.2 ISO-9613 model

ISO 9613:1996(E) is an international standard for calculating sound attenuation during propagation outdoors. Its application carries no legal weight in the Netherlands, but it is recognised worldwide. Its basic equation is given by:

$$L_{ft} = L_W + D_c - A$$

Where:

L_{ft} = the equivalent continuous downwind octave-band sound pressure level.

L_W = octave-band sound power level

D_c = directivity correction

A = total attenuation per octave band

Total equivalent sound power level at the receiver is the (logarithmic) sum of all octave band sound power levels from 63 to 80000 Hz.

The terms $L_w + D_c$ are equivalent to the term L_{wr} in the Dutch method.

A is the equivalent of $\sum D$:

$$A = A_{div} + A_{atm} + A_{gr} + A_{bar} + A_{misc}$$

Here A_{div} (divergence) corresponds to D_{geo} , A_{atm} (atmosphere) to D_{lucht} , A_{gr} (ground) to D_{bodem} and A_{bar} (barrier) to D_{scherm} . D_{refl} is taken as an additional point source in the ISO method. A_{misc} includes any other miscellaneous terms, like D_{veg} , $D_{terrein}$ and D_{huis} in the Dutch model.

Variables can thus be defined the same in the ISO and Dutch method, though different symbols may be used. Despite the similarities there are slight differences in the way some terms are calculated.

A_{div} is the attenuation due to distance and is the same in all octave bands:

$$A_{div} = 20 \cdot \log(d/d_0) + 11$$

where d is the distance between source and receiver, and $d_0 = 1$ m is a reference distance.

$A_{atm} = \alpha \cdot d/1000$, with α the atmospheric attenuation coefficient, depending on frequency, relative humidity and temperature. A table for α is given in ISO 9613-2:1996(e), on page 5. Though the equation is similar to the one for D_{lucht} in the Dutch method the coefficients are slightly different. For Dutch conditions we take the average annual temperature as 9 degrees centigrade, relative humidity as 85% and barometric pressure 1015 hPa. Using the ISO 9613 Part 1 calculation method for the atmospheric attenuation coefficient this yields the attenuation coefficients as shown in table 4.2.

Table 4.2: air absorption according to ISO-9613 sound propagation model

| Octave band frequency (Hz) | 63 | 125 | 250 | 500 | 1000 | 2000 | 4000 | 8000 |
|----------------------------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| α (dB/km) | 0.125 | 0.414 | 1.02 | 1.89 | 3.64 | 10.0 | 34.5 | 122 |

Attenuation due to ground absorption and reflection is calculated from three components as in the Dutch model: $A_{atm} = A_s + A_r + A_m$ (source, receiver and middle area, respectively). The equations for A_s , A_r and A_m are slightly different. The variable G is identical to B in the Dutch method.

The term A_{misc} is composed of attenuation from foliage (A_{fol}), industrial installations (A_{site}) and housing (A_{hous}): $A_{misc} = A_{fol} + A_{site} + A_{hous}$. These terms correspond to D_{veg} , $D_{terrein}$ and D_{huis} in the Dutch method.

Finally, in ISO 9613 there are terms for barriers and screens as in the Dutch model. These terms, as those in A_{misc} , are all assumed to be zero.

4.1.3 Simplified model

In contrast with the Dutch and ISO models the simplified model, such as used in the New Zealand Standard 6808, does not use octave band spectra but only uses the total (broad band) sound power level L_w and distance r :

$$L_A = L_w - 8 - 20 \cdot \log(r) - 0.005 \cdot r$$

Where $8 = 10 \cdot \log(2\pi)$, because divergence over half a sphere (*i.e.* above ground) is assumed.


4.1.4 Comparison of models

To be able to compare the differences between the three models, a simple situation is modelled. For this an octave band spectrum from the Vestas V90 is used, shown in table 4.3.

Table 4.3: A-weighted octave band power spectrum of Vestas V90

| Octave band frequency | 32Hz | 63Hz | 125Hz | 250Hz | 500Hz | 1kHz | 2kHz | 4kHz | 8kHz |
|-----------------------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|------|
| Sound emission in dBA | 83.6 | 91.3 | 95.0 | 100.5 | 103.3 | 102.9 | 99.5 | 95.7 | 95.4 |

The source is at 90 m height, the receiver at 5 m. It is assumed that all ground is absorbing. Immission sound levels as a function of distance are shown in table 4.4 and figure 4.1. The Dutch and ISO models yield almost similar results, except at great distances due to slightly different air absorption values (which are fixed in the Dutch model, but must be determined from atmospheric conditions in the ISO model). The simplified model overestimates the sound level at small distances due to the assumption of fully reflective ground (+3 dB), and underestimates the level at great distances due to an air absorption value that is too high for the



low frequency sound remaining at these distances.

Table 4.4: A-weighted immission sound spectrum at various distances of Vestas V90 according to three sound propagation models

| Distance (m) | 200 | 300 | 400 | 600 | 800 | 1200 | 1600 | 2400 | 3200 | 4800 |
|----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Immission dBA) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dutch model | 49.3 | 45.9 | 43.3 | 39.5 | 36.7 | 32.5 | 29.4 | 24.9 | 21.8 | 17.4 |
| ISO model | 49.6 | 46.1 | 43.5 | 39.5 | 36.5 | 32.1 | 28.8 | 23.9 | 20.1 | 14.4 |
| NZ model | 53.6 | 49.6 | 46.6 | 42.0 | 38.5 | 33.0 | 28.5 | 21.0 | 14.5 | 3.0 |

When the background sound level is 30 dBA or higher, residents living more than 2.5 km away from the nearest turbine will not be able to perceive wind turbine sound or only very faintly. However, the presence of an entire wind turbine park may increase the distance over which sound can be observed. Background sound is dependent on location, so a distant wind farm that is audible at one point may –at the same distance- not be audible elsewhere.

4.2 Sound power levels of turbine types

For a number of turbines the sound spectra could be determined from reported measurements, presented in appendices B and C. For 1182 of the 1846 wind turbines in this project sound power data are available; 291 of these have a maximum electric power less than 500 kW. For 664 wind turbines in this project no sound power data are available; 358 of these have a maximum electric power less than 500 kW.

From the results presented in figures 3.1 and 3.2 it follows that sound power spectra are similar for all turbines, and that total sound power depends on electric power production. Therefore, for the 664 wind turbines where no sound power data were available, we have used the sound power data of a known type of the same electric power.

The sound power was used as given for a wind speed of 8 m/s at 10 m height in standard atmospheric conditions. The result is a list of turbine types given in appendix D, where types with sound power data from reported sources are numbered 1 through 28, and types with sound power data determined from other types are numbered r1 through r28 (coincidentally these are also 28 types).

4.3 Sound dose

4.3.1 Input parameters


For all respondents the immission sound level was calculated from the sound power level at high electric power according to all three sound propagation models (Dutch, ISO and NZS model). If different operational modes were present, the highest (loudest) mode was used. The sound power data used are those given in appendix D.

The following values were used as input of the calculation models:

- sound power spectrum and source height: from appendix D.
- sound absorption in air: from tables 6 and 7.
- receiver height: 5 m.
- ground absorption (all areas): 100% ($B = G = 1$).

Although addresses are selected within 2.5 km from all wind turbines with a minimum electric power of 500 kW and with another turbine present within 500 m, and where no changes have occurred in the year preceding the survey, the sound levels have been calculated due to all turbines within 2.5 km of each address. This therefore includes the sound of smaller wind turbines (< 500 kW) in the area of the receiver.


In figure 4.2 the individual calculated levels according to the Dutch and the simplified model are plotted versus those of the ISO model. The Dutch and ISO models are highly correlated and yield almost identical results, as could be expected from the similarities between both models. The difference in results between the ISO and Dutch model vary from -0.8 to 1.4 dB, the average difference is 0.3 dB. The difference in results between the ISO and simplified model vary from -4.4 to 1.8 dB, the average difference is -0.8 dB.



In figure 4.3 the sound immission levels according to the ISO-9613 propagation model are plotted versus distance to the nearest wind turbine. Both parameters are highly correlated, considering the variety in wind turbine sizes and wind farm lay-outs.

4.3.2 L_{den}

The result of the sound dose calculations is the total A-weighted sound immission level due to all wind turbines close to a receiver and the turbines operating at high electric power. This can be converted to a day-evening-night averaged sound level or L_{den} , which is now the common noise exposure metric in the European Union. The procedure for this will be presented in a paper presented at Acoustics'08 [Van den Berg 2008], calculating L_{den} for an inland an coastal location, 3 hub heights (60, 80 and 100 m) and three types/modes of wind turbines. The result is that the sound power $L_{W,den}$, to be used as the characteristic sound power to calculate L_{den} , can be expressed relative to the sound power level at an 8 m/s 10-m wind speed (neutral atmosphere): $L_{W,den} - L_{W,8m/s} = 4.7 \pm 1.5$ dB.



4.3.3 Accuracy of calculated sound levels

ISO-9613 has been shown to be an accurate model for the prediction of (maximum) wind turbine immission sound levels, except sometimes in terrain with steep gradients [see, *e.g.*, ETSU-W13, Bullmore].

For the dose calculations two assumptions have been made that may not apply at all respondents, *viz.* a receiver height of 5 m and a fully absorbent ground. Also it was assumed that there is no reflection (other than from the ground) or shielding of the sound from a wind turbine, because respondents in the countryside live in farms or detached houses. In built-up areas this may not be true, but will seldom lead to very different results (see final paragraph in section 4.1.1).

A receiver height of 5 m is used because usually bedrooms are on the first floor and the night time level is the most restrictive limit and often the highest level. For 'ear height' on the first floor a height of 5m is assumed in the Netherlands. If residents stay on the ground floor, as is more usual when the bedroom is on the ground floor and in day time, a receiver height of 2 m is more realistic. Using this height yields sound immission levels that are 0.1 dB lower than those calculated at 5 m.

For a receiver height of 5 m, the receiver area stretches 150 m towards the sound source. In the countryside all or most of this area will be soft (bare or covered with vegetation) ground. If the entire stretch would be paved or consist of a water surface, it would reflect sound which would yield higher sound levels at the receiver. Comparison of all calculated results with $G_{rec} = 1$ relative to $G_{rec} = 0$ shows that with a fully reflective receiver area the immission sound level is 1.4 dB higher than the level used in this study for the absorbent ground.

4.4 Visual dose

There is no generally accepted measure to determine the visual impact of a wind farm (or in fact the visual impact of other objects).

4.4.1 Vertical angle

Pedersen *et al* [2007] used the vertical angle of a wind turbine as a measure of impact, defined as the angle between the horizontal at the receiver and the line between the receiver and the turbine hub. In hilly area, if a turbine is situated at an elevated position, this includes the angle between the horizontal and a line from the receiver to the base of the turbine. This implies that a 50 m high wind turbine on a 200 m hill at 500 m distance has the same impact as a 100 m high turbine at ground level at 250 m distance. It is not obvious this would indeed have the same objective impact. However, in flat terrain elevation is nil and the vertical angle only depends on distance and turbine height.

When several wind turbines are visible, the vertical angle is the maximum value of the individual vertical angles.

4.4.2 Fraction of field of view

From a planning point of view "the two principal criteria determining significance [of effects] are the scale or magnitude of effect and the environmental sensitivity of the location or receptor" [Landscape Guidelines]. Visual impact of an object thus depends on the size of the object in the field of view and the appropriateness of the object in its environment, and thus

depends on a quantity (relative size) and a quality (appropriateness). This quality depends on the contrast between the object and its environment (e.g. a highly technical object in a natural landscape, or a yellow building between brown brick buildings) and the appreciation of the object in its environment (depending on purpose, material, perceived beauty, etc.), and must be determined from people's judgments. In fact, this project will yield the assessment of this quality by the respondents.

The quantity is the size of an object relative to the total field of view. It can be defined as the size of the object area normal to the receiver, divided by the area of half a sphere with a radius equal to the distance between receiver and object. In this study, as illustrated in figure 4.4, the relative size is the area $2R(R+H)$ divided by the area $2\pi r^2$ of the half sphere with radius r . The quantifiable part of the visual impact is thus the fraction of the total field of view (= half sphere above the horizon) covered by a schematized turbine.

This is equal to twice the space angle as defined in mathematics (twice because in mathematics the area is relative to the entire sphere). Replacing a wind turbine by a rectangle seems a very schematic approximation, but the rectangle area is highly correlated to the actual size of the rotor and/or the rotor + mast because wind turbine diameter and hub height are highly correlated (best fit: diameter = $0.95 \times$ hub height, correlation coefficient = 0.91). The calculation is valid for a relative size $\ll 1$, because then the rectangle area projected on the curved sphere can be approximated with plane geometry. For bigger values the relative size will be overestimated by the calculation used.

For several wind turbines the (total) relative size is the sum of the individual relative sizes. In the text below the (total) relative size will also be referred to as the percentage of view.

In figure 4.5 the relation between the total relative size and the maximum vertical angle of all wind turbines within 2.5 km of a receiver is plotted for all respondents. At high angles, the divergence from the best fit to all data points is probably due to overestimating the relative size when a wind turbine is very close to the receiver.




Figure 4.4: sketch of schematized turbine size relative to total field of view




Figure 4.5: relation between visual impact parameters

In figure 4.6 both visual impact parameters for all respondents are plotted versus the distance between each receiver and the nearest wind turbine. Again the parameters are highly correlated.

4.5 Receiver – wind turbine distance

The distance between a wind turbine and a receiver is an attractive dose measure as it would





Figure 4.6: relation between visual impact parameters (left: maximum vertical angle, right: relative size/percentage of view) and distance to nearest wind turbine

constitute a very simple measure of impact. Because visual as well as aural dose have been shown to correlate well with distance, perhaps distance can be used as a single measure for impact. When more wind turbines are present, the dose measure is the distance from the receiver to the nearest turbine.

4.6 Background transportation sound levels

The study sample originally was divided in three categories: those living in built-up areas in towns, and those living in the countryside, either with or without a major road close (< 500 m) to at least one wind turbine. The purpose of this distinction (the presence of the road in an otherwise similar environment) was to investigate the effect of possible masking of wind turbine sound by other continuous sound, notably road traffic sound. However, in a later stage we contacted the Dutch National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM) and they were so kind to supply us with their database of transportation sound levels of the Netherlands. The database contains calculated day-evening-night sound immission levels (L_{den}) due to road, air and rail traffic for a 25 m by 25 m grid over the entire country (see figure 4.7). The levels are based on traffic volumes in 2002. Mopeds, motor bicycles, and local traffic on minor roads are not included in the road traffic sound level, and overflying (*i.e.* no taking off or landing) aircraft are not included in the aircraft sound level.

For (nearly) all respondents there is no railroad or airport nearby, so road traffic will dominate the L_{den} value. For each respondent the value at the nearest grid point has been used.



5. Survey preparation and implementation


5.1 Questionnaire preparation and handling

The base material for the Dutch questionnaire in this project was the Swedish questionnaire used by Pedersen *et al* [Pedersen *et al* .2005, 2007]. This was translated from Swedish into English by Pedersen, then translated by the Dutch partners into Dutch. All the important questions pertaining to dose and response were kept, those addressing coping strategies were left out, and questions regarding health and the environment were added. Part of the questions measuring ‘perceived health’ consisted of a validated instrument: the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ). Quality of life was measured with ordinal scales ranking from 10 (best possible quality of life) to 1 (worst possible quality of life). Also questions about other environmental factors were added to obtain better masking of the main topic (questions about road traffic were made equally important in the questionnaire) and to be able to make more comparisons to other environmental factors.

After carefully checking the precise wording and lay out the questions were translated back into English and checked by Pedersen. Finally the questionnaire was made definite and 2000 copies were printed. The questionnaire’s cover (figure 5.1) shows the title “Onderzoek beleving woonomgeving” (“Study of the perception of the living environment”) and as sender –again in Dutch- the Section Applied Research of the Northern Center for Healthcare Research from the University Medical Center Groningen (UMCG)¹. The English translation is given in appendix A.

Questionnaires were sent in the second half of April 2007, reminders were sent to all non-responding candidates (1475) three weeks after sending the questionnaires. In order to stimulate the response it was announced that every hundredth respondent received a gift certificate of € 25. Respondents that were interested in receiving the result of the study could leave a small note in the prepaid envelope which was enclosed to return the questionnaires, or – if they were connected to the internet – they could supply us with their e-mail address. Two hundred sixty (36%) of the respondents did so.

The survey database was developed in Clipper.



*Figure 5.1: front of questionnaire
(original is size A4)*

¹ now: section Applied Research/SHARE of UMCG

5.2 Response rate

Of the study sample ($n = 1948$), 37% ($n = 725$) answered and sent back the questionnaire. The final response rate was 37%, higher than the expected response rate of 30%. The response rate was of the same magnitude in all 5-dBA intervals of immission sound levels due to wind turbine noise (table 5.1). The response rates in intervals of high immission levels were not higher than the responses rates in intervals of low immission levels. Biases in the forthcoming analyses due to a higher amount of people exposed to high levels of sound from wind turbines responding to the questionnaire could therefore be excluded.

Table 5.1: response rate related to immission levels

| | Immission intervals, ISO, dBA | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-------|
| | <30 | 30-35 | 35-40 | 40-45 | >45 | |
| Study sample, n | 491 | 589 | 421 | 250 | 197 | 1948 |
| Respondents, n | 185 | 219 | 162 | 94 | 65 | 725 |
| Response rate, % | 38 | 37 | 38 | 38 | 33 | 37 |

5.3 Non-respondent analysis

A non-response analysis has been carried out, based on the questions 26 and 27 of the questionnaire, which can be regarded as ‘core questions’ of our study. These questions dealt with the level of annoyance respondents experienced from the sound of wind turbines *outside* (question 26) and *inside* (question 27) their dwelling. On both questions respondents could mark a figure between 0 and 10, which corresponded closest to their perceived annoyance. The higher the figure marked, the more they declared to be annoyed. The questions 26 and 27 were sent as a separate questionnaire to a randomly chosen sub sample of 200 non-respondents. Ninety five of the non-respondents filled out and sent back these small questionnaires. The mean score on both questions was compared between the responders ($n = 725$) on the one hand and these 95 ‘responding non-responders’ on the other, using independent t-tests (for the two main questions: $t = -0.82$, $p = 0.412$ and $t = -0.74$ and $p = 0.458$). No statistical significant differences in annoyance between the two groups could be found, meaning that there is no evidence that respondents form a selective group with regard to annoyance within our sample of all approached people living in the neighbourhood of wind turbines ($n = 1948$).

5.4 Validity and reliability

Analyses of the results showed a high validity for the sampling and the classification of areas in the study. Respondents living in built-up areas or areas with a main road were exposed to statistically significant higher levels of L_{den} , i.e. background sound levels mainly due to road traffic, than respondents in rural areas without a main road just as expected (ANOVA, post hoc test LSD: Built-up vs. rural area with no main road, $p < 0.001$; rural area with main road vs. rural with no main road, $p < 0.001$).

The questionnaire had a high internal reliability for measurements of response to wind turbine sound. Five questions in the questionnaire assessed response to wind turbine noise in different wording and with different scales: response to wind turbine noise as an exposure among other

exposures outdoors (question 10) and indoors (question 11), response to sound from the rotor blades (question 22) and ratings on an 11-point scale of response to wind turbine sound outdoors (question 26) and indoors (question 27). The questions showed high internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.871$).

6. Analysis model and method

6.1 Dose-response model

The objectives of this study were to provide knowledge on the perception of wind turbines by people living in the vicinity of wind farms, to evaluate human responses to aural and visual exposure from wind turbines and to provide data that could be used to avoid their possible negative impacts.

A theoretical model developed to explain the relation between exposure and response, based on the results from previous studies of community noise and specifically wind turbine noise, was used as a base for the present study (figure 6.1). Exposures from wind turbines are assumed to generate a response among the exposed population. This response could lead to adverse effects on health and well-being, but several factors may moderate the outcomes of the exposures. These factors could be physical, i.e. related to the living conditions and the environment. They could also be individual, i.e. related to the receiver of the exposure.




Figure 6.1: theoretical model of the relation between exposure and response

6.2 Method

6.2.1 Exposure measurements

Four physical exposures from wind turbines were estimated for each respondent in the study. As described in Chapter 4, sound pressure levels (in dBA) of wind turbine sound were calculated as the levels outside the dwelling of the respondent. Distance (in meters) was measured as the distance between the respondent and the nearest wind turbine. Vertical angle (in degrees) was the largest of all angles between a horizontal line and the line from a respondent to the highest tips of the rotor blades of the wind turbines in the area. Fraction of

view (as a percentage) was the proportion of a half sphere above the horizon that was covered by (schematized) wind turbines, as seen from the dwelling of the respondent.

6.2.2 *Response measurements*

Response to wind turbines and subjective health status was measured in a questionnaire. The questionnaire was previously developed and used in the Swedish studies, but modified to suit conditions in the Netherlands and enlarged with the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ) and some questions probing more detail as described in chapter 5 *Survey preparation and implementation*. The questionnaire comprised questions on response to several sources of possible disturbance in the living area, including wind turbines.

6.2.3 *Statistical analyses*

The measurements obtained had different characters that required different statistical methods. Exposures, for example sound level, were measured on continuous scales, as were some of the individual factors, for example the age of the respondents. Also scores derived from several items in the questionnaire could be viewed upon as continuous scales. Continuous scales are in the results presented with mean values. The standard deviation (SD) gives an indication of the spreading of the variable; a large standard deviation indicates a large spread and vice versa. The Student's t-test was used to test if there was a statistically significant difference in means and distribution between two groups. If more than two groups were tested, the ANOVA and the post-hoc test LSD were used for the same purpose. In all tests a p-value below 0.05 implies that an observed difference between the groups is likely to be a real difference, not one due to chance (although there is a 5% probability that it is a coincidence).

Most variables in the study were not measured with continuous scales, but with ordinal scales that have some kind of order by classification, even though they are not regular scales with the same increment between successive scale points. For example: response was measured from "do not notice" to "very annoyed". The results are presented as proportions of respondents that reported one or more of the points, for example the proportion of respondents annoyed by wind turbine sound. Confidence intervals (CI) of 95% were calculated in accordance with Altman *et al* [Altman 2005]. A confidence interval can be interpreted as the interval wherein the "true" proportion very probably (with 95% certainty) would lie. For these ordinal scales the differences between groups were tested with the Mann-Whitney U-test. Again for this test, p-values below 0.05 indicate a difference between groups.

Relationships between two or more variables were tested with Pearson's product-moment correlation, with Spearman's rank-order correlation and with binary logistic regression. Pearson's (two continuous variables) and Spearman's (if at least one variable was ordinal) test of correlation are useful when the agreement between two variables is of interest. The outcome is a value between 0 and 1; the closer to 1, the higher the correlation is or the better the two variables agree with one another. Binary logistic regression is a more advanced test in that several variables can be tested at the same time. First a model is constructed that explains the relationship between a dependent variable that is to be tested and independent variables that are supposedly related to the dependent variable, and with variables that may influence the relationship (the 'variables adjusted for'). In a binary logistic regression the dependent variable

can only have two values. If it has more than two values, it is dichotomized. For example, response to wind turbine noise can be dichotomized into "do not notice" (point 1) versus "notice" (points 2 through 5) when exploring perception, and into "not annoyed" (point/slightly 1 through 3) versus "rather/very annoyed" (points 4 through 5) when exploring annoyance. The outcome of the test is the odds ratio (OR) with a 95% CI. An OR below 1.0 with a 95% CI not including 1.0 indicates that there is a negative correlation between the dependent and the independent variables. An OR above 1.0 with a 95% CI not including 1.0 indicates that there is a positive correlation between the variables; i.e. the dependent variable will increase if the independent variable increases. If the CI includes 1.0 there is no (significant) correlation. Finally, the Hosmer and Lemeshow test is used to test the agreement between the model tested with the binary logistic regression and the data. A p-value *above* 0.5 indicates that the model and the data are in agreement. When the p-value is below 0.05, the model does not fit the data.

Factor analyses (principal components analyses; Varimax) were carried out when a factor was measured with several items. The factor analysis finds a pattern in the measurement from which a score can be calculated. This score has a mean value of 0.0 and a SD of 1.0. Cronbach's alpha was used to test the interval consistency of the items within a factor. The factor scores were treated as values on a continuous scale and the association with other variables were therefore tested in linear regression models. The outcome of the linear regression is presented with the scale dependent coefficients of the variables in the model (B) but also with standardized coefficients (Beta) that can be compared to other standardized coefficients.

Psychological distress was measured with the validated protocol General Health Questionnaire (12-item version) on a 4-point scale from 0 to 3. Six of the items were negative statements and six were positive statements. The replies were coded so that a high score always meant a higher load of psychological distress than a low score. The scale was dichotomized. For negative items scale points 1-3 were classified as sign of distress. For positive items, scale points 2 – 3 (reversed scale) were classified as sign of distress. The ratings from the dichotomized items were added into a GHQ-score, with a 13-point scale from 0 to 12. The GHQ-score was treated as a continuous scale.

Table 6.1 lists the abbreviations that are used in the presentation of the results in the next chapter.

Tabel 6.1: abbreviations used in the presentation of results

| | |
|-----------|---|
| alpha | A value between 0.0 and 1.0 that indicates the consistency of two or more variables. A value close to 1.0 indicates high consistency. |
| B | Unstandardized regression coefficient for a variable in a multiple linear regression. Scale dependent. |
| Beta | Standardized regression coefficient for a variable in a multiple linear regression. Beta ranges from 0.0 to 1.0. The value could be compared to Beta of other variables within the same multiple regression (a higher Beta implies a higher impact on the dependent variable), but not between separate regressions. |
| H-L test | Hosmer-Lemeshow test provides a value between 0.0 and 1.0. A low value (<0.05) indicates that the modelled regression do not fit the data. |
| n | Number of respondents. |
| OR | Odds ratio. The ratio between the odds for the dependent variable to occur if the independent variable is 1 (or "yes", or one scale point higher) and the odds for the dependent variable not to occur if the independent variable is 0 (or "no", or one scale point lower). A value below 1.0, with a confidence interval with both values below 1.0, indicates that the independent variable lower the odds for the dependent variable to occur and vice versa. |
| p | The probability that a tested hypothesis is true. The hypothesis is often "there is no difference between the groups" or "there is no correlation between two variables". If the p-value is less than 0.05, i.e. the probability that the hypothesis is true is less than 5%, it will be interpreted as there <i>is</i> a difference between the groups or that there <i>is</i> a correlation. |
| r | Correlation coefficient derived with Pearson's product-moment correlation. The values range from 0.0 to 1.0; a high value indicates a strong correlation. |
| r_s | Correlation coefficient derived with Spearman's rank-order correlation. The values range from 0.0 to 1.0; a high value indicates a strong correlation. |
| t | The outcome of a Student's t-test that tests if two samples have the same distribution and the outcome of an ANOVA that tests if three groups or more have the same distribution; with other words, if there is a difference between groups. A high value indicates that there is a difference between the groups. |
| Z_{MWU} | The outcome of a Mann-Whitney U-test which tests if there is a difference between two groups. A high value indicates that there is a difference. |
| 95% CI | Confidence interval of 95%. A range of values within there is a 95% probability of the true value occurring. |

7. Results

In this chapter the results of the study will be given in a sequence based on the model presented in section 6.1 *Dose-response model*. Each of the components of the model will be analyzed in a separate section (in each section one of the ‘boxes’ of figure 6.1 is repeated). Then the relation between components will be investigated.

7.1 Exposures from wind turbines

EXPOSURE
Sound level
Distance
Vertical angle
Fraction of view

The mean values of the four exposure values for the respondents in the study are shown in table 7.1.

Table 7.1: mean value and distribution of sound levels, distance, vertical angle and fraction of view for all respondents

| n = 725 | Unit | Mean (SD) | Minimum | Maximum |
|------------------|--------|-------------|---------|---------|
| SPL | dBA | 35.1 (6.41) | 23.8 | 54.4 |
| Distance | meter | 741 (408) | 17 | 2138 |
| Vertical angle | degree | 10.4 (10.3) | 2.2 | 79.0 |
| Fraction of view | % | 2.0 (13.2) | 0.1 | 263.0 |

All exposure variables depend on the distance between the wind turbines and the dwelling of the respondents. They were therefore highly correlated (table 7.2). That means that it is difficult to distinguish between the influences of one of the exposure variables in comparison to the influence of another of the exposure variables. The sound level will in this report be assumed to be the most relevant exposure variable for noise annoyance and is therefore used in statistical tests when exploring the relationship between exposure and response.

Table 7.2: correlations between distance, vertical angle, fraction of view and sound levels for all respondents

| n=725 | Distance | | Vertical angle | | Fraction of view | |
|------------------|----------|--------|----------------|--------|------------------|--------|
| | r_s | p | r_s | p | r_s | p |
| Distance | --- | | | | | |
| Vertical angle | -0.927 | <0.001 | | | | |
| Fraction of view | -0.860 | <0.001 | 0.916 | <0.001 | | |
| SPL | -0.893 | <0.001 | 0.924 | <0.001 | 0.973 | <0.001 |

The respondents were divided into five groups based on the levels of sound from wind turbines outside their dwelling. The number of respondents was smaller in the groups with higher levels of sound than in groups with lower levels (table 7.3). Only 65 respondents were exposed to

more than 45 dBA, which means that the results of this study will be less certain for respondents exposed to high levels of sound than for those exposed to lower levels.

Table 7.3: number of respondents at each 5 dBA-interval of sound levels.

| n=725 | Sound pressure levels, dBA | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-----|
| | <30 | 30-35 | 35-40 | 40-45 | >45 |
| Number of respondents | 185 | 219 | 162 | 94 | 65 |

7.2 Physical factors

PHYSICAL FACTORS
 Visibility
 Urbanization
 Type of house
 Background sound level

7.2.1 Visibility

Of the respondents, 68% could see at least one wind turbine from their dwelling, while 32% could not. Almost all respondents in groups exposed to 35 dBA or more could see wind turbines from outside or inside their homes (table 7.4), the number of visible wind turbines ranging from one to more than 75.

Table 7.4: proportion of respondents that could see at least one wind turbine from their dwelling, in relation to levels of wind turbine sound

| n=715 | Sound pressure levels, dBA | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-------|
| | <30 | 30-35 | 35-40 | 40-45 | >45 | |
| Visibility, % | | | | | | |
| Wind turbine visible | 35 | 60 | 90 | 89 | 100 | 68 |
| Wind turbine not visible | 65 | 40 | 10 | 11 | 0 | 32 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

7.2.2 Urbanization

The study sample was deliberately chosen from three different area types: built-up areas, rural areas with a main road and rural areas without a main road. The objective was to get a variety of background levels, but also to study annoyance with wind turbine sound in different landscapes. Of the respondents, 27% lived in built-up areas, 34% lived in rural areas with a main road and 39% lived in rural areas without a main road (table 7.5). Respondents in the lower groups of exposure to wind turbine sound more commonly lived in built-up areas than respondents in the groups of higher exposure.

Table 7.5: proportion of respondents per area type in relation to levels of wind turbine sound

| n=725 | Sound pressure levels, dBA | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-------|
| | <30 | 30-35 | 35-40 | 40-45 | >45 | |
| Degree of urbanisation, % | | | | | | |
| Built-up area | 37 | 38 | 17 | 19 | 2 | 27 |
| Rural with main road | 27 | 32 | 36 | 38 | 46 | 34 |
| Rural without main road | 36 | 30 | 46 | 43 | 52 | 39 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

7.2.3 Type of dwelling

Of the respondents, 77% lived on farms or in detached houses, while 22% lived in rented or owned apartments (table 7.6). Respondents in groups with low levels of wind turbine sound more commonly lived in apartments than those in groups with higher levels. This is in agreement with the higher proportion of respondents living in built-up areas in the lower exposure groups.

Table 7.6: type of dwelling in relation to levels of wind turbine sound

| n=693 | Sound pressure levels, dBA | | | | | Total |
|------------------------|----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-------|
| | <30 | 30-35 | 35-40 | 40-45 | >45 | |
| Type of dwelling, % | | | | | | |
| Farm or detached house | 65 | 68 | 86 | 92 | 98 | 77 |
| Apartment | 35 | 31 | 14 | 8 | 2 | 22 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

7.2.4 Background sound levels

Immission levels of background sound for all respondents in the study were obtained from community noise maps as Lden (Lden scale with 5 dB intervals). In the selected areas, road traffic dominated the (calculated) background sound level. Therefore, the Lden values can be considered as an approximation of road traffic noise levels. Lden values of background sound were in the study negatively related to sound pressure levels of wind turbine sound ($r = -0.242$, $n = 725$, $p < 0.001$). That means that respondents exposed to high levels of wind turbine sound were on average exposed to lower levels of road traffic sound than other respondents were (table 7.7).

Table 7.7: background sound levels (Lden) in relation to levels of wind turbine sound.

| n=725 | Sound pressure levels, dBA | | | | | Total |
|--------------------|----------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| | <30 | 30-35 | 35-40 | 40-45 | >45 | |
| Lden, mean (SD) | 49.0 (6.9) | 46.6 (7.9) | 44.8 (11.4) | 43.9 (10.2) | 41.1 (9.0) | 46.0 (9.3) |

7.2.5 Relationships between physical factors

Respondents living in built-up areas were less likely to see the wind turbines from their dwelling in comparison to respondents living in rural areas (table 7.8). They also more commonly lived in apartments.

Table 7.8: number of respondents who could not and who could see wind turbines from their dwelling and mean value of Sound levels for each sub-sample

| | Area types | | | Type of dwelling | |
|----------------------------|---------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|------------|
| | Built-up area | Rural with main road | Rural without main road | House or farm | Apartment |
| <i>Visibility, %</i> | | | | | |
| Not visible | 89 (46%) | 66 (27%) | 75 (27%) | 126 (24%) | 92 (61%) |
| Visible | 105 (54%) | 177 (73%) | 203 (73%) | 407 (76%) | 60 (39%) |
| Total | 194 (100%) | 243 (100%) | 278 (100%) | 533 (100%) | 152 (100%) |
| | | | | | |
| <i>Type of dwelling, %</i> | | | | | |
| House or farm | 126 (67%) | 182 (78%) | 230 (85%) | | |
| Apartment | 61 (33%) | 52 (22%) | 42 (15%) | | |
| Total | 187 (100%) | 234 (100%) | 272 (100%) | | |

As expected, respondents in built-up areas and rural areas with a main road were on average exposed to higher levels of road traffic sound than those living in rural areas with no main road (table 7.9). The differences were statistically significant (ANOVA, post hoc test LSD; built-up vs. rural with no main road, $p < 0.001$; Rural with main road vs. rural without main road, $p < 0.001$). Respondents in rural areas (with or without main road) were on average exposed to higher levels of wind turbine sound than those living in built-up areas. Hence the three area types represented different sound conditions; high L_{den} from road traffic and low SPL from wind turbines (built-up), high L_{den} and high SPL (rural with main road) and low L_{den} and high SPL (rural without main road).

Table 7.9: mean values of exposure levels in three types of area

| N=725 | Built-up areas n = 199 | Rural areas with main road n = 245 | Rural areas without main roads n = 281 |
|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) |
| L_{den} | 49.1 (6.3) | 49.2 (8.4) | 41.0 (9.5) |
| SPL from wind turbines | 32.5 (4.7) | 36.2 (6.6) | 36.1 (6.7) |

7.3 Individual factors

INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

Age and gender
Economical benefit from wind turbines
Education level and employment
Living conditions
Attitude and noise sensitivity

7.3.1 Age and gender

The mean age of the respondents was 51 years with a higher average age in the groups with low levels of sound and a lower average age at higher sound levels (table 7.10). The correlation between age and sound levels was statistically significant ($r = -0.21$, $n = 703$, $p < 0.001$), *i.e.* age decreased with increasing sound levels. Of the respondents, 51% were men and 49% were women. The proportion of men and women differed somewhat between groups of sound levels. The uneven distributions of age and gender in relation to sound levels make it important to adjust for these two factors when relationships between sound levels and response are explored.

Table 7.10: age and gender in relation to levels of wind turbine sound

| | Sound pressure levels, dBA | | | | | Total |
|-------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | <30 | 30-35 | 35-40 | 40-45 | >45 | |
| Age (n=703) | | | | | | |
| Mean | 57 | 57 | 52 | 51 | 48 | 54 |
| (SD) | (15.0) | (15.4) | (14.9) | (14.7) | (10.7) | (15.0) |
| Gender (n=706), % | | | | | | |
| Male | 44 | 52 | 55 | 54 | 51 | 51 |
| Female | 56 | 48 | 45 | 46 | 49 | 49 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

7.3.2 Economical benefits

Of the respondents, 14% ($n = 100$) benefited economically from wind turbines by owning wind turbines or shares of wind turbines, or otherwise. These respondents more commonly lived in rural areas; only 3 respondents benefited economically and lived in a built-up area.

Respondents who benefited economically were exposed to higher levels of wind turbine noise than others (table 7.11). The difference was statistically significant ($t = -16.1$, $p < 0.001$). In the group of respondents exposed to levels of wind turbine sound below 30 dBA, only 2% benefited economically, while among respondents in the group exposed to more than 45 dBA, 67% benefited.

Table 7.11: economical benefits in relation to levels of wind turbine sound

| n=699 | Sound pressure levels, dBA | | | | | Total |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-------|
| | <30 | 30-35 | 35-40 | 40-45 | >45 | |
| Economical benefits, % | | | | | | |
| Benefited economically | 2 | 3 | 10 | 34 | 67 | 14 |
| Did not benefit economically | 98 | 97 | 90 | 66 | 33 | 86 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

7.3.3 Education and employment

Respondents were classified into three groups in accordance with their educational level; primary (lower general or vocational), secondary (secondary general or vocational) and higher (general or vocational, university). The proportion of respondents with higher education was larger in the group of respondents exposed to high levels of wind turbine sound (>45 dBA) than among other respondents (table 7.12). Respondents with higher education also more often benefited economically from the wind turbines.

People who spend a lot of time at home could be expected to be more annoyed by wind turbine sound. Of the respondents, 31% were employed, 19% were retired and 26% worked at home (table 7.12). However, 25% had classified their occupation as "other". Included in this category were mainly self-employed persons and farmers.

Table 7.12: education and employment in relation to levels of wind turbine sound

| | Sound pressure levels, dBA | | | | | Total |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-------|
| | <30 | 30-35 | 35-40 | 40-45 | >45 | |
| Education (n=701), % | | | | | | |
| Primary | 25 | 27 | 21 | 14 | 6 | 23 |
| Secondary | 38 | 42 | 41 | 53 | 44 | 43 |
| Higher | 32 | 32 | 38 | 33 | 49 | 35 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Employment status (n=704), % | | | | | | |
| Employed | 41 | 27 | 34 | 24 | 19 | 31 |
| Domestic work or working at home | 22 | 22 | 24 | 34 | 41 | 26 |
| Retired | 22 | 28 | 15 | 10 | 0 | 19 |
| Other | 16 | 23 | 26 | 33 | 40 | 25 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

7.3.4. Living conditions

The respondents had on average lived 18 years at their current dwelling (table 7.13). Most respondents were satisfied with their living conditions. Of the respondents, 23% reported changes for the better in the living environment during the last years. Changes for the worse in the living environment were reported by 36% of the respondents. The nature of these changes are described in section Appendix I: *Remarks in the questionnaires added by respondents*.

Table 7.13: characteristics of the respondents at each 5 dBA interval of sound levels

| | Sound pressure levels, dBA | | | | | Total |
|---|----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | <30 | 30-35 | 35-40 | 40-45 | >45 | |
| Years at this address (n=715) | | | | | | |
| Mean (SD) | 18 (13) | 17 (14) | 17 (13) | 22 (15) | 16 (15) | 18 (15) |
| | | | | | | |
| Satisfaction with the living environment (n=717), % | | | | | | |
| Satisfied or very satisfied | 92 | 91 | 93 | 90 | 97 | 92 |
| Not satisfied | 8 | 9 | 7 | 10 | 3 | 8 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | | | | | |
| Changes for the better (n=710), % | | | | | | |
| No | 75 | 79 | 76 | 86 | 67 | 77 |
| Yes | 25 | 21 | 24 | 14 | 33 | 23 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| | | | | | | |
| Changes for the worse (n=707), % | | | | | | |
| No | 73 | 65 | 58 | 60 | 60 | 64 |
| Yes | 27 | 35 | 43 | 40 | 40 | 36 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

7.3.5 Attitude and noise sensitivity

General attitude towards wind turbines was measured on a 5-point scale from very positive to very negative. Of the respondents, 14% were negative or very negative towards wind turbines in general (table 7.14), while 56% were positive or very positive. General attitude was not correlated with levels of wind turbine sound, *i.e.* respondents in groups with higher levels of wind turbine sound were not more negative or positive than those in groups with lower levels.

Of the respondents, 36% were negative or very negative to the impact of the wind turbines on the landscape scenery (table 7.14). On the other hand, 21% were positive or very positive. No difference was found between respondents who could see wind turbines from their dwelling and those who could not. Attitude towards the impact of wind turbines on the landscape was not correlated with levels of wind turbine sound.

Noise sensitivity is well-known from community noise studies to be associated with noise annoyance. Noise sensitivity is in those studies seen as a personal trait that is independent of sound exposure. In this study, WINDFARMperception, noise sensitivity was measured on a 4-point scale from "not at all sensitive" to "very sensitive". Of the respondents, 30% were rather or very sensitive to noise. The proportions of respondents that rated themselves as rather or very sensitive to noise were approximately the same in all five groups of sound levels, and hence there was no statistically significant correlation between noise sensitivity and levels of wind turbine sound.

Table 7.14: attitude and noise sensitivity in relation to levels of wind turbine sound

| | Sound pressure levels, dBA | | | | | Total |
|--|----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-------|
| | <30 | 30-35 | 35-40 | 40-45 | >45 | |
| Attitude to wind turbines in general (n=708), % | | | | | | |
| Rather or very negative | 10 | 14 | 19 | 17 | 9 | 14 |
| Not negative | 90 | 86 | 81 | 83 | 91 | 86 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Attitude to the impact of wind turbines on the landscape (n=704), % | | | | | | |
| Rather or very negative | 33 | 36 | 45 | 39 | 20 | 36 |
| Not negative | 67 | 64 | 55 | 61 | 80 | 64 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Noise sensitivity (n=713), % | | | | | | |
| Rather or very sensitive | 36 | 25 | 31 | 31 | 23 | 30 |
| Not sensitive or slightly sensitive | 64 | 75 | 69 | 69 | 77 | 70 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

The respondents were asked to judge several aspects of wind turbines on 5-point scales with the third point supposed to be a neutral judgment. The wind turbines were perceived as relatively ugly, repulsive, unnatural and annoying, but also as relatively efficient, environmental friendly, necessary and harmless according to the mean values of ratings of eight pairs of judgment terms (table 7.15).

Table 7.15: judgments of wind turbines

| | n | Mean | SD | Skewness | Kurtosis |
|--|-----|------|------|----------|----------|
| Efficient – inefficient | 629 | 2.5 | 1.26 | 0.45 | -0.71 |
| Environmental friendly – not environmental friendly | 652 | 2.1 | 1.27 | 0.97 | -0.14 |
| Pretty – ugly | 643 | 3.5 | 1.30 | -0.49 | -0.84 |
| Necessary – unnecessary | 647 | 2.4 | 1.28 | 0.57 | -0.65 |
| Inviting – repulsive | 625 | 3.4 | 1.19 | -0.27 | -0.63 |
| Natural – unnatural | 636 | 3.4 | 1.37 | -0.41 | -1.03 |
| Annoying – blends in | 633 | 2.7 | 1.15 | 0.12 | -0.63 |
| Dangerous -harmless | 631 | 3.5 | 1.28 | -0.50 | -0.69 |

From the terms of judgments, two factors describing different aspects of wind turbines were constructed with factor analysis. This was done to capture different aspects of judgments towards wind turbines. Factor 1 comprised items that could be connected to the looks of the wind turbines and the factor was therefore named "Visual judgments" (table 7.16). Factor 2 comprised items describing electricity generation and its contribution to less environmental harm. This factor was named "Utility judgments". The two constructed factors reflected 75%

of the variance of the items. Two items did not fit into the factor analysis; annoying – blends in and dangerous - harmless.

Table 7.16: factor loadings of two factors derived from 6 of the pair of judgment terms

| n=595 | Visual judgment (Factor 1) alpha = 0.850 | Utility judgment (Factor 2) alpha = 0.804 |
|---|--|---|
| Pretty – ugly | 0.884 | 0.127 |
| Inviting – repulsive | 0.880 | 0.201 |
| Natural – unnatural | 0.829 | 0.152 |
| | | |
| Environmental friendly – not environmental friendly | 0.039 | 0.841 |
| Efficient – inefficient | 0.213 | 0.836 |
| Necessary – unnecessary | 0.235 | 0.810 |

7.3.6 Relationships between individual factors

Respondents who benefited economically from wind turbines were on average younger than those who did not and hence on average more healthy, though not less psychologically distressed or stressed (see section 7.8 below). They had higher education and more commonly worked at home than others. Respondents who benefited economically were less negative to wind turbines in general and to the impact of wind turbines on the landscape scenery, but rated themselves as noise sensitive to the same degree as those who did not benefit.

Respondents with higher education rated their sensitivity for noise higher than the others. They were younger and had less chronic diseases, but did not differ in psychological distress or stress score (see section 7.8 below) from those with lower education. They were not more negative to wind turbines in general, but were more negative to the impact of the turbines on the landscape scenery.

Variables measuring different aspects of attitude and noise sensitivity were correlated to each other. Attitude towards the impact of wind turbines on the landscape scenery was correlated with general attitude, to the factor "visual judgment" as expected, and to a lesser degree with the factor "utility judgment" (table 7.17). Noise sensitivity was correlated with all the attitude variables. As expected, the two constructed factors of judgments were not correlated.

Table 7.17: correlations between variables measuring attitude and noise sensitivity.

| Spearman's rank-order correlation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|-------|---|
| 1. Noise sensitivity | - | | | | |
| 2. Attitude to impact on landscape | 0.259*** | - | | | |
| 3. General attitude | 0.140*** | 0.646*** | - | | |
| 4. Factor Visual judgments | 0.212*** | 0.602*** | 0.501*** | - | |
| 5. Factor Utility judgments | 0.105* | 0.381*** | 0.513*** | 0.053 | - |

***p<0.001, *p<0.05

7.4 Response to wind turbines

RESPONSE
Perception
Annoyance
Occurrence
Sound character

7.4.1 Response to exposures from wind turbines

In this study response was measured to several types of exposure from wind turbines in the living environment. Of the respondents, 17% were rather or very annoyed by the sound from rotor blades, 13% by the changes in view and 9% by the movement of the rotor blades (table 7.18). Also, 6% of the respondents were rather or very annoyed by blinking shadows indoors and/or moving shadows outdoors.

**Table 7.18: response to different types of exposures from wind turbines;
number of respondents and proportions of respondents**

| | Do not notice | Notice but not annoyed | Slightly annoyed | Rather annoyed | Very annoyed | Total |
|--------------------------|---------------|------------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|------------|
| Blinking shadows indoors | 464 (69%) | 91 (14%) | 75 (11%) | 20 (3%) | 19 (3%) | 669 (100%) |
| Moving shadows outdoors | 434 (65%) | 130 (20%) | 63 (9%) | 15 (2%) | 23 (4%) | 665 (100%) |
| Sound of rotor blades | 430 (65%) | 57 (9%) | 60 (9%) | 45 (7%) | 69 (10%) | 661 (100%) |
| Movement of rotor blades | 344 (52%) | 196 (29%) | 70 (10%) | 30 (5%) | 27 (4%) | 667 (100%) |
| Changed view | 283 (43%) | 201 (30%) | 91 (14%) | 48 (7%) | 42 (6%) | 665 (100%) |
| Vibrations | 574 (90%) | 39 (6%) | 18 (3%) | 4 (1%) | 3 (0%) | 638 (100%) |

The respondents were asked how often they were affected by different exposures from wind turbines. Most often the respondents were affected by the changed view: 20% reported that they were affected by changed view once a week or more often (table 7.19). With the same frequency, 17% were affected by sound from rotor blades and 15% by movement of the rotor blades.

Table 7.19: frequency of perceived annoyance with different exposures from wind turbines

| | Almost never | At least once in the past year | At least once a month | At least once a week | Almost daily | Total |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------|------------|
| Blinking shadows indoors | 529 (80%) | 44 (7%) | 38 (6%) | 30 (5%) | 22 (3%) | 663 (100%) |
| Moving shadows outdoors | 520 (79%) | 43 (7%) | 37 (6%) | 27 (4%) | 32 (5%) | 659 (100%) |
| Sound of rotor blades | 430 (65%) | 57 (9%) | 60 (9%) | 45 (7%) | 69 (10%) | 661 (100%) |
| Movement of rotor blades | 498 (76%) | 31 (5%) | 27 (4%) | 26 (4%) | 73 (11%) | 655 (100%) |
| Changed view | 442 (68%) | 46 (7%) | 29 (4%) | 22 (3%) | 113 (17%) | 652 (100%) |
| Vibrations | 615 (96%) | 9 (1%) | 7 (1%) | 7 (1%) | 6 (1%) | 644 (100%) |

7.4.2 Response to wind turbine sound

Annoyance with sound from wind turbines was investigated further. Five variables measuring annoyance with wind turbine sound, outdoors or indoors, were included in the study. The variables were all highly correlated (all p-values <0.001). The five questions also showed high internal consistency (alpha = 0.87). This means that the measurements were reliable. One of these measurements (question 10, see Appendix A) will be used as the main outcome in this report. The results presented here would have been similar if another of the five measurements had been chosen as the main outcome.

Early in the questionnaire, in question 10, response to wind turbine sound was assessed with a 5-point scale from "do not notice" to "very annoyed" among other disturbances. Of the respondents, 60% reported that they noticed sound from wind turbines outdoors and 33% reported noticing the sound indoors. Furthermore, 10% of the respondents were rather or very annoyed by wind turbine sound outdoors and 6% were rather or very annoyed by wind turbine sound indoors (table 7.20).

Table 7.20: response to wind turbine sound, outdoors and indoors, measured on a 5-point scale

| | Do not notice | Notice but not annoyed | Slightly annoyed | Rather annoyed | Very annoyed | Total |
|----------------|---------------|------------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|------------|
| Sound outdoors | 284 (40%) | 259 (37%) | 92 (13%) | 44 (6%) | 29 (4%) | 708 (100%) |
| Sound indoors | 465 (67%) | 139 (20%) | 54 (8%) | 21 (3%) | 20 (3%) | 699 (100%) |

Respondents who could hear wind turbine sound at their dwelling were asked if the sound was more distinctive in some situations. Most often, the sound of the wind turbines was perceived as louder when the wind was blowing from the wind turbines towards the dwelling and when the wind was strong (table 7.21). Also, 40% of the respondents that could hear the wind turbine sound reported that the sound was louder at night time and 32% reported it was louder on warm summer evenings.

Table 7.21: perception of loudness in different situations. Only respondents who could hear wind turbine sound at their dwelling

| | Less loud | Louder | No difference | Do not know | Total |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|---------------|-------------|------------|
| Wind from turbine towards dwelling | 18 (5%) | 230 (69%) | 44 (13%) | 43 (13%) | 335 (100%) |
| Wind from dwelling towards turbine | 176 (56%) | 37 (12%) | 45 (14%) | 58 (18%) | 316 (100%) |
| Weak or no wind | 215 (69%) | 46 (15%) | 28 (9%) | 24 (8%) | 313 (100%) |
| Strong wind | 59 (18%) | 220 (67%) | 32 (10%) | 17 (5%) | 328 (100%) |
| Warm summer evenings | 85 (27%) | 102 (32%) | 82 (26%) | 52 (16%) | 321 (100%) |
| Nighttime | 70 (22%) | 125 (40%) | 80 (25%) | 41 (13%) | 316 (100%) |
| Sideways | 75 (26%) | 16 (6%) | 97 (33%) | 105 (36%) | 293 (100%) |

The most common description of the wind turbine sound was "swishing/lashing": 75% of the respondents who could hear the sound thought that this was a suitable term to characterize the sound (table 7.22). "Rustling" was the second most common description, followed by "a low

frequency/low pitch sound". A "pure tone" was reported by only 3% of those that could hear the sound.

Table 7.22: characteristics of the wind turbine sound. Only respondents who could hear wind turbine sound at their dwelling

| How would you describe the sound of wind turbines? | N* | yes |
|--|-----|-----------|
| A pure tone | 335 | 11 (3%) |
| Thumping/throbbing | 335 | 24 (7%) |
| Swishing/lashing | 335 | 251 (75%) |
| Whistling/screeching | 335 | 32 (10%) |
| Rustling | 335 | 83 (25%) |
| Scratching/squeaking | 335 | 10 (3%) |
| A low frequency/low pitch sound | 335 | 46 (14%) |
| Resounding | 335 | 23 (7%) |
| Other | 335 | 23 (7%) |

*Number of respondents who answered that they could hear sound from wind turbines

Respondents that characterized the sound from wind turbines as "swishing/lashing", the most common classification, were more likely to also be annoyed by the sound than others ($Z_{MWU} = -3.2$; $p < 0.001$). Respondents annoyed (rather or very) by wind turbine sound more often characterized the sound as "thumping/throbbing", "swishing/lashing", whistling/screeching", "scratching/squeaking" and "resounding" than respondents who were not annoyed by the sound (table 7.23).

Table 7.23: characteristics of the wind turbine sound among respondents who were not annoyed by wind turbine sound and among respondents who were annoyed; only respondents who could hear wind turbine sound at their dwelling


| How would you describe the sound of wind turbines? | Not annoyed by wind turbine sound | Annoyed by wind turbine sound | p-values |
|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------|
| A pure tone | 4% | 0% | 0.127 |
| Thumping/throbbing | 4% | 17% | <0.001 |
| Swishing/lashing | 69% | 82% | <0.05 |
| Whistling/screeching | 6% | 18% | <0.01 |
| Rustling | 22% | 23% | 0.871 |
| Scratching/squeaking | 2% | 9% | <0.05 |
| A low frequency/low pitch sound | 12% | 20% | 0.077 |
| Resounding | 3% | 21% | <0.001 |
| Other | 6% | 9% | 0.589 |

Respondents who benefited economically from wind turbines were less annoyed by wind turbine sound than other respondents, despite higher exposure levels. Of those who did not benefit, 12% were rather or very annoyed, compared to 3% of those who did benefit (table 7.24). This difference in distribution was statistically significant ($Z_{MWU} = -2.55$, $p < 0.05$).

Table 7.24: response to wind turbine sound outdoors among respondents who did or did not benefit economically from wind turbines

| | Do not notice | Notice but not annoyed | Slightly annoyed | Rather annoyed | Very annoyed | Total |
|---|---------------|------------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|------------|
| Sound outdoors (No economical benefits) | 255 (44%) | 184 (31%) | 78 (13%) | 41 (7%) | 28 (5%) | 586 (100%) |
| Sound outdoors (Economical benefits) | 15 (15%) | 68 (69%) | 13 (13%) | 2 (2%) | 1 (1%) | 99 (100%) |

7.5 Response to wind turbines related to exposure




Response to wind turbine sound outdoors (5-point scale from "do not notice" to "very annoyed") was correlated with levels of wind turbine sound ($r_s = 0.501$, $n = 708$, $p < 0.001$); the probability of noticing and/or being annoyed by wind turbine sound increased with increasing sound levels. The distribution of respondents annoyed by wind turbine sound is shown in table 7.25.

Table 7.25: response to wind turbine sound outdoors in relation to 5 dBA-intervals of sound levels (all respondents)

| Response outdoors | Sound pressure levels, dBA | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| | <30 | 30-35 | 35-40 | 40-45 | >45 | |
| Do not notice | 134 (75%) | 99 (47%) | 34 (21%) | 12 (13%) | 5 (8%) | 284 (40%) |
| Notice, but not annoyed | 36 (20%) | 77 (36%) | 65 (41%) | 43 (46%) | 38 (59%) | 259 (37%) |
| Slightly annoyed | 4 (2%) | 21 (10%) | 32 (20%) | 21 (23%) | 14 (22%) | 92 (13%) |
| Rather annoyed | 2 (1%) | 13 (6%) | 19 (12%) | 6 (7%) | 4 (6%) | 44 (6%) |
| Very annoyed | 2 (1%) | 3 (1%) | 9 (6%) | 11 (12%) | 4 (6%) | 29 (4%) |
| Total | 178 (100%) | 213 (100%) | 159 (100%) | 93 (100%) | 65 (100%) | 708 (100%) |

The same result is illustrated in figure 7.1 as added proportions of respondents who noticed or/and were annoyed by wind turbine sound. The proportion of respondents who noticed the sound increased with increasing sound levels. Of the respondents, 80% or more noticed sound from wind turbines when the sound levels were 40 dBA or higher. The proportion of respondents who were annoyed by wind turbine sound increased with increasing sound levels up to 45 dBA, and after that decreased. Among respondents in the group 40-45 dBA, 19% were rather or very annoyed, and 12% were very annoyed. The confidence intervals do not overlap in most of the increasing part of the curves which means that the increase is statistically

significant. However, at sound pressure levels of 40 dBA and higher, the confidence intervals of the different 5 dBA-intervals of sound levels overlap.




The large differences in proportion annoyed among respondents that did not benefit economically from the wind turbines and respondent who did, and the fact that most of the respondents that benefited lived close to the wind turbines, made it interesting to also study relationships between sound levels and response only among respondents who did not benefit. Table 7.26 shows the number and proportion of respondents that were annoyed by sound from wind turbines and who did not benefit economically from the turbines.

Table 7.26: response to wind turbine sound outdoors in relation to 5 dBA-intervals of sound levels; only respondents who did not benefit economically from wind turbines

| Response outdoors | Sound pressure levels, dBA | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| | <30 | 30-35 | 35-40 | 40-45 | >45 | |
| Do not notice | 124 (75%) | 92 (46%) | 30 (21%) | 7 (12%) | 2 (10%) | 255 (44%) |
| Notice, but not annoyed | 34 (21%) | 71 (36%) | 52 (37%) | 22 (37%) | 5 (24%) | 184 (31%) |
| Slightly annoyed | 4 (2%) | 20 (10%) | 30 (21%) | 16 (27%) | 8 (38%) | 78 (13%) |
| Rather annoyed | 2 (1%) | 13 (7%) | 19 (14%) | 4 (7%) | 3 (14%) | 41 (7%) |
| Very annoyed | 2 (1%) | 3 (2%) | 9 (6%) | 11 (18%) | 3 (14%) | 28 (5%) |
| Total | 166 (100%) | 199 (100%) | 140 (100%) | 60 (100%) | 21 (100%) | 586 (100%) |

The relationships between sound levels and response among respondents who did not benefit economically from wind turbines are also shown in figure 7.2. The confidence intervals are rather large at the higher levels of exposure due to a small number of respondents at these intervals. There was no significant difference in perception of the sound between respondents who benefited economically from wind turbines and those who did not; the likeliness to notice the sound was about 80% or more above 40 dBA. However, the proportion of respondents annoyed by wind turbine sound is higher when respondents that benefited economically are excluded. Of the respondents in the group 40-45 dBA, 25% were rather or very annoyed by the sound and 18% were very annoyed.



The relationship between sound levels and response to wind turbine sound were tested with binary logistic regression. The measured response to wind turbine sound was dichotomized into "do not notice" (point 1) versus "notice" (points 2 through 5) and assigned to the dependent variable. Sound level (continuous scale in dBA), age (continuous scale in years), gender (male/female) and economical benefits (no/yes) were assessed as independent variables and entered into the regression simultaneous. For a description of how the odds ratios (OR) should be interpreted, see section 6.2.3 *Statistical analyses*. The odds for noticing sound from wind turbines increased statistically significant with increasing sound levels (table 7.27).

Table 7.27: relationship between sound levels and perception of wind turbine sound, adjusted for age, gender and economical benefits

| | | |
|---|-------------|----------------------|
| Do not notice vs. notice wind turbine sound | OR | 95% CI |
| H-L test p = 0.144 | | |
| Sound levels* | 1.25 | 1.197 – 1.301 |

*Adjusted for age, gender and economical benefits.

The measured response to wind turbine sound was dichotomized into “not annoyed” (point 1 through 3) versus “annoyed” (point 4 through 5). The odds for being annoyed by wind turbine sound also increased with increasing sound levels (table 7.28).


Table 7.28: relationship between sound levels and annoyance with wind turbine sound, adjusted for age, gender and economical benefits

| | | |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------------|
| Not annoyed vs. annoyed | OR | 95% CI |
| H-L test** p = 0.434 | | |
| Sound levels* | 1.18 | 1.121 – 1.235 |

*Adjusted for age, gender and economical benefits.

For the standardized measurements of response, see Appendix F.

7.6 Influence of physical factors on response to wind turbine sound



Several physical factors were hypothesized to increase the odds for noticing sound from wind turbines. They were first tested one by one in a binary logistic regression with the outcome "do not notice" vs. "notice" wind turbine sound. Sound levels, age, gender and economical benefits were adjusted for in the test. Thus, if a statistically significant increase in odds was found for a tested variable, this variable supposedly had an impact on the likeliness to hear wind turbine sound despite sound levels, age, gender or economical benefits.

Respondents who could see at least one wind turbine from their dwelling were more likely to notice the sound from wind turbines than other respondents (table 7.29). The degree of urbanisation did not have a statistically significant impact on the possibility to notice sound from wind turbines. When the two types of rural areas were compared with the built-up areas, no differences in odds were found. Though there was a difference between both rural area types in noticing the sound (less when there was a main road, more when there was no such road), this difference was not statistically significant. Respondents living in apartments were less likely to notice the sound in comparison with those living in other types of dwellings. Background (road traffic) sound levels had a negative, though very small effect; the possibility to notice wind turbine sound decreased with increasing background levels as expected.

Table 7.29: relationship between physical factors and noticing sound from wind turbines, adjusted for sound levels, age, gender and economical benefits; variables were tested one by one

| Do not notice vs. notice wind turbine sound | OR | 95% CI |
|--|-------------|----------------------|
| <i>Visibility</i> , H-L test p = 0.922 | | |
| Visibility (no/yes)* | 4.16 | 2.717 – 6.372 |
| | | |
| <i>Urbanization</i> , H-L test p = 0.333 | | |
| Built-up area* | 1.00 | |
| Rural area with a main road* | 0.66 | 0.416 – 1.052 |
| Rural area without main road* | 1.23 | 0.785 – 1.940 |
| | | |
| <i>Type of dwelling</i> , H-L test p = 0.465 | | |
| Type of dwelling (house/apartment)* | 0.56 | 0.365 – 0.869 |
| | | |
| <i>Background sound</i> , H-L test p = 0.124 | | |
| Lden* | 0.98 | 0.958 – 0.999 |

*Adjusted for sound levels, age, gender and economical benefits.

The factors found to be related with noticing sound from wind turbines were tested simultaneously. Seeing at least one wind turbine from the dwelling still increased the odds for noticing the sound and increased background sound levels decrease the odds, though very slightly (table 7.30). However, type of housing no longer influenced the possibility of noticing the sound. This could be due to the correlation between type of dwelling and visibility as described above; respondents living in houses or farms more commonly could see wind turbines from their dwelling than respondents living in apartments.

Table 7.30. Relationship between physical factors and noticing sound from wind turbines, adjusted for sound levels, age, gender and economical benefits; variables were tested simultaneously

| Do not notice vs. notice wind turbine sound | OR | 95% CI |
|---|-------------|----------------------|
| H-L test p = 0.860 | | |
| Visibility (no/yes)* | 3.97 | 2.540 – 6.205 |
| Type of dwelling (house/apartment)* | 0.74 | 0.468 – 1.183 |
| Lden* | 0.98 | 0.955 – 0.998 |

*Adjusted for s levels, age, gender and economical benefits.

The influences of physical factors on the probability of being annoyed by wind turbine sound were also explored. Visibility was strongly related to annoyance; respondents who could see at least one wind turbine from their dwelling were more likely to be annoyed by the sound than respondents who could not see any wind turbine (table 7.31). Respondents living in a rural area with a main road were less likely to be annoyed by wind turbine sound than respondents living in a built-up area, even though sound levels of wind turbine sound were just as high. Living in an apartment lowered the odds for being annoyed by the sound from wind turbines. Levels of

background (road traffic) sound had no relationship with annoyance due to wind turbine sound; increased levels of background sound did not decrease the odds for annoyance.

Table 7.31: relationship between physical factors and being annoyed by sound from wind turbines, adjusted for sound levels, age, gender and economical benefits; variables were tested one by one

| Not annoyed vs. annoyed | OR | 95% CI |
|--|--------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Visibility</i> , H-L test p = 0.590 | | |
| Visibility (no/yes)* | 12.51 | 2.937 – 53.271 |
| | | |
| <i>Urbanization</i> , H-L test p = 0.650 | | |
| Built-up area* | 1.0 | |
| Rural area with a main road* | 0.24 | 0.107 – 0.522 |
| Rural area without main road* | 0.67 | 0.356 – 1.252 |
| | | |
| <i>Type of dwelling</i> , H-L test p = 0.882 | | |
| Type of dwelling (house/apartment)* | 0.40 | 0.162 – 0.980 |
| | | |
| <i>Background sound</i> , H-L test p = 0.960 | | |
| Lden* | 1.01 | 0.986 – 1.042 |

*Adjusted for sound levels, age, gender and economical benefits.


The influence of visibility on annoyance with wind turbine sound was large, also when the variables were tested simultaneously (table 7.32). Living in an area with a main road in comparison with a built-up area still decreased the odds for being annoyed. However, type of dwelling was no longer associated with annoyance due to wind turbine sound.

Table 7.32: relationship between physical factors and being annoyed by sound from wind turbines, adjusted for sound levels, age, gender and economical benefits; variables were tested simultaneously

| Not annoyed vs. annoyed | OR | 95% CI |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| H-L test p = 0.690 | | |
| Visibility (no/yes)* | 12.0 | 2.782 – 51.910 |
| Urbanization | | |
| Built-up area* | 1.0 | |
| Rural area with a main road* | 0.20 | 0.084 – 0.448 |
| Rural area without main road* | 0.55 | 0.282 – 1.077 |
| Type of dwelling (house/apartment)* | 0.12 | 0.189 – 1.210 |

*Adjusted for sound levels, age, gender and economical benefits.

7.7 Influence of individual factors on annoyance with wind turbine sound



The relationships between individual factors and annoyance with wind turbine sound were also tested. Some of the factors, such as age and gender, could be considered as factors that actually could influence the odds for being annoyed by the sound (even though it cannot be excluded that there is another related factor that actually causes the effect). Other factors, such as attitude, are more ambiguous; we do not know if the attitude has an influence on annoyance or if annoyance leads to a negative attitude. The statistical tests can only show whether there is a relationship between attitude and annoyance, not which one is the cause and which one the effect.

Age was found to be related to annoyance with wind turbine sound (table 7.33). Older respondents were more likely to be annoyed than younger ones. No difference was found between men and women. Benefiting economically from wind turbines decreased the odds for being annoyed by the sound as shown before.

Table 7.33: relationship between individual factors and annoyance with sound from wind turbines, adjusted for sound levels; variables were tested one by one

| Not annoyed vs. annoyed | OR | 95% CI |
|---|-------------|----------------------|
| <i>Age</i> , H-L test $p = 0.224$ | | |
| Age (year)* | 1.03 | 1.010 – 1.049 |
| | | |
| <i>Gender</i> , H-L test $p = 0.017$ | | |
| Gender (male, female)* | 0.93 | 0.558 – 1.531 |
| | | |
| <i>Economical benefits</i> , H-L test $p = 0.152$ | | |
| Economical benefits (no/yes)* | 0.05 | 0.014 – 0.186 |

*Adjusted for sound levels.

Respondents who were highly educated were more likely to be annoyed by the sound than respondents with primary education (table 7.34). No differences between respondents that were employed, and supposedly not so much at home, and other, non-employed respondents were found. Respondents that were not satisfied with the living environment were more likely to be annoyed by wind turbine sound than others. Positive changes in the living environment were not associated with annoyance, while negative changes were. All measurements of attitude as

well as noise sensitivity were positively related to annoyance with wind turbine sound: respondents who were negative towards the wind turbines were more likely to be annoyed or vice versa.

Table 7.34: relationship between individual factors and being annoyed by sound from wind turbines, adjusted for sound levels, age, gender and economical benefits; variables were tested one by one

| Not annoyed vs. annoyed | OR | 95% CI |
|--|-------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Education</i> , H-L test p = 0.454 | | |
| Primary* | 1.0 | |
| Secondary* | 1.56 | 0.708 – 3.421 |
| Higher* | 2.29 | 1.020 – 5.122 |
| | | |
| <i>Employment</i> , H-L test p = 0.315 | | |
| Employed | 1.00 | |
| Home workers* | 1.19 | 0.532 – 2.647 |
| Retired* | 1.66 | 0.648 – 4.256 |
| Others* | 1.04 | 0.477 – 2.260 |
| | | |
| <i>Living conditions</i> , H-L test p=0.439 | | |
| Dissatisfaction with living environment (5-point scale)* | 1.92 | 1.377 – 2.675 |
| | | |
| <i>Positive changes in the living environment</i> , H-L test p=0.607 | | |
| Changes for the better (no/yes)* | 0.59 | 0.288 – 1.190 |
| | | |
| <i>Negative changes in the living environment</i> , H-L test p=0.835 | | |
| Changes for the worse (no/yes)* | 6.35 | 3.448 – 11.681 |
| | | |
| <i>General attitude</i> , H-L test p = 0.915 | | |
| Attitude to wind turbines in general (5-point scale)* | 3.18 | 2.371 – 4.261 |
| | | |
| <i>Impact on landscape</i> , H-L test p = 0.491 | | |
| Attitude to wind turbines' impact on the landscape (5-point scale)* | 4.10 | 2.841 – 5.908 |
| | | |
| <i>Noise sensitivity</i> , H-L test p = 0.181 | | |
| Noise sensitivity (4-point scale)* | 1.94 | 1.513 – 2.489 |
| | | |
| <i>Visual judgment</i> , H-L test p = 0.592 | | |
| Visual judgment (scale)* | 2.55 | 1.736 – 3.730 |
| | | |
| <i>Utility judgment</i> , H-L test p = 0.320 | | |
| Utility judgment (scale) | 1.88 | 1.434 – 2.467 |

*Adjusted for sound levels, age, gender and economical benefits.

The degree of education was no longer statistically significant when the variables were tested simultaneously (table 7.35). Changes for the worse, attitude to wind turbines in general and attitude to wind turbines' impact on the landscape were still related to annoyance with wind turbine sound. Visual judgment and utility judgment were not tested as they were strongly correlated with the two other variables of attitude.

Table 7.35: relationship between individual factors and being annoyed by sound from wind turbines, adjusted for sound levels, age, gender and economical benefits; variables were tested simultaneously

| Not annoyed vs. annoyed, H-L test p = 0.663 | OR | 95% CI |
|---|-------------|----------------------|
| Education | | |
| Primary* | 1.0 | |
| Secondary* | 0.87 | 0.330 – 2.317 |
| Higher* | 1.30 | 0.484 – 3.512 |
| Satisfaction with living environment (5-point scale)* | 1.20 | 0.782 – 1.845 |
| Changes for the worse (no/yes)* | 2.82 | 1.340 – 5.927 |
| Attitude to wind turbines in general (5-point scale)* | 1.79 | 1.217 – 2.623 |
| Attitude to wind turbines' impact on the landscape (5-point scale)* | 2.11 | 1.291 – 3.451 |
| Noise sensitivity (4-point scale)* | 1.30 | 0.956 – 1.777 |

*Adjusted for sound levels, age, gender and economical benefits.

7.8 Effects

EFFECTS
Health
Psychological distress
Stress
Sleep quality

One of the objectives of the study was to explore the impact of wind turbines on health and well-being among people living in the vicinity of wind farms. Health and well-being among the respondents were measured by several questions in the questionnaire: respondents were asked if they had any chronic disease (no/yes) and if so, if they suffered from diabetes, high blood pressure, tinnitus, hearing impairment, cardiovascular disease, migraine or other diseases. Of the respondents, 25% reported to have a chronic disease (table 7.36). Most common among chronic diseases or health symptoms was high blood pressure. The proportion of respondents who suffered from chronic diseases or health symptoms increased statistically significant with increasing age, except for tinnitus and migraine (t-tests, $p < 0.001$). No statistically significant differences between men and women were found, except for migraine, which was more common among female respondents.

Psychological distress was measured with the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ), ranging from 0 to 12, with a higher value corresponding to a higher degree of psychological distress. The GHQ-score was negatively correlated with age ($r = -0.108$, $n = 703$, $p < 0.01$), which means that younger respondents were more psychological distressed. No statistically significant difference in GHQ-score was found between male and female respondents.

A stress score was constructed from 13 items measuring stress in the questionnaire with a 4-point scale rated from "(almost) never" to "(almost) daily" with factor analysis so that the mean value was 0 and the standard deviation 1. The factor analysis showed that 6 of the items could form a factor that described symptoms of stress (alpha: 0.840; minimum: -2.2; maximum: 4.4). The items were: feeling tense or stressed, feeling irritable, having mood changes, being depressed, suffering from undue tiredness and having concentration problems. The stress score was negatively correlated with age ($r = -0.09$, $n = 639$, $p < 0.05$), i.e. younger respondents had on average higher stress scores. No difference was found between male and female respondents

Sleep was measured with several variables. The question "How often have you had difficulties falling asleep in your home?" was answered on a 5-point scale from "(almost) never" to "(almost) daily". The question "How often is your sleep interrupted by sound?" was answered on the same 5-point scale. Of the respondents, 30% reported difficulties to fall asleep at least once a month and 25% reported interrupted sleep at least once a month (table 7.36). Difficulty with falling asleep was positively correlated with age ($r_s = 0.08$, $n = 691$, $p < 0.05$). Older respondents more commonly had difficulties falling asleep. Interrupted sleep was negatively correlated with age ($r_s = -0.08$, $n = 699$, $p < 0.05$); younger respondents were more often interrupted in their sleep. Differences between men and women were found for falling asleep. Women had more difficulties falling asleep than men ($Z_{MWU} = -3.18$, $p < 0.01$). No differences between men and women were found for sleep interruption.

Table 7.36: health and sleep in relation to levels of wind turbine sound

| | Sound pressure levels, dBA | | | | | Total |
|---|----------------------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| | <30 | 30-35 | 35-40 | 40-45 | >45 | |
| Chronic disease (n=717), % | 32 | 25 | 25 | 18 | 15 | 25 |
| Diabetes (n=725), % | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| High blood pressure (n=725), % | 9 | 13 | 9 | 6 | 2 | 9 |
| Tinnitus (n=725), % | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Hearing impairment (n=725), % | 4 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| Cardiovascular disease (n=725), % | 6 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 6 |
| Migraine (n=725), % | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| | | | | | | |
| <i>Psychological distress</i> | | | | | | |
| GHQ12-score (n=656), mean (SD) | 3.2 (2.78) | 3.1 (2.66) | 3.8 (2.91) | 3.8 (2.81) | 3.6 (2.76) | 3.4 (2.79) |
| | | | | | | |
| <i>Stress</i> | | | | | | |
| Stress score (n=656), mean (SD) | 0.1 (1.04) | -0.1 (0.93) | 0.1 (1.09) | 0.0 (0.91) | -0.1 (1.02) | 0.0 (1.00) |
| | | | | | | |
| <i>Sleep quality</i> | | | | | | |
| Difficulties falling asleep* (n=710), % | 36 | 31 | 28 | 32 | 16 | 30 |
| Interrupted in the sleep* (n=718), % | 21 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 28 | 25 |

*At least once a month

Respondents who did not benefit economically from wind turbines reported more chronic diseases and health symptoms than those who benefited. They more often suffered from chronic disease in general, as well as from diabetes, high blood pressure and cardiovascular disease, and also more often had difficulties to fall asleep. The observed difference between the sub-samples regarding chronic diseases and health symptoms could be due to age effects; respondents who did not benefit economically were older than those who benefited, as shown above. Regarding variables measuring psychological distress and stress, respondents who did not benefit economically from wind turbines did not differ to any extent from those who did benefit economically.

Several of the variables measuring health and well-being were associated with each other. All variables measured on a continuous or ordinal scale were correlated (table 7.37). A respondent with a high GHQ-score more likely also had a high stress score.

**Table 7.37. Relationship between measurements of health and well-being
(Spearman's rank-order correlation; all p-values <0.001)**

| | GHQ-score | Stress score | Difficulties falling asleep | Interrupted in the sleep |
|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| GHQ-score | 1 | | | |
| Stress score | 0.565 (n=652) | 1 | | |
| Difficulties falling asleep | 0.299 (n=707) | 0.315 (n=651) | 1 | |
| Interrupted in the sleep | 0.229 (n=715) | 0.211 (n=211) | 0.264 (n=710) | 1 |

Respondents who reported that they had a chronic disease (n = 179) on average scored higher on the GHQ-score and the stress score than others (table 7.38). They also had more difficulties falling asleep.


**Table 7.38: relationships between chronic disease and other
measurements of health, well-being and sleep**

| | Chronic disease | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---------|
| GHQ-score | t = -2.02* | p<0.05 |
| Stress score | t = -4.19* | p<0.001 |
| Difficulties falling asleep | Z _{MWU} = -3.23** | p<0.01 |
| Interrupted in the sleep | Z _{MWU} = -0.16** | p=0.873 |

*t-test **Mann-Whitney U-test

When the suggested diseases were analyzed separately, no associations between diabetes, high blood pressure, tinnitus, hearing impairment or cardiovascular disease on the one hand and the GHQ-score or the stress score on the other hand were found. Diabetes, tinnitus and hearing impairment were associated with difficulties to fall asleep. Migraine was related to the GHQ-score, the stress score, and both of the sleep variables; respondents suffering from migraine (n = 15) scored higher on all these measurements than respondents who did not suffer from migraine.

7.9 Relationships between exposure to wind turbine sound and effects



Possible adverse effects on health and well-being due to wind turbines have in previous studies been associated with noise annoyance, but not directly with the exposure. It could however not be excluded that there is a direct pathway between exposure and effects. It was in this study therefore of interest to explore relations between levels of wind turbine sound on the one hand and possible adverse effects on health and well-being on the other. This was done with binary logistic regression, with the variables measuring health or well-being as dependent variable.

The relationships between exposure and chronic diseases were analyzed together with age, gender and economical benefits in accordance with the findings reviewed above. Diseases and symptoms were chosen as dependent variables (reported disease/not reported disease). The independent variables sound levels (continuous scale), economical benefits (no/yes), age (continuous scale) and gender (male/female) were entered simultaneously into the regression. The results are shown in table 7.39. Values for adjusting variables are also shown. Sound levels were not related to any of the diseases or symptoms. Economical benefits were not associated with impaired health when adjusted for age and gender. Age was associated with chronic disease in general, diabetes, high blood pressure, hearing impairment and cardiovascular disease. Gender was associated with migraine.

Table 7.39: relationship between exposure of wind turbine sound and chronic diseases and health symptoms

| | OR | 95% CI |
|--|-------------|----------------------|
| <i>Chronic disease, (H-L test: $p=0.850$)</i> | | |
| Sound levels | 0.98 | 0.947 – 1.014 |
| Economical benefits (no/yes) | 0.70 | 0.348 – 1.425 |
| Age (years) | 1.03 | 1.017 – 1.044 |
| Gender (male/female) | 1.18 | 0.821 – 1.704 |
| <i>Diabetes, (H-L test: $p=0.844$)</i> | | |
| Sound levels | 1.00 | 0.917 – 1.093 |
| Economical benefits* (no/yes) | - | - |
| Age (years) | 1.07 | 1.030 – 1.106 |
| Gender (male/female) | 0.69 | 0.282 – 1.703 |
| <i>High blood pressure, (H-L test: $p=0.226$)</i> | | |
| Sound levels | 1.01 | 0.955 – 1.062 |
| Economical benefits (no/yes) | 0.15 | 0.019 – 1.195 |
| Age (years) | 1.06 | 1.033 – 1.078 |
| Gender (male/female) | 1.27 | 0.955 – 1.062 |

| (Table 7.39 continued) | OR | 95% CI |
|---|-------------|------------------------|
| <i>Tinnitus, (H-L test: p= 0.437)</i> | | |
| Sound levels | 0.94 | 0.848 – 1.038 |
| Economical benefits (no/yes) | 0.90 | 0.095 – 8.418 |
| Age (years) | 1.03 | 0.993 – 1.063 |
| Gender (male/female) | 1.26 | 0.474 – 3.359 |
| | | |
| <i>Hearing impairment, (H-L test: p= 0.499)</i> | | |
| Sound levels | 1.01 | 0.939 – 1.095 |
| Economical benefits (no/yes) | 0.38 | 0.043 – 3.306 |
| Age (years) | 1.06 | 1.027 – 1.095 |
| Gender (male/female) | 0.60 | 0.261 – 1.371 |
| | | |
| <i>Cardiovascular disease, (H-L test: p= 0.023)</i> | | |
| Sound levels | 0.98 | 0.914 – 1.054 |
| Economical benefits (no/yes) | 0.39 | 0.045 – 3.262 |
| Age (years) | 1.06 | 1.030 – 1.090 |
| Gender (male/female) | 0.61 | 0.293 – 1.268 |
| | | |
| <i>Migraine, (H-L test: p= 0.016)</i> | | |
| Sound levels | 0.93 | 0.830 – 1.037 |
| Economical benefits* (no/yes) | - | - |
| Age (years) | 0.98 | 0.942 – 1.010 |
| Gender (male/female) | 13.2 | 1.704 – 101.857 |

*no variation, i.e. none of the respondents who benefited economically had reported this chronic disease or symptom

Psychological distress was, as described above, measured with the GHQ-score, which was a continuous scale and therefore not suitable for binary logistic regression. The GHQ-score was re-calculated according to Goldberg to make it possible to explore the relationship between sound levels and psychological distress [Goldberg]. The variable was dichotomized into "not psychologically distressed" and "psychologically distressed", using the cut-off point 2 or above for the latter. The dichotomized variable was used as the dependent variable in a binary logistic regression. Also the stress score and the variables measuring sleep quality were dichotomized for the same purpose. An overview is shown in table 7.40.

Table 7.40: dependent variables in binary logistic regressions

| | Definition of yes | n | |
|--------------------|--|-----|-----|
| | | No | Yes |
| GHQ | 2 or above on the GHQTOT_G | 532 | 185 |
| Stress-score | 0.01 or higher on the stress-score | 429 | 227 |
| Falling asleep | Difficulties to fall asleep once a month or more often | 495 | 230 |
| Sleep interruption | Interrupted in the sleep once a month or more often | 539 | 186 |

Sound levels (continuous scale), economical benefits (no/yes), age (continuous scale) and gender (male/female) were entered simultaneously as independent variables into a binary logistic regression (table 7.41). Levels of sound from wind turbines did not influence psychological distress, stress or difficulties to fall asleep. Respondents that did not benefit economically, were older and were females more often had trouble to fall asleep than others. However, interruption in the sleep was associated with sound levels. An increase in sound levels correlated with an increased risk for being interrupted in the sleep. Respondents who benefited economically from wind turbines were less likely to be interrupted in the sleep than respondents who did not benefit economically.

Table 7.41: relationship between sound levels from wind turbines and psychological distress/sleep quality (binary logistic regression)

| | OR | 95% CI |
|--|-------------|----------------------|
| <i>GHQ (<2/>2), (H-L test: $p=0.965$)</i> | | |
| Sound levels | 1.02 | 0.992 – 1.057 |
| Economical benefits (no/yes) | 0.74 | 0.413 – 1.335 |
| Age (years) | 0.99 | 0.992 – 1.001 |
| Gender (male/female) | 1.12 | 0.784 – 1.584 |
| <i>Stress score($\leq 0/\geq 0.01$), (H-L test: $p=0.032$)</i> | | |
| Sound levels | 1.01 | 0.979 – 1.041 |
| Economical benefits (no/yes) | 0.61 | 0.345 – 1.068 |
| Age (years) | 0.98 | 0.969 – 0.992 |
| Gender (male/female) | 1.32 | 0.828 – 1.635 |
| <i>Falling asleep (<once a month/\geqonce a month), (H-L test: $p=0.366$)</i> | | |
| Sound levels | 0.99 | 0.965 – 1.026 |
| Economical benefits (no/yes) | 0.52 | 0.274 – 0.970 |
| Age (years) | 1.02 | 1.005 – 1.028 |
| Gender (male/female) | 1.47 | 1.053 – 1.059 |
| <i>Interrupted in the sleep (<once a month/\geqonce a month), (H-L test: $p=0.025$)</i> | | |
| Sound levels | 1.03 | 1.000 – 1.066 |
| Economical benefits (no/yes) | 0.45 | 0.236 – 0.839 |
| Age (years) | 1.00 | 0.985 – 1.008 |
| Gender (male/female) | 1.07 | 0.750 – 1.513 |


The only measurement of impaired health that was found to increase statistically significant with increasing levels of exposure was interruption in the sleep. It was however not clear which sound source caused interruption in the sleep; it could as well be road traffic sound as sound from wind turbines. It was also of interest to find out at what sound levels the respondents reported interruption in the sleep. A new logistic regression was therefore carried out, now

including background sound levels (Lden). Respondents with sound levels from wind turbines below 30 dBA outside their dwelling were chosen as controls. The result show that the odds for being interrupted in the sleep was statistically significantly higher among respondents exposed to levels above 45 dBA than for the control group when adjusted for age, gender and economical benefits from wind turbines (table 7.42). There was a relationship between sleep interruption and levels of background sound: an increase in background sound levels predicted an increase in proportion of respondents reporting having been interrupted in their sleep once a month or more frequently.

Table 7.42: relationship between sound levels from wind turbines and interruption in the sleep (binary logistic regression)


| | OR | 95% CI |
|---|-------------|----------------------|
| <i>Interrupted in the sleep (<once a month/≥once a month, (H-L test: p= 0.819)</i> | | |
| Sound levels | | |
| <30 | 1.00 | |
| 30 – 35 | 1.36 | 0.836 – 2.210 |
| 35 – 40 | 1.54 | 0.915 – 2.590 |
| 40 – 45 | 1.83 | 0.976 – 3.438 |
| >45 | 2.98 | 1.347 – 6.597 |
| Background sound (Lden) | 1.04 | 1.018 – 1.059 |
| Economical benefits (no/yes) | 0.47 | 0.238 – 0.928 |
| Age (years) | 1.00 | 0.983 – 1.007 |
| Gender (male/female) | 1.05 | 0.739 – 1.503 |

The same finding is illustrated in figure 7.3; only respondents that did not benefit economically from the wind turbines were included (no adjustments for background sound levels). Less than 30% of the respondents reported that they were interrupted in their sleep by sound once a month or more often. However, among respondents in the group of more than 45 dBA, 48% reported sleep interruption. It has to be noted that the confidence interval is large due to a small number of respondents in that group (n = 21). The findings should therefore be treated with caution.



The respondents had an opportunity to report the noise source that interrupted their sleep; 244 respondents mentioned one or more sources. Road traffic was mentioned 93 times and wind turbines 36 times. Respondents that had specified wind turbines as a noise source for sleep interruption were found in all of the five exposure groups.

7.10 Relationships between response to wind turbine sound and effects



Relationships between diseases/health symptoms and annoyance with wind turbine noise were also tested with binary logistic regression. The same procedure as described above for exploring relations between sound levels and health effects were used.

No association between annoyance due to wind turbine noise (5-point scale from "Do not notice" to "Very annoyed") outdoors and chronic disease in general was found (table 7.43). However, diabetes was statistically significant related to noise annoyance, also when adjusted for age, gender, economical benefits from wind turbines and sound levels.

Table 7.43: relationship between annoyance due to wind turbine sound and chronic diseases

| | OR | 95% CI |
|---|-------------|----------------------|
| <i>Chronic disease</i> (H-L test: $p=0.951$) | | |
| Annoyance (5-point scale)* | 1.00 | 0.826 – 1.208 |
| | | |
| <i>Diabetes</i> (H-L test: $p=0.672$) | | |
| Annoyance (5-point scale)* | 1.58 | 1.063 – 2.350 |
| | | |
| <i>High blood pressure</i> (H-L test: $p=0.194$) | | |
| Annoyance (5-point scale)* | 0.88 | 0.653 – 1.186 |
| | | |
| <i>Tinnitus</i> (H-L test: $p=0.667$) | | |
| Annoyance (5-point scale)* | 0.84 | 0.465 – 1.505 |
| | | |
| <i>Hearing impairment</i> (H-L test: $p=0.956$) | | |
| Annoyance (5-point scale)* | 1.14 | 0.772 – 1.680 |
| | | |
| <i>Cardiovascular disease</i> (H-L test: $p<0.05$) | | |
| Annoyance (5-point scale)* | 0.97 | 0.668 – 1.408 |
| | | |
| <i>Migraine</i> (H-L test: $p=0.549$) | | |
| Annoyance (5-point scale)* | 1.22 | 0.714 – 2.068 |

*Adjusted for age, gender, economical benefits from wind turbines and sound levels.

The stress score, difficulties to fall asleep and sleep interruption were associated with noise annoyance due to wind turbines (table 7.44). Respondents that were annoyed by wind turbine sound also had higher stress scores, more often difficulties to fall asleep and were more often interrupted in their sleep by sound.

Table 7.44: associations between annoyance due to wind turbine sound, and psychological distress (GHQ), stress-score, difficulties falling asleep and sleep interruption

| | OR | 95% CI |
|--|-------------|----------------------|
| <i>GHQ (<2/>2), (H-L test: p= 0.133)</i> | | |
| Annoyance (5-point scale)* | 1.07 | 0.890 – 1.281 |
| | | |
| <i>Stress score(≤0/≥0.01), (H-L test: p= 0.776)</i> | | |
| Annoyance (5-point scale)* | 1.27 | 1.065 – 1.509 |
| | | |
| <i>Difficulties falling asleep (<once a month/≥once a month), (H-L test: p=0.905)</i> | | |
| Annoyance (5-point scale)* | 1.41 | 1.184 – 1.674 |
| | | |
| <i>Sleep interruption (<once a month/≥once a month), (H-L test: p=0.613)</i> | | |
| Annoyance (5-point scale)* | 1.78 | 1.486 – 2.142 |

*Adjusted for age, gender, sound pressure levels and economical benefits.

The observed association between GHQ-score and stress score described above called for further exploration of the relationship between noise annoyance and psychological distress. The relationship was therefore modeled in a multiple linear regression, with the objective to use GHQ-score as a continuous variable and hence take advantage of the whole variation. GHQ-score was assigned to be the dependent variable. A statistically significant relationship between annoyance due to wind turbine sound and GHQ-score was found (table 7.45). The variance of GHQ-score that was explained by the model was however low: only 2% (adj R-square 0.02).

Table 7.45: association between GHQ-score and annoyance

| | B | SE | Beta | p-value |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------|
| <i>GHQ-score, adj R-square 0.02</i> | | | | |
| Annoyance (5-point scale) | 0.29 | 0.113 | 0.11 | <0.05 |

*Adjusted for age, sex, economical benefits from wind turbines and sound levels.

8. Conclusions

8.1 Discussion of results

Several possible exposures from wind turbines were studied: aural as well as visual. Sound was found to be the most annoying of the exposures. The proportion of respondents that could hear wind turbine sound from their dwelling increased logically with increasing sound levels so that more than 80% heard the sound at levels of 35 – 40 dBA and above. The proportion of respondents that reported that they were annoyed by the sound also increased with increasing sound levels. There was no difference in the ability to hear the sound between respondents that benefited economically from wind turbines and those who did not, but there was a clear difference in annoyance between the two groups. Very few people among those who benefited economically reported annoyance with sound from wind turbines. Among those who did not benefit economically, 2% reported that they were rather or very annoyed at sound levels below 30 dBA, 9% at 30 – 35 dBA, 20% at 35 – 40 dBA, 25% at 40 – 45 dBA and 28% at levels above 45 dBA.

The sound levels that were calculated occur when a wind turbine operates at high, though not maximum power (8m/s wind speed at 10 m height in a neutral atmosphere).

It appears that people living close to wind farms in the Netherlands are not quite the same people as the larger group living further away. Respondents living close to wind farms and exposed to higher sound levels more usually have a farm or detached house in a rural and relatively quiet (lower levels of road traffic sound) area, are more often male and have a less negative view on the visual impact of wind turbines. They are relatively young, well educated, work at home and/or are self-employed and have economical benefits from wind turbines. Also, they are healthier (less often high blood pressure, cardiovascular disease and migraine), and they have less difficulty in falling asleep. In short, they may be typified as ‘healthy farmers’ and/or entrepreneurs who have to earn their living by making use of the land. This may help to explain the different opinions on wind farms, arising from different views on landscape utility and use.

Another reason for the low prevalence of annoyance amongst respondents with an economical benefit may be that they have more control over the wind turbines. A healthy environment “provides safety, opportunities for social integration, and the ability to predict and/or control aspects of that environment” [Taylor]. Respondents that benefit will more usually have control: most or all of them have taken part in the decision to put up the turbines and they can stop them if they want. One respondent remarked that if a turbine close by caused too much noise for him or his neighbour, he stopped the turbine.

Respondents that could see at least one wind turbine from their dwelling were more likely to be annoyed by the sound than those who did not see any wind turbines. When respondents did not see wind turbines, the turbines were either relatively small, *i.e.* distant, or respondents lived in built-up areas. A free sight from the dwelling to one or more of the wind turbines also gives free way for the sound. In these cases the immission levels at the dwelling of the respondent were in accordance with the calculated levels, and not less due to hindrance of the sound

propagation. When the sight of the wind farm is blocked, then the sound may be (partly) blocked too, leading to lower sound levels. This may explain the lower levels of annoyance. However, the enhanced probability for annoyance if the wind turbines were visible could also be due to a multimodal effect; the rotating blades of a wind turbine attracting the sight could increase the awareness of the sound and hence also the possibility of noise annoyance.

Respondents in built-up areas were more likely to be annoyed by wind turbine sound than respondents living in rural areas with road traffic, with approximately the same levels of background sound, despite the lower visibility of wind turbines in the built-up areas. This unexpected finding is not easily understood, but could indicate a saturation of audible and visual stimuli that leads to a negative appraisal of exposures from an additional source. It may also be related to an urban feeling that wind turbines disrupt the perceived naturalness and tranquility of the surrounding countryside.

Background sound levels, mostly from road traffic, influenced the possibility to notice sound from wind turbines; the likeliness to hear wind turbine sound decreased if the levels of background sound increased. However, the likeliness of being annoyed by wind turbine sound was not influenced by the levels of background sound. The main source of background sound was road traffic which is different in character from wind turbine sound. The "swishing" character of wind turbine sound was in the study found to be the most annoying of the suggested sound properties. "Swishing" is a description of amplitude modulated sound that is pulsating with the pace of the rotation of the blades. It will supposedly be perceived as separated from the road traffic sound and therefore be valued independently. This separation may also be due to differences in frequency content. The dominant sound (trailing edge noise) from more or less distant wind turbines is in the range of 400 to 1000 Hz, whereas the dominant sound of more or less distant road traffic is the low pitched engine noise at 60 to 80 Hz and the high pitched tyre noise that dominates frequencies above 1000 Hz. Finally, road traffic is quieter at night than in daytime, whereas wind turbines are at night equally noisy or noisier than in daytime. The findings suggest that a noisy environment could make wind turbine sound less easily audible, but once the levels of wind turbine sound can be heard above the road traffic, which is more probable at night, the likeliness for annoyance would be the same as in environments with little road traffic.

The probability of being disturbed in the sleep by sound increased with increasing levels of wind turbine sound and of background sound. The odds for being disturbed in the sleep by sound at least once a month were significantly higher at levels of wind turbine sound above 45 dBA than in the control group (<30 dBA). Other measurements of effects on health and well-being that were included in the study were not associated with sound levels as such, but with annoyance with the sound. Respondents who reported that they were annoyed by wind turbine sound were more likely to also be psychologically distressed, reporting symptoms of stress and having difficulties to fall asleep. It appears that these symptoms occur when people are annoyed, but it does not matter at what sound level this annoyance occurs. The study design does not allow conclusions on what is the cause and what is the effect. A plausible explanation of the observed association is that wind turbine sound leads to annoyance for some people; annoyance that in turn possibly hinders psycho-physiological restoration and increases the level of stress. However, it can not be excluded that some people that are under stress or strain

for other reasons than wind turbine sound more easily react negatively when exposed to the sound and hence become annoyed. Further studies will be needed to distinguish between the two directions of cause and effect. Also the relationship between diabetes and annoyance should be further investigated.

Annoyance with wind turbine sound was associated with a negative attitude towards the wind turbines, especially with regard to the impact on the landscape scenery. Also when the turbines were judged by opposite pairs of descriptors, the descriptors connected to the visual aspect, for example "ugly" and "natural", formed a clear group with a high correlation between the different visual descriptors. The judgments of the living environment were also more negative among respondents that were annoyed by the sound than among others.

8.2 Comparison with annoyance from other noise sources

Miedema *et al* have analyzed noise annoyance from transportation noise sources [Miedema]. For air, road and rail traffic it was shown that the dose-response relations, between noise level (L_{den}) and percentage highly annoyed respondents (%HA), can be written as second power polynomials,¹ assuming zero severe annoyance at sound levels below 42 dBA. These relations can be compared with the percentages highly (or very) annoyed by wind turbine sound in this study, either for all respondents or respondents that did not benefit economically (see tables F1 and F2 in Appendix F).²

For this comparison, the sound power level used to calculate the immission level due to wind turbines (at 8 m/s 10-m wind speed in a neutral atmosphere) must be transformed to a sound power level characteristic for L_{den} . With an expected accuracy of 2 dB or better this transformation is $L_{W,den} - L_{W,8m/s} = 4.7$ dB ([Van den Berg 2008], see section 4.3.2).


Results from this study have been plotted in Figure 8.1 together with the curves from Miedema *et al*. The bars at the percentages measured in this study denote the interval wherein the true percentage is expected to lie with a 95% certainty. The decrease in annoyance at high levels of wind turbine sound is in part due to a higher percentage of respondents that benefit from the turbines. This decrease also occurs for respondents without benefits, but the percentage at the highest value of L_{den} is determined by only 3 respondents and is thus not a statistically reliable number as demonstrated by the wide confidence interval.

¹ For air, road and rail traffic it was shown that the dose-response relations, between noise level (L_{den}) and percentage highly annoyed respondents (%HA), can be written as:

- $\%HA = -0.02 \cdot (L_{den} - 42) + 0.0561 \cdot (L_{den} - 42)^2$ for aircraft noise;
- $\%HA = 0.24 \cdot (L_{den} - 42) + 0.0277 \cdot (L_{den} - 42)^2$ for road traffic noise;
- $\%HA = 0.28 \cdot (L_{den} - 42) + 0.0085 \cdot (L_{den} - 42)^2$ for rail traffic noise.

² The percentages in Appendix F are standardized according to the procedure described by Miedema and therefore differ from the percentages given in chapter 7 (tables 7.25 and 7.26).

From figure 8.1 it appears that wind turbine sound is relatively annoying: at every sound level respondents were more annoyed from modern wind turbines than people generally are from transportation noise sources. The results from this study thus confirm the conclusion from a previous Swedish study [Pedersen *et al* 2004] that wind turbine sound is more annoying than road traffic sound.



For road traffic noise also the results of this study can be compared to the standardized percentage of highly annoyed. As is shown in Appendix H the standardized percentages for road traffic noise lie within the 95% confidence intervals of the percentages in this study. Thus, as far as noise annoyance is concerned the respondents in this study do not differ significantly from the standard population.

8.3 Main conclusions

The analysis results are summarized below.

With respect to hearing wind turbines:

- The probability to hear wind turbines increased with increasing levels of wind turbine sound, irrespective of the appreciation of the sound by respondents.
- Not having wind turbines visible from the dwelling and high levels of background (road traffic) sound decreased the probability of hearing wind turbine sound, though the influence of background sound is small.
- Wind turbines were perceived as louder when the wind was blowing from the wind turbine towards the dwelling, and less loud vice versa.
- Wind turbines were perceived as louder when the wind was strong and less loud with a weak or no wind. However, more respondents thought it was louder than less loud at night, even though at night wind speeds are on average lower.

With respect to annoyance from wind turbine sound

- Of the exposures from wind turbines, noise was the most annoying.
- The probability of being annoyed by wind turbine sound increased with increasing levels of wind turbine sound.
- The most common description of the wind turbine sound was swishing/lashing; a description that was associated with noise annoyance: annoyance is more probable for respondents that gave this description than for those who did not.
- Benefiting economically from wind turbines, not having wind turbines visible from the dwelling and living in a rural area with a main road (in comparison with a built-up area) decreased the probability of being annoyed by wind turbine sound.
- Although the presence of background sound from road traffic made wind turbine sound less noticeable, higher levels of background sound did not reduce the probability of being annoyed.
- Annoyance with wind turbine noise was associated with a negative attitude towards wind turbines in general and the impact of wind turbines on the landscape.

With respect to other health effects associated with wind turbines:

- The risk for sleep interruption by noise was higher at levels of wind turbine sound above 45 dBA than at levels below 30 dBA.
- Annoyance with wind turbine noise was associated with psychological distress, stress, difficulties to fall asleep and sleep interruption.

8.4 Recommendations

Several conclusions suggest that practical measures may either increase or decrease the negative impact of wind farms.

Perhaps the main finding is that wind turbine sound is relatively annoying, more so than equally loud sound from aircraft or road traffic. A swishing character is perceived by most respondents, indicating that this is an important characteristic of wind turbine sound. Sound should therefore receive more attention in the planning of wind farms, and (more) sound mitigation measures must be considered.

At the same time it can be concluded that people that benefit from wind turbines are much less or not at all annoyed. This is true even though they notice the sound equally well as all other respondents do and both groups use the same characteristics to describe it. However, the groups differ in personal characteristics: those benefiting are more usually 'healthy farmers', have a more positive view on the visual impact of wind turbines and are relatively young and well educated. Respondents that benefit from the wind turbines are less annoyed in spite of living in a rural area and closer to wind farms -and thus experiencing higher wind turbine sound levels. Several factors may explain this relative absence of annoyance: the more positive opinion on wind farms -arising from different views on landscape utility and use, the actual financial benefit, and the sense of control making it possible to reduce temporarily the impact if wanted. This may lead to possibilities to mitigate annoyance: residents may be given a sense of control and some benefits, and could perhaps learn to share other views on (some) landscapes.

It is difficult to separate the visual from the acoustic impact, because they are so closely related: when turbines are closer and bigger they are usually better audible. However, when wind turbines are less visible they are less easily noticed by their sound and cause less annoyance. Perhaps the same is true when there is less visual contrast between wind turbines and their environment. Some respondents have remarked in the questionnaires that wind turbines make the landscape more dynamical, or they serve as handy indicators of wind direction and speed. This perceived 'appropriateness' with respect to the environment may thus help to cause less impact.

When there is more background sound from road traffic, wind turbine sound is –as one would expect- less easily noticeable. However, the results show that road traffic noise does not seem to reduce the annoyance due to a wind farm. This may be due to the different characteristics of both sounds: road traffic is usually less loud in night time, whereas wind turbines are not. Also, the swishing character and pitch of wind turbine sound may make the sound discernible even in moderate to high levels of road traffic noise. As it has been proposed several times to construct wind farms in the Netherlands close to motorways because the motorway noise would 'mask' the wind turbine noise, such a masking capability is an important issue. In this study no empirical evidence has been found for this point of view. This needs further investigation.

9. Acknowledgements

This study was financed by the European Union as a Science and Society Special Support Action (contract no. 044628) in the sixth Framework Program. We thank the European Union for acknowledging the importance of determining the impact of sustainable energy generation on residents by providing the funds for this project.

We acknowledge Wind Service Holland who provided the lists with location and type of all wind turbines in the Netherlands.

Four (former) students from the Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences of the University of Groningen have cooperated in this project. Eildert Slim collected the information on sound production of wind turbines. Lianne Schuiling designed and wrote the text for the website for this project. Rowan Rossing, just finishing his study, designed a software application that enabled the calculation of visual and aural exposure for the study group from all Dutch wind turbines. Jan Oudelaar already had finished his study and was appointed as our GIS expert who did all the selection on turbines and addresses.

10. References

- Altman: "Statistics with confidence", D.G. Altman, D. Machin, T.N. Bryant, M.J. Gardner, 2nd ed. London: BMJ Books (2005)
- Bullmore: "Wind Farms Noise Predictions and the Risks of Conservatism", A. Bullmore, J. Adcock, M. Jiggins and M. Cand, Second International Meeting on Wind Turbine Noise, Lyon, 2007
- ETSU-W13: "A critical appraisal of wind farm noise propagation", ETSU report W/13/00385/REP, Department of Trade and Industry, UK, 2000
- Goldberg: "The detection of psychiatric illness by questionnaire", D.P. Goldberg, Oxford University Press, London, 1972
- Hayes Mckenzie: "The measurement of low frequency noise at three UK wind farms", Hayes Mckenzie Partnership Ltd, report to the Department of Trade and Industry, 2006
- HMRI: "Handleiding Meten en Rekenen Industrielawaai"("Manual to measure and calculate industrial noise"), Department of Housing, Planning and Environment, 1999
- ISO: "Attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors. Part 2: General method of calculation", International Standard Organization, 1996
- Landscape Guidelines: Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Assessment, SPON Press, London and New York, 1995
- Miedema: "Annoyance from Transportation Noise: Relationships with Exposure Metrics DNL and DENL and Their Confidence Intervals", H.M.E. Miedema and C. G.M. Oudshoorn, Environmental Health Perspectives, Vol. 109, No. 4, pp. 409-416, 2001
- NZS: New Zealand Standard NZS 6808:1998 "Acoustics – The assessment and measurement of sound from wind turbines", 1998
- Pedersen 2005: "Perception and annoyance due to wind turbine noise—a dose–response relationship", E. Pedersen and K. Persson Waye, J. Acoust. Soc. Am., Vol. 116, No. 6, pp. 3460-3470, 2004
- Pedersen 2007: "Wind turbine noise, annoyance and self-reported health and wellbeing in different living environments", E. Pedersen and K. Persson Waye, Occ. Env. Med., Vol. 64, pp. 480-486, 2007
- Sondergaard: "Low frequency Noise from Large Wind Turbines", B. Sondergaard, Second International Meeting on Wind Turbine Noise, Lyon, 2007
- Taylor: "Health psychology: What is an unhealthy environment and how does it get under the skin?", S. E. Taylor and R. L. Repetti, Annual Review of Psychology, Vol. 48, pp. 411-447, 1997
- Van den Berg 2004: "Effects of the wind profile at night on wind turbine sound", Van den Berg G.P., Journal of Sound and Vibration 277 (4-5), pp. 955-970, 2004
- Van den Berg 2005: "The beat is getting stronger: the effect of atmospheric stability on low frequency modulated sound of wind turbines", Van den Berg G.P., Journal of Low Frequency Noise, Vibration And Active Control 24 (1), pp. 1-24, 2005

Appendices

Appendix A: Questionnaire text

STUDY OF THE PERCEPTION OF THE LIVING ENVIRONMENT

1. On what date do you fill in this questionnaire? (Fill in date: - .. - ..)
2. How many people are there in the household (including yourself)? (Above 18 years:; under 18 years:)
3. How many years have you lived at this address? (..... years)
4. In what type of residence do you live? (*more than one answer possible*) (farm, detached dwelling, owned apartment, rented apartment, summerhouse → 6))
5. Where did you live before you moved to this address? (always lived here, in the countryside, in a small town, in a city)
6. How satisfied are you with your living environment? (very satisfied, satisfied, not so satisfied, not satisfied, not at all satisfied)
7. Have there been any changes *for the better* in your living environment during the last years? (no → 8, yes). *If yes, which positive changes have occurred?*
8. Have there been any changes *for the worse* in your living environment during the last years? (no → 9, yes). *If yes, which negative changes have occurred?*
9. To what extent do you *agree* or *disagree* with the statements below about your dwelling and your living environment? (do not agree at all, do not agree, neither agree or disagree, agree, totally agree)
 - I spend a lot of time at home if possible.
 - When outside on a calm summer morning, I can hear only bird song and other nature sounds.
 - Sound from agricultural machinery is a natural part of my living environment.
 - It is not very important what my living environment looks like, as long as it is functional.
 - I live in a place where I can restore myself and gain strength.
 - I have renovated major parts of my dwelling since I moved in.
 - The area where I live is suitable for economical growth.
 - Background sounds from road traffic are almost always present outdoors.
 - I feel a sense of community with people living in this area.
 - I like to personalize my dwelling.
 - I have many friends in the neighbourhood that I socialize with.
 - It is never really quiet in the area.
 - I am concerned about keeping the garden/the balcony tidy.
10. Below are a number of items that you may notice or that could annoy you when you spend time **outdoors** at your dwelling. Could you indicate whether you have noticed these or whether these annoy you? (do not notice, notice but not annoyed, slightly annoyed, rather annoyed, very annoyed)
 - Odour from industries
 - Odour from manure
 - Flies and/or gnats
 - Sound from agricultural machinery
 - Airplane sound

- Road traffic sound
- Railway sound
- Sound from wind turbines
- View on power lines/pylons
- View on factories
- View on wind turbines
- View on busy road
- Other, namely: *(please indicate what)*

11. Below are a number of items that you may notice or that could annoy you when you spend time **indoors** at your dwelling. Could you indicate whether you have noticed these or whether these annoy you? (do not notice, notice but not annoyed, slightly annoyed, rather annoyed, very annoyed)

(same items as in 10.)

12. How would you describe your sensitivity to the environmental factors below? (not sensitive at all, hardly sensitive, slightly sensitive, rather sensitive, very sensitive)

- Air pollution
- Odours
- Noise
- Littering

The next questions are about sources of possible nuisance in your living environment

13. In your living environment there are possibly one or more busy roads. What is your opinion on the impact of busy roads on the landscape scenery? (very positive, positive, neither positive nor negative, negative, very negative) *If (very) positive of (very) negative, in what way do you think the impact is positive or negative?*

.....

14. To what extent are you affected by busy roads in your living environment? Please indicate for each item whether you notice it or are annoyed by it. (do not notice, notice but not annoyed, slightly annoyed, rather annoyed, very annoyed)

- Sound indoors
- Sound outdoors
- The movement of the vehicles
- Odor (exhaust gases) indoor
- Odor (exhaust gases) outdoor
- Changed view
- Other, namely: *(please indicate what)*

15. **How often** are you annoyed by the factors mentioned in 14 ((almost) never, at least once in the past year, at least once a month, at least once a week, (almost) daily)

(same items as in 14)

16. Can you see a busy road from your residence or garden/balcony? (no, yes)

17. Can you hear the sound of busy roads from your residence or garden/balcony? (yes, no → 21)

18. To what extent are you annoyed by the sound of road traffic when you are **outdoors** at your dwelling? Please encircle a number on the scale between 0 and 10; if you are not annoyed at all you encircle a 0, if you are

extremely annoyed you encircle a 10. If the perceived annoyance is in between, please encircle the most appropriate number

I am not at all annoyed 0 – 10 I am extremely annoyed

19. To what extent are you annoyed by the sound of road traffic when you are **indoors**? Please encircle a number on the scale between 0 and 10; if you are not annoyed at all you encircle a 0, if you are extremely annoyed you encircle a 10. If the perceived annoyance is in between, please encircle the most appropriate number

I am not at all annoyed 0 – 10 I am extremely annoyed

20. If you are affected by busy roads, which type of road traffic do you find most intrusive? (*more than one answer possible*) (Cars, trucks, motorbikes, scooters/mopeds, tractors)
21. In your area there are possibly wind turbines. What is your opinion on the impact of wind turbines on the landscape scenery? (very positive, positive, neither positive nor negative, negative, very negative). *If (very) positive of (very) negative, in what way do you think the impact is positive or negative?*
22. To what extent are you affected by wind turbines in your living environment? Please indicate for each item whether you notice it or are annoyed by it in your living environment. (do not notice, notice but not annoyed, slightly annoyed, rather annoyed, very annoyed)

Blinking shadows indoors

Moving shadows outdoors

Sound from rotor blades

Movement of rotor blades

Changed view

Vibrations

Other, namely: (*please indicate what*)

23. **How often** are you affected by the factors in question 22? ((almost) never, at least once in the past year, at least once a month, at least once a week, (almost) daily)

(same items as in 22)

24. Can you hear the sound of wind turbines from within your house or from your garden/balcony? (yes, no → 29)

25. How would you describe the sound of the wind turbines? (*you can tick more than one answer category*)

A pure tone

Thumping/throbbing

Swishing/lashing

Whistling/screeching

Rustling

Scratching/squeaking

A low frequency/low pitched sound

Resounding

Other, namely: (*please indicate what*)

26. To what extent are you annoyed by the sound of wind turbines when you are **outdoors** at your dwelling?

Please encircle a number on the scale between 0 and 10; if you are not at all annoyed you encircle a 0, if you are extremely annoyed you encircle a 10. If the perceived annoyance is in between, please encircle the most appropriate number

I am not at all annoyed scale 0 – 10 I am extremely annoyed

27. To what extent are you annoyed by the sound of wind turbines when you are **indoors**? Please encircle a number on the scale between 0 and 10; if you are not at all annoyed you encircle a 0, if you are extremely annoyed you encircle a 10. If the perceived annoyance is in between, please encircle the most appropriate number
- I am not at all annoyed scale 0 – 10 I am extremely annoyed
28. Are there conditions when the sound of these wind turbines is more distinct? (I hear it less loud than usual, I hear it louder than usual, it makes no difference, I do not know whether it makes a difference)
- When the wind blows from the turbine towards my dwelling
When the wind blows from my dwelling towards the turbine
When there is a weak/no wind
When the wind is strong
On warm summer evenings
At night time
When I see the wind turbines sideways
Other, namely: *(please indicate what)*
29. Are you a (co-) owner of a wind turbine? (no, yes I own one or more turbines, yes I own shares/am a co-owner of wind turbines)
30. Have you received any financial or economical benefit of the construction of wind turbines in your living environment? (no, yes) *If yes, can you clarify your answer?*
31. What is your general opinion on wind turbines? (very positive, positive, neither positive nor negative, negative, very negative)
32. What is your opinion on the statements below about wind turbines? Please encircle the number that corresponds best to your opinion: 1 through 5 for each of the following pairs:
- efficient – inefficient
environmentally friendly – not environmentally friendly
pretty – ugly
necessary – unnecessary
inviting – repulsive
natural – unnatural
annoying - blends in
dangerous – harmless
33. Can you see a wind turbine from your dwelling or your garden/balcony? (yes, no; if no → 34) *If yes, how many wind turbines can you see? (from my dwelling:..... ; from my garden/balcony:*
34. If there are wind turbines in your environment, is your bedroom situated at the side of the house where those wind turbines are? (no, yes)
35. If there is a busy road in your environment, is your bedroom situated at the side of the house where the busy road is? (no, yes)
36. On what floor is your bedroom? (ground level, floor)

The next questions are about your health and the way you perceive your health

37. Do you have any long term/chronic disease? (no → 38, yes). *If yes, which chronic disease do you have? (diabetes, high blood pressure, tinnitus, hearing impairment, cardiovascular disease, migraine, other viz:)*

38. Have you been troubled by the following symptoms during the last months? ((almost) never, at least once a month, at least once a week, (almost) daily)

Headache

Undue tiredness

Pain and stiffness in the back, neck or shoulders

Feeling tense or stressed

Depressivity

Not very sociable, wanting to be alone

Irritable

Resigned

Fearful

Concentration problems

Nausea

Vertigo

Mood changes

Other, namely: *(please indicate what)*

39. Do you have health complaints that you think are related to environmental factors? (no → 40, yes). *If yes, to which environmental factors do you relate them? (for example noise, odour, radiation, pollution) (more than one answer possible)*

If you have complaints that you think are related to environmental factors, did you consult a doctor for these complaints? (no, yes)

40. How often have you had difficulties falling to sleep in your home? ((almost) never, at least once in the past year, at least once a month, at least once a week, (almost) daily)

41. How often do you sleep with your window ajar or open? ((almost) never, sometimes, often, always)

42. How often is your sleep interrupted by sound? ((almost) never, at least once in the past year, at least once in the past month, at least once in the past week, (almost) daily). *If your sleep is ever interrupted, which sound sources are involved?*

43. How have you been feeling in the morning during the last months? Please encircle a number between 0 and 10 on both scales below.

Very rested scale 0 – 10 very sleepy

Very relaxed scale 0 – 10 very tense

We would like to know how well you feel and what complaints you have had **in the past few weeks**. Please answer the questions below. Remember that this concerns only the complaints of this moment in time or of the last few weeks, **not** the complaints you have ever had **in the past**. (answers are: not at all, no more than usual, rather more than usual, much more than usual).

44. Have you lost much sleep over worry lately?

45. Did you feel constantly under strain lately?

46. Have you been able to concentrate on whatever you're doing lately?

47. Did you feel you were playing a useful part in things lately?

48. Have you been able to face up to your problems lately?

49. Did you feel capable of making decisions (about things) lately?
50. Did you feel you couldn't overcome your difficulties lately?
51. Did you feel reasonably happy lately, all things considered?
52. Have you been able to enjoy your normal day-to-day activities lately?
53. Did you feel unhappy and depressed lately?
54. Have you been losing confidence in yourself lately?
55. Have you been thinking of yourself as a worthless person lately?
56. How would you generally rate the quality of your life (how satisfied are you with your life, all things considered)? Please encircle a number between 0 and 10 on the scale below.
- Best possible quality of life scale 0 – 10 lowest possible quality of life
57. How would you rate your quality of life if there were no busy roads in your neighbourhood?
- Best possible quality of life scale 0 – 10 lowest possible quality of life
58. How would you rate your quality of life if there were no wind turbines in your neighbourhood?
- Best possible quality of life scale 0 – 10 lowest possible quality of life
59. What is your sex? (male, female)
60. In what year were you born? (in)
61. What is the highest education level you completed? (lower general or primary education or part thereof, lower vocational education, secondary general education, secondary vocational education, higher vocational education, university education)
62. What was your main occupation the last half year? (household work, working at home, employed, parental leave, sick leave, retired, study, currently unemployed, disablement insured, other *viz*)
63. What are your normal working hours? (daytime, both night- and dayshift, 2-3 shift, only nights, other *viz*)
64. At which hours are you usually at home? (in daytime 7 – 19 hours: from ... to ... hours and from ... to ... hours; in evening and night time (19 – 7 hours): from ... to ... hours and from ... to ... hours)

If you would like to add a remark that you think might be of interest for this study and not sufficiently addressed in this questionnaire, you can do so below. (followed by open space)

This is the end of the questionnaire. Many thanks for your cooperation.

Give your e-mail address here if you want to receive the results of this study.

Appendix B: Available spectral sound power data

| Manufacturer | type | version | power kW | hub height | diameter | mode | sound emission per octave band | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|------------|----------|----------|--------------------------------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|
| | | | | | | | at V10 (m/s) | 31.5Hz | 63Hz | 125Hz | 250Hz | 500Hz | 1000Hz | 2000Hz | 4000Hz | 8000Hz | sum | |
| Bonus | Bonus 1300 | Bonus 1300 | 1300 | 66m | 62m | 19 rpm | 9.2 | 7 | | 81.8 | 88.8 | 90.8 | 92.1 | 90.7 | 90.3 | 87.9 | 82.8 | 98.3 |
| Bonus | Bonus MKIV | Bonus 600/44-40 | 600 | | | | | 7 | | 76.2 | 86.2 | 92.3 | 93 | 89.8 | 88 | 87.4 | 89.3 | 98.5 |
| Enercon | E-40 | E-40/6.44 | 600 | 50m | 44m | | | 8 | | 83 | 89 | 91 | 95 | 97 | 89 | 82 | 75 | 100.6 |
| Enercon | E-40 | E-40/6.44 | 600 | 65m | 44m | | | | 73.8 | 83 | 88.5 | 93 | 96.9 | 95 | 89.3 | 83.9 | 72.9 | 100.8 |
| Enercon | E-66/18.70 | | 1800 | | | | | | 71 | 82 | 92 | 94 | 98 | 98 | 93 | 88 | 4.9 | 102.9 |
| Enercon | E-70 | E-70 E4 | 2000 | 85m | 71m | | | 8 | | 85 | 93.5 | 97.2 | 96 | 91.1 | 86.6 | 81.7 | 75.7 | 101.4 |
| Enercon | E-70 | E-70 E4 | 2300 | 85m | 71m | mode 2 | | 8 | | 86.5 | 94.8 | 97.8 | 96.7 | 94.3 | 90.4 | 83.6 | 77.1 | 102.6 |
| Enron | TW 1.5s | TW 1.5s | 1500 | 80m | 70m | 22 rpm | | 8 | | 86 | 91 | 96 | 97 | 98 | 94 | 88 | 75 | 103.0 |
| Lagerwey | LW50 | | 750 | | | | | 7 | | 80 | 90 | 92 | 93 | 94 | 94 | 94 | | 100.9 |
| NedWind | NedWind 40 | NedWind 40 | 500 | 39m | 40m | | 7 | | 72 | 92 | 93 | 98 | 99 | 89 | 85 | 75 | 102.8 | |
| Neg Micon | NM52 | NM52/900 | 900 | 40m | 52m | 22,4 rpm | 7 | | 75.7 | 90.3 | 92.3 | 93.9 | 90.6 | 89 | 84.5 | 79.7 | 98.8 | |
| Neg Micon | NM52 | NM52/900 | 900 | 70m | 52m | 22 rpm | 8 | | 78 | 89 | 94 | 96 | 94 | 92 | 91 | 83 | 101.1 | |
| Neg Micon | NM54 | NM54/950 | 950 | 46m | 54m | 22 rpm | 7 | 68.2 | 73.4 | 81.4 | 93.9 | 95.8 | 95.1 | 95.3 | 90.2 | 85.1 | 101.6 | |
| Nordex | N90 | N90 | 2300 | 100m | 90m | 16,9 rpm | 8.7 | | | 82 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 96 | 97 | 95 | 89 | 103.5 |
| Nordtank | NTK37 | NTK37/500 | 500 | 42,5m | 37m | | | 4 | | 73.2 | 81.8 | 86.6 | 89.8 | 85.8 | 84.5 | 83.3 | 75.2 | 94.0 |
| Nordtank | NTK37 | NTK37/500 | 500 | 42,5m | 37m | | | 4 | | 73.9 | 82.5 | 87.3 | 90.5 | 86.5 | 85.2 | 84 | 75.9 | 94.7 |
| Nordtank | NTK37 | NTK37/500 | 500 | 35m | 37m | | | 8 | | 76.3 | 84.9 | 89.7 | 92.9 | 88.9 | 87.6 | 86.4 | 78.3 | 97.1 |
| Nordtank | NTK43 | NTK43/600 | 600 | 40m | 43m | | 7.8 | | | 77.1 | 84 | 91.7 | 94.5 | 90.2 | 87.7 | 85.5 | 78.7 | 98.2 |
| Vestas | V39 | V39-500kW | 500 | 40.5m | 39m | | 5.8 | | | 79 | 87 | 89 | 91 | 89 | 88 | 81 | 66 | 96.2 |
| Vestas | V39 | V39-500kW | 500 | 40.5m | 39m | | | 8 | | 81 | 89 | 91 | 93 | 91 | 90 | 83 | 68 | 98.2 |
| Vestas | V44 | V44-600kW | 600 | 55m | 44m | | 8 | | 72 | 78 | 85 | 91 | 94 | 92 | 91 | 90 | 99.0 | |
| Vestas | V44 | V44-600kW | 600 | 55m | 44m | | 8 | | 78.6 | 86.5 | 88.8 | 92.6 | 94 | 91.6 | 88.4 | 74 | 98.9 | |
| Vestas | V44 | V44-600kW | 600 | 41m | 44m | Optitip | 8 | | 78.1 | 85.9 | 89.4 | 93.7 | 94.8 | 92.4 | 86.8 | 74.8 | 99.5 | |
| Vestas | V47 | V47-660 kW | 660 | 55m | 47m | | 8 | | 78 | 86 | 90 | 95 | 97 | 93 | 88 | 69 | 100.9 | |
| Vestas | V47 | | 660 | | | | 8 | | 78.2 | 86.1 | 89.8 | 95.2 | 97 | 92.9 | 87.9 | 69.2 | 100.9 | |
| Vestas | V52 | V52-850kW | 850 | 65m | 52m | | 8 | | 79 | 87 | 93 | 97 | 95 | 92 | 86 | 75 | 101.1 | |
| Vestas | V66 | V66-1650kW | 1650 | 70m | 66m | 19 rpm | 8 | | 84 | 92 | 95 | 98 | 98 | 96 | 90 | 78 | 103.6 | |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2,0MW | 2000 | 60m | 80m | | 8 | | 82 | 88 | 94 | 95 | 95 | 93 | 90 | 73 | 101.0 | |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2,0MW | 2000 | 68m | 80m | 101dB(A) | 8 | | 82 | 89 | 94 | 96 | 94 | 93 | 86 | 69 | 100.9 | |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2,0MW | 2000 | 80m | 80m | | 8 | | 82.3 | 89.6 | 94.8 | 96.2 | 91.8 | 93.5 | 86.7 | 69.6 | 101.0 | |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 75m | 90m | | 5 | 76.3 | 83.3 | 88.7 | 94 | 97 | 96.6 | 92.6 | 88.6 | 85.7 | 102.0 | |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 105m | 90m | | 8 | | 92.5 | 94.5 | 97.5 | 100.5 | 101.5 | 101.5 | 100.5 | | 107.8 | |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 75m | 90m | | 7 | 83.6 | 91.3 | 95 | 100.5 | 103.3 | 102.9 | 99.5 | 95.7 | 95.4 | 108.6 | |
| Vestas | V90 | | 2000 | | | | 8 | | 88.3 | 93.6 | 95.9 | 97.2 | 97.1 | 96.1 | 93.1 | 79.1 | 103.7 | |
| Windmaster | 750-E (750kW) | | 750 | 45m | | | | 75 | 81 | 87 | 91 | 95 | 97 | 89 | 78 | | 100.4 | |

Appendix C: Sound power levels and wind speed

Wind speeds are at 10 m height in a neutral atmosphere and a standard ground roughness

| Manufacturer | type | version | power kW | hub height m | diameter m | mode | sound power level in dB(A) | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|----------|----------------------------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | | | | | | 3m/s | 4m/s | 5m/s | 6m/s | 7m/s | 8m/s | 9m/s | 10m/s | 11m/s |
| Bonus | Bonus 1300 | Bonus 1300 | 1300 | 66 | 62 | 15 rpm | | | | | 93,8 | | | | |
| Bonus | Bonus 1300 | Bonus 1300 | 1300 | 66 | 62 | 19 rpm | | | | | 98,8 | | | | |
| Bonus | Bonus 1300 | Bonus 1300 | 1300 | 50 | 62 | 19 rpm | | | | | | 98,8 | | | |
| Bonus | Bonus MKIV | Bonus 600/44-40 MKI | 600 | | | | 90,1 | 90,7 | 92,4 | 95,9 | 98,2 | 99,1 | 99,7 | 100,3 | 100,9 |
| Enercon | E-40 | E-40/6.44 | 600 | 50 | 44 | | | 97 | 98 | 99 | 100 | 100 | 101 | 101 | |
| Enercon | E-40 | E-40/6.44 | 600 | 50 | 44 | | | | | 97 | 98,5 | 99,5 | | | |
| Enercon | E-40 | E-40/6.44 | 600 | 46 | 44 | | | | | | | 99,2 | | 100,5 | |
| Enercon | E-40 | E-40/6.44 | 600 | 50 | 44 | | | | | | | 99,3 | | 100,6 | |
| Enercon | E-40 | E-40/6.44 | 600 | 58 | 44 | | | | | | | 99,5 | | 100,8 | |
| Enercon | E-40 | E-40/6.44 | 600 | 65 | 44 | | | | | | | 99,6 | | 100,8 | |
| Enercon | E-40 | E-40/6.44 | 600 | 75 | 44 | | | | | | | 99,9 | | 100,8 | |
| Enercon | E-40 | E-40/6.44 | 600 | 78 | 44 | | | | | | | 99,9 | | 100,8 | |
| Enercon | E-66 | E-66/20.70 | 2000 | | | | | | | 96,5 | 99 | 101 | 102,5 | 103 | |
| Enercon | E-70 | E-70 E4 | 2000 | 58 | 71 | | | 90,7 | 93,6 | 98,5 | 100,8 | 101,9 | 103 | 103 | |
| Enercon | E-70 | E-70 E4 | 2000 | 64 | 71 | | | 90,8 | 93,6 | 98,8 | 100,9 | 102,1 | 103 | 103 | |
| Enercon | E-70 | E-70 E4 | 2000 | 85 | 71 | | | 91,1 | 94,1 | 99,7 | 101,1 | 102,5 | 103 | 103 | |
| Enercon | E-70 | E-70 E4 | 2000 | 98 | 71 | | | 91,3 | 94,6 | 100 | 101,2 | 102,7 | 103 | 103 | |
| Enercon | E-70 | E-70 E4 | 2000 | 113 | 71 | | | 91,4 | 95,1 | 100,3 | 101,4 | 102,8 | 103 | 103 | |
| Enercon | E-70 | E-70 E4 | 2000 | 85 | 71 | | | | | 99,1 | 100,2 | 101,4 | 102 | | |
| Enercon | E-70 | E-70 E4 | 2300 | 58 | 71 | | | 90,7 | 93,6 | 98,5 | 101,3 | 102,9 | 104,5 | 104,5 | |
| Enercon | E-70 | E-70 E4 | 2300 | 64 | 71 | | | 90,8 | 93,6 | 98,8 | 101,4 | 103,1 | 104,5 | 104,5 | |
| Enercon | E-70 | E-70 E4 | 2300 | 85 | 71 | | | 91,1 | 94,1 | 99,7 | 101,6 | 103,5 | 104,5 | 104,5 | |
| Enercon | E-70 | E-70 E4 | 2300 | 98 | 71 | | | 91,3 | 94,6 | 100 | 101,7 | 103,7 | 104,5 | 104,5 | |
| Enercon | E-70 | E-70 E4 | 2300 | 113 | 71 | | | 91,4 | 95,1 | 100,3 | 101,9 | 103,8 | 104,5 | 104,5 | |
| Enercon | E-70 | E-70 E4 | 2300 | 85 | 71 | mode 2 | | | | 98,2 | 100,6 | 102,6 | 104 | 104,4 | |
| Enron | TW 1.5s | TW 1.5s | 1500 | 80 | 70 | 11 rpm | | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | | | |
| Enron | TW 1.5s | TW 1.5s | 1500 | 80 | 70 | 22 rpm | | | 102 | 102 | 103 | 103 | 104 | 104 | |
| Lagerwey | LW18/80 | | 80 | 25 | 18 | | | | | | 88,9 | 89,7 | | | |
| Neg Micon | NM52 | NM52/900 | 900 | 70 | 52 | 15 rpm | | 93 | 93 | 94 | | | | | |
| Neg Micon | NM52 | NM52/900 | 900 | 70 | 52 | 22 rpm | | | 98 | 99 | 100 | 101 | 102 | 103 | |
| Neg Micon | NM54 | NM54/950 | 950 | 46 | 54 | 15 rpm | | | | | 95,6 | | | | |
| Neg Micon | NM54 | NM54/950 | 950 | 46 | 54 | 22 rpm | | | | | 101,6 | | | | |
| Neg Micon | NM54 | NM54/950 | 950 | 55 | 54 | 22 rpm | | | | | | 103,7 | | | |
| Nordex | N80 | N80 | 2500 | 80 | 80 | | 97 | 98,7 | 100 | 100,9 | 101,7 | 102,6 | 103,1 | 103,8 | 104,5 |
| Nordex | N90 | N90 | 2300 | 100 | 90 | 16,9 rpm | | 101 | 102 | 103 | 103 | 104 | 104 | 105 | |
| Nordtank | NTK37 | NTK37/500 | 500 | 35 | 37 | | | | | 95,9 | 96,5 | 97,1 | | | |
| Nordtank | NTK37 | NTK37/500 | 500 | 42,5 | 37 | | 93 | 94 | 96 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 97 | | |
| Nordtank | NTK43 | NTK43/600 | 600 | 40 | 43 | | 96,1 | 96,5 | 96,9 | 97,3 | 97,7 | 98,1 | 98,5 | 98,9 | 99,3 |
| Repower | MM82 | MM82 | 2000 | 80 | 82 | | | 95 | 97,5 | 100 | 102 | 103,5 | 105 | 106 | 106,5 |
| Repower | MM82 | MM82 | 2000 | 80 | 82 | | | | 99 | 101 | 102 | 103 | 105 | 105 | 105 |

| Manufacturer | type | version | power | hub height | diameter | mode | sound power level in dB(A) | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|------|------------|-------|------------|----------|------------|----------------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | | kW | m | m | | 3m/s | 4m/s | 5m/s | 6m/s | 7m/s | 8m/s | 9m/s | 10m/s | 11m/s |
| Vestas | V39 | V39-500kW | 500 | 40.5 | 39 | | | | | 96,3 | | 97,8 | | | |
| Vestas | V39 | V39-500kW | 500 | 40.5 | 39 | | | | | 96,3 | | 97,8 | | | |
| Vestas | V44 | V44-600kW | 600 | 55 | 44 | | | 98,1 | 98,3 | 98,5 | 98,7 | 98,9 | 99,1 | 99,3 | |
| Vestas | V44 | V44-600kW | 600 | 55 | 44 | | | 98,6 | 98,8 | 99 | 99,3 | 99,1 | | | |
| Vestas | V44 | V44-600kW | 600 | 41 | 44 | Optitip | | | | 98,5 | 98,7 | 98,9 | 99,1 | | |
| Vestas | V47 | V47-660 kW | 660 | 55 | 47 | | | 99 | 99 | 100 | 100 | 101 | 101 | 102 | |
| Vestas | V52 | V52-850kW | 850 | 65 | 52 | | | 97 | 98 | 100 | 101 | 102 | 103 | 104 | |
| Vestas | V66 | V66-1650kW | 1650 | 70 | 66 | 15 rpm | 97 | 97 | 97 | 98 | 98 | 98 | | | |
| Vestas | V66 | V66-1650kW | 1650 | 70 | 66 | 19 rpm | | | 101 | 101 | 101 | 102 | 102 | 102 | |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2.0MW | 2000 | 68 | 80 | 101dB(A) | | 98 | 100 | 101 | 101 | 101 | 102 | 105 | |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2.0MW | 2000 | 68 | 80 | 102dB(A) | | 98 | 101 | 102 | 102 | 102 | 103 | 105 | |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2.0MW | 2000 | 68 | 80 | 103dB(A) | | 98 | 101 | 103 | 103 | 103 | 104 | 105 | |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2.0MW | 2000 | 68 | 80 | 104dB(A) | | 100 | 103 | 104 | 104 | 104 | 105 | 105 | |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2.0MW | 2000 | 68 | 80 | 105dB(A) | | 101 | 104 | 105 | 105 | 105 | 105 | 105 | |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2.0MW | 2000 | 78 | 80 | 101dB(A) | | 94 | 99,6 | 100,2 | 100,7 | 101 | 101,9 | 102,8 | 104,1 |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2.0MW | 2000 | 78 | 80 | 102dB(A) | | 94,1 | 99,7 | 101,2 | 101,7 | 102 | 102,9 | 103,7 | 104,3 |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2.0MW | 2000 | 78 | 80 | 102,5dB(A) | | 94,1 | 99,5 | 101,7 | 102,1 | 102,6 | 103,5 | 103,8 | 104,3 |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2.0MW | 2000 | 78 | 80 | 104dB(A) | | 94,1 | 99,6 | 102,7 | 103,4 | 104 | 104,2 | 103,7 | 104,3 |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2.0MW | 2000 | 78 | 80 | 105,1dB(A) | | 94,1 | 99,6 | 103 | 104,2 | 105 | 104,9 | 103,8 | 104,3 |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2.0MW | 2000 | 100 | 80 | 101dB(A) | | 95 | 99,8 | 100,3 | 100,8 | 101,3 | 102,3 | 103,1 | 104,4 |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2.0MW | 2000 | 100 | 80 | 102dB(A) | | 95 | 99,9 | 101,3 | 101,8 | 102,3 | 103,2 | 103,9 | 104,6 |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2.0MW | 2000 | 100 | 80 | 102,5dB(A) | | 95 | 100 | 101,8 | 102,2 | 102,9 | 103,7 | 103,9 | 104,6 |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2.0MW | 2000 | 100 | 80 | 104dB(A) | | 95 | 100,2 | 102,7 | 103,7 | 104,3 | 104,1 | 103,9 | 104,6 |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2.0MW | 2000 | 100 | 80 | 105,1dB(A) | | 95 | 100,3 | 103,3 | 104,5 | 105,2 | 104,2 | 103,9 | 104,6 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 65 | 90 | mode 0 | | 96,4 | 101,5 | 105,3 | 107,8 | 109,1 | 109,4 | 108 | 106,1 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 80 | 90 | mode 0 | | 97 | 102 | 105,8 | 108,2 | 109,3 | 109,4 | 106,7 | 105,9 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 90 | 90 | mode 0 | | 97,5 | 102,4 | 106,1 | 108,3 | 109,4 | 109,2 | 106,5 | 105,9 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 105 | 90 | mode 0 | | 98,2 | 103 | 106,5 | 108,6 | 109,4 | 109 | 106,3 | 105,8 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 65 | 90 | mode 1 | | 96,4 | 101,5 | 105,3 | 107,5 | 107,8 | 107,8 | 107,2 | 106,1 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 80 | 90 | mode 1 | | 97 | 102 | 105,8 | 107,7 | 107,8 | 107,8 | 106,7 | 105,9 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 90 | 90 | mode 1 | | 97,5 | 102,4 | 106,1 | 107,8 | 107,8 | 107,8 | 106,5 | 105,9 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 105 | 90 | mode 1 | | 98,2 | 103 | 106,5 | 107,8 | 107,8 | 107,7 | 106,3 | 105,8 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 65 | 90 | mode 2 | | 96,4 | 101,5 | 105,2 | 106,8 | 106,8 | 106,8 | 106,8 | 106,1 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 80 | 90 | mode 2 | | 97 | 102 | 105,6 | 106,8 | 106,8 | 106,8 | 106,8 | 105,9 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 90 | 90 | mode 2 | | 97,5 | 102,4 | 105,8 | 106,8 | 106,8 | 106,8 | 106,5 | 105,9 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 105 | 90 | mode 2 | | 98,2 | 103 | 106,3 | 106,8 | 106,8 | 106,8 | 106,3 | 105,8 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 65 | 90 | mode 3 | | 96,4 | 101,5 | 104,4 | 104,4 | 104,4 | 104,4 | 104,4 | 104,4 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 80 | 90 | mode 3 | | 97 | 102 | 104,4 | 104,4 | 104,4 | 104,4 | 104,4 | 104,9 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 90 | 90 | mode 3 | | 97,5 | 102,4 | 104,4 | 104,4 | 104,4 | 104,4 | 104,4 | 105,2 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 105 | 90 | mode 3 | | 98,2 | 102,9 | 104,4 | 104,4 | 104,4 | 104,4 | 104,4 | 105,8 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 65 | 90 | mode 4 | | 96,4 | 101,5 | 102,8 | 102,8 | 102,8 | 102,8 | 102,8 | 102,8 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 80 | 90 | mode 4 | | 97 | 102 | 102,8 | 102,8 | 102,8 | 102,8 | 102,8 | 102,8 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 90 | 90 | mode 4 | | 97,5 | 102,2 | 102,8 | 102,8 | 102,8 | 102,8 | 102,8 | 102,9 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 105 | 90 | mode 4 | | 98,2 | 102,4 | 102,8 | 102,8 | 102,8 | 102,8 | 102,8 | 103,6 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 75 | 90 | | | | | | 108,6 | | | | |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 75 | 90 | | | | 102 | | | | | | |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 105 | 90 | | | 95 | 100 | 105 | 107 | 107,6 | 108 | 107 | 107 |
| Vestas | V90 | | 2000 | | | | | 95 | 100 | 103 | 104 | 104 | 103 | 103 | 103 |
| Vestas | V90 | | 3000 | | | | | 97 | 102 | 105,8 | 108,2 | 109,3 | 109,4 | 106,7 | 105,9 |

Appendix D: Sound power data used in calculations

type ID 1 – 28: data from acoustic reports

type ID r1 – r28: data from other wind turbine type with equal nominal electric power

type nr at type ID r1 – r28 equals power in kW

H = hub height; D = rotor diameter

| Type ID | Type nr | Manufacture r | 31.5 | 63 | 125 | 250 | 500 | 1000 | 2000 | 4000 | 8000 | H | D |
|---------|---------|---------------|-------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|----|
| | | | Hz | | | | | | | | | m | m |
| 1 | Bm250 | Bouma | 63.1 | 71.0 | 80.1 | 89.7 | 89.6 | 92.3 | 90.7 | 83.3 | 72.0 | 51 | -- |
| 2 | Bo600 | Bonus | -99.0 | 76.2 | 86.2 | 92.3 | 93.0 | 89.8 | 88.0 | 87.4 | 89.3 | 40 | -- |
| 3 | Bo1300 | Bonus | -99.0 | 81.8 | 88.8 | 90.8 | 92.1 | 90.7 | 90.3 | 87.9 | 82.8 | 66 | 62 |
| 4 | Ec600 | Enercon | 73.8 | 83.0 | 88.5 | 93.0 | 96.9 | 95.0 | 89.3 | 83.9 | 72.9 | 65 | 44 |
| 5 | Ec800 | Enercon | -99.0 | 81.7 | 90.4 | 94.7 | 96.7 | 96.1 | 94.5 | 90.4 | 77.5 | -- | -- |
| 6 | Ec1800 | Enercon | 71.0 | 82.0 | 92.0 | 94.0 | 98.0 | 98.0 | 93.0 | 88.0 | 4.9 | -- | -- |
| 7 | Ec2000 | Enercon | -99.0 | 82.2 | 90.9 | 95.2 | 97.2 | 96.6 | 95.0 | 90.9 | 78.0 | -- | -- |
| 8 | Ec2300 | Enercon | -99.0 | 86.3 | 95.2 | 99.4 | 99.2 | 94.6 | 89.9 | 85.7 | 82.2 | 85 | 71 |
| 9 | Er1500 | Enron | -99.0 | 86.0 | 91.0 | 96.0 | 97.0 | 98.0 | 94.0 | 88.0 | 75.0 | 80 | 70 |
| 10 | Lw80 | Lagerwey | -99.0 | 74.2 | 82.9 | 87.2 | 89.2 | 88.6 | 87.0 | 82.9 | 70.0 | 40 | 18 |
| 11 | Lw250 | Lagerwey | -99.0 | 83.2 | 91.9 | 96.2 | 98.2 | 97.6 | 96.0 | 91.9 | 79.0 | 51 | 30 |
| 12 | Lw750 | Lagerwey | -99.0 | 80.0 | 90.0 | 92.0 | 93.0 | 94.0 | 94.0 | 94.0 | -99.0 | -- | -- |
| 13 | Nw500 | NedWind | -99.0 | 72.0 | 92.0 | 93.0 | 98.0 | 99.0 | 89.0 | 85.0 | 75.0 | 39 | 40 |
| 14 | NM900 | Neg Micon | -99.0 | 78.0 | 89.0 | 94.0 | 96.0 | 94.0 | 92.0 | 91.0 | 83.0 | 70 | 52 |
| 15 | NM950 | Neg Micon | 68.2 | 73.4 | 81.4 | 93.9 | 95.8 | 95.1 | 95.3 | 90.2 | 85.1 | 46 | 54 |
| 16 | Nd2300 | Nordex | -99.0 | 82.0 | 95.0 | 95.0 | 95.0 | 96.0 | 97.0 | 95.0 | 89.0 | 100 | 90 |
| 17 | Nd2500 | Nordex | -99.0 | 90.0 | 95.0 | 99.0 | 99.0 | 96.0 | 97.0 | 92.0 | 79.0 | 80 | 90 |
| 18 | Nt500 | Nordtank | -99.0 | 76.3 | 84.9 | 89.7 | 92.9 | 88.9 | 87.6 | 86.4 | 78.3 | 35 | 37 |
| 19 | Nw100 | Northwind | -99.0 | 73.0 | 81.7 | 86.0 | 88.0 | 87.4 | 85.8 | 81.7 | 68.8 | 25 | 19 |
| 20 | Rp2000 | Repower | -99.0 | 84.2 | 92.9 | 97.2 | 99.2 | 98.6 | 97.0 | 92.9 | 80.0 | 80 | 82 |
| 21 | Ve500 | Vestas | -99.0 | 79.0 | 87.0 | 89.0 | 91.0 | 89.0 | 88.0 | 81.0 | 66.0 | 40.5 | 39 |
| 22 | Ve600 | Vestas | -99.0 | 78.6 | 86.5 | 88.8 | 92.6 | 94.0 | 91.6 | 88.4 | 74.0 | 55 | 44 |
| 23 | Ve660 | Vestas | -99.0 | 78.0 | 86.0 | 90.0 | 95.0 | 97.0 | 93.0 | 88.0 | 69.0 | 55 | 47 |
| 24 | Ve850 | Vestas | -99.0 | 79.0 | 87.0 | 93.0 | 97.0 | 95.0 | 92.0 | 86.0 | 75.0 | 65 | 52 |
| 25 | Ve1650 | Vestas | -99.0 | 84.0 | 92.0 | 95.0 | 98.0 | 98.0 | 96.0 | 90.0 | 78.0 | 70 | 66 |
| 26 | Ve2000 | Vestas | -99.0 | 89.6 | 94.9 | 97.2 | 98.5 | 98.4 | 97.4 | 94.4 | -99.0 | 78 | 80 |
| 27 | Ve3000 | Vestas | -99.0 | 92.5 | 94.5 | 97.5 | 100.5 | 101.5 | 101.5 | 100.5 | -99.0 | 105 | 90 |
| 28 | Wm750 | Windmaster | -99.0 | 75.0 | 81.0 | 87.0 | 91.0 | 95.0 | 97.0 | 89.0 | 78.0 | 45 | -- |
| r1 | 250 | -- | 63.1 | 71.0 | 80.1 | 89.7 | 89.6 | 92.3 | 90.7 | 83.3 | 72.0 | 51 | -- |
| r2 | 600 | -- | -99.0 | 76.2 | 86.2 | 92.3 | 93.0 | 89.8 | 88.0 | 87.4 | 89.3 | 40 | -- |
| r3 | 1300 | -- | -99.0 | 81.8 | 88.8 | 90.8 | 92.1 | 90.7 | 90.3 | 87.9 | 82.8 | 66 | 62 |
| r4 | 600 | -- | 73.8 | 83.0 | 88.5 | 93.0 | 96.9 | 95.0 | 89.3 | 83.9 | 72.9 | 65 | 44 |
| r5 | 800 | -- | -99.0 | 81.7 | 90.4 | 94.7 | 96.7 | 96.1 | 94.5 | 90.4 | 77.5 | -- | -- |
| r6 | 1800 | -- | 71.0 | 82.0 | 92.0 | 94.0 | 98.0 | 98.0 | 93.0 | 88.0 | 4.9 | -- | -- |
| r7 | 2000 | -- | -99.0 | 82.2 | 90.9 | 95.2 | 97.2 | 96.6 | 95.0 | 90.9 | 78.0 | -- | -- |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|----|-------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|----|
| r8 | 2300 | -- | -99.0 | 86.3 | 95.2 | 99.4 | 99.2 | 94.6 | 89.9 | 85.7 | 82.2 | 85 | 71 |
| r9 | 1500 | -- | -99.0 | 86.0 | 91.0 | 96.0 | 97.0 | 98.0 | 94.0 | 88.0 | 75.0 | 80 | 70 |
| r10 | 80 | -- | -99.0 | 74.2 | 82.9 | 87.2 | 89.2 | 88.6 | 87.0 | 82.9 | 70.0 | 40 | 18 |
| r11 | 250 | -- | -99.0 | 83.2 | 91.9 | 96.2 | 98.2 | 97.6 | 96.0 | 91.9 | 79.0 | 51 | 30 |
| r12 | 750 | -- | -99.0 | 80.0 | 90.0 | 92.0 | 93.0 | 94.0 | 94.0 | 94.0 | -99.0 | -- | -- |
| r13 | 500 | -- | -99.0 | 72.0 | 92.0 | 93.0 | 98.0 | 99.0 | 89.0 | 85.0 | 75.0 | 39 | 40 |
| r14 | 900 | -- | -99.0 | 78.0 | 89.0 | 94.0 | 96.0 | 94.0 | 92.0 | 91.0 | 83.0 | 70 | 52 |
| r15 | 950 | -- | 68.2 | 73.4 | 81.4 | 93.9 | 95.8 | 95.1 | 95.3 | 90.2 | 85.1 | 46 | 54 |
| r16 | 2300 | -- | -99.0 | 82.0 | 95.0 | 95.0 | 95.0 | 96.0 | 97.0 | 95.0 | 89.0 | 100 | 90 |
| r17 | 2500 | -- | -99.0 | 90.0 | 95.0 | 99.0 | 99.0 | 96.0 | 97.0 | 92.0 | 79.0 | 80 | 90 |
| r18 | 500 | -- | -99.0 | 76.3 | 84.9 | 89.7 | 92.9 | 88.9 | 87.6 | 86.4 | 78.3 | 35 | 37 |
| r19 | 100 | -- | -99.0 | 73.0 | 81.7 | 86.0 | 88.0 | 87.4 | 85.8 | 81.7 | 68.8 | 25 | 19 |
| r20 | 2000 | -- | -99.0 | 84.2 | 92.9 | 97.2 | 99.2 | 98.6 | 97.0 | 92.9 | 80.0 | 80 | 82 |
| r21 | 500 | -- | -99.0 | 79.0 | 87.0 | 89.0 | 91.0 | 89.0 | 88.0 | 81.0 | 66.0 | 40.5 | 39 |
| r22 | 600 | -- | -99.0 | 78.6 | 86.5 | 88.8 | 92.6 | 94.0 | 91.6 | 88.4 | 74.0 | 55 | 44 |
| r23 | 660 | -- | -99.0 | 78.0 | 86.0 | 90.0 | 95.0 | 97.0 | 93.0 | 88.0 | 69.0 | 55 | 47 |
| r24 | 850 | -- | -99.0 | 79.0 | 87.0 | 93.0 | 97.0 | 95.0 | 92.0 | 86.0 | 75.0 | 65 | 52 |
| r25 | 1650 | -- | -99.0 | 84.0 | 92.0 | 95.0 | 98.0 | 98.0 | 96.0 | 90.0 | 78.0 | 70 | 66 |
| r26 | 2000 | -- | -99.0 | 89.6 | 94.9 | 97.2 | 98.5 | 98.4 | 97.4 | 94.4 | -99.0 | 78 | 80 |
| r27 | 3000 | -- | -99.0 | 92.5 | 94.5 | 97.5 | 100.5 | 101.5 | 101.5 | 100.5 | -99.0 | 105 | 90 |
| r28 | 750 | -- | -99,0 | 75,0 | 81,0 | 87,0 | 91,0 | 95,0 | 97,0 | 89,0 | 78,0 | 45 | -- |

Appendix E: Sound power data sources

| manufactur er | type | version | max. power kW | hub height m | diamet er m | mode | source | reference nr | date |
|------------------|---------------|------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|
| Bonus | Bonus MKIV | 600/44-40 | 600 | | | | Danak | | aug-96 |
| Bonus | Bonus 1300 | Bonus 1300 | 1300 | 66 | 62 | 13 rpm | Van Grinsen Advies | Kenmerk SWNN- Rommens.TS1.doc | dec-00 |
| Bonus | Bonus 1300 | Bonus 1300 | 1300 | 50 | 62 | 19 rpm | Delta Acoustics & Vibration | K 877166 | 07-03-2000 |
| Bonus | Bonus 1300 | Bonus 1300 | 1300 | 66 | 62 | 19 rpm | Van Grinsen Advies | Kenmerk SWNN- Rommens.TS1.doc | dec-00 |
| Enercon | E-40 | E-40/6.44 | 600 | 50 | 44 | | Lichtveld Buis & Partners BV | R068201aaA1.tk | mei-04 |
| Enercon | E-40 | E-40/6.44 | 600 | 50 | 44 | | Lichtveld Buis & Partners BV | R068201aaA0.tk | mei-04 |
| Enercon | E-40 | E-40/6.44 | 600 | 46 | 44 | | Enercon technische data | S-tab E-40-600-44 WT 04_2001 | apr-01 |
| Enercon | E-40 | E-40/6.44 | 600 | 50 | 44 | | Enercon technische data | S-tab E-40-600-44 WT 04_2001 | apr-01 |
| Enercon | E-40 | E-40/6.44 | 600 | 58 | 44 | | Enercon technische data | S-tab E-40-600-44 WT 04_2001 | apr-01 |
| Enercon | E-40 | E-40/6.44 | 600 | 65 | 44 | | Windtest | WT 1809/01 | jun-01 |
| Enercon | E-40 | E-40/6.44 | 600 | 75 | 44 | | Enercon technische data | S-tab E-40-600-44 WT 04_2001 | apr-01 |
| Enercon | E-40 | E-40/6.44 | 600 | 78 | 44 | | Enercon technische data | S-tab E-40-600-44 WT 04_2001 | apr-01 |
| Enercon | E-66 | E-66/20.70 | 2000 | | | | Hayes McKenzie Partnership | HM:1471/R1 | feb-04 |
| Enercon | E-70 | E-70 E4 | 2000 | 58 | 71 | | Enercon | SA-04-SPL Guarantee E-70 2,0MW | feb-06 |
| Enercon | E-70 | E-70 E4 | 2000 | 64 | 71 | | Enercon | SA-04-SPL Guarantee E-70 2,0MW | feb-06 |
| Enercon | E-70 | E-70 E4 | 2000 | 85 | 71 | | Enercon | SA-04-SPL Guarantee E-70 2,0MW | feb-06 |
| Enercon | E-70 | E-70 E4 | 2000 | 98 | 71 | | Enercon | SA-04-SPL Guarantee E-70 2,0MW | feb-06 |
| Enercon | E-70 | E-70 E4 | 2000 | 113 | 71 | | Enercon | SA-04-SPL Guarantee E-70 2,0MW | feb-06 |
| Enercon | E-70 | E-70 E4 | 2000 | 85 | 71 | | WIND-consult GmbH | test report WICO 392SEA03/03 | aug-04 |
| Enercon | E-70 | E-70 E4 | 2300 | 58 | 71 | | Enercon | SA-04-SPL Guarantee E-70 2,3MW | feb-06 |
| Enercon | E-70 | E-70 E4 | 2300 | 64 | 71 | | Enercon | SA-04-SPL Guarantee E-70 2,3MW | feb-06 |
| Enercon | E-70 | E-70 E4 | 2300 | 85 | 71 | | Enercon | SA-04-SPL Guarantee E-70 2,3MW | feb-06 |
| Enercon | E-70 | E-70 E4 | 2300 | 98 | 71 | | Enercon | SA-04-SPL Guarantee E-70 2,3MW | feb-06 |
| Enercon | E-70 | E-70 E4 | 2300 | 113 | 71 | | Enercon | SA-04-SPL Guarantee E-70 2,3MW | feb-06 |
| Enercon | E-70 | E-70 E4 | 2300 | 85 | 71 | mode 2 | WIND-consult GmbH | test report 049SE206/01 | mrt-06 |
| Enron | TW 1.5s | TW 1.5s | 1500 | 80 | 70 | 11 rpm | Lichtveld Buis & Partners BV | R060388acA0.tk | sep-00 |
| Enron | TW 1.5s | TW 1.5s | 1500 | 80 | 70 | 22 rpm | Lichtveld Buis & Partners BV | | sep-00 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----------|------------|----------------|------|------|----|----------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| NedWind | NedWind 40 | NedWind 40 | 500 | 39 | 40 | | Peutz & Associates BV | FA 2024-2 | 09-12-1992 |
| NegMicon | NM52 | NM52/900 | 900 | 70 | 52 | 15 rpm | Lichtveld Buis & Partners BV | R052 495abA1.tk | 11-12-2000 |
| NegMicon | NM52 | NM52/900 | 900 | 70 | 52 | 22 rpm | Lichtveld Buis & Partners BV | R052 495abA1.tk | 11-12-2000 |
| NegMicon | NM52 | NM52/900 | 900 | 40 | 52 | 22,4 rpm | NEG Micon Holland | NM-Heeres.TS1 | jun-01 |
| NegMicon | NM54 | NM54/950 | 950 | 46 | 54 | 15 rpm | Van Grinsven Advies | Kenmerk WNW- Rodenthuis.TS7.doc | jul-03 |
| NegMicon | NM54 | NM54/950 | 950 | 46 | 54 | 22 rpm | Van Grinsven Advies | Kenmerk WNW- Rodenthuis.TS7.doc | jul-03 |
| NegMicon | NM54 | NM54/950 | 950 | 55 | 54 | 22 rpm | Windtest | WT2127/02 | mrt-02 |
| Nordex | N80 | N80 | 2500 | 80 | 80 | | Gemeenten Nijkerk, Ermelo en Putten/Locatieonderzoek windpark A28 | MD-WR2004.0233 | 11-05-2004 |
| Nordex | N90 | N90 | 2300 | 100 | 90 | 16.9 rpm | Lichtveld Buis & Partners BV | R052619aaA1.tk | 24-10-2003 |
| Nordtank | NTK37 | NTK37/500 | 500 | 35 | 37 | | Nordtank | Ref.no. S.hla.931209d1 | dec-93 |
| Nordtank | NTK37 | NTK37/500 | 500 | 42.5 | 37 | | Jansen Raadgevend Ingenieursbureau | Kenmerk 2309M01L.R06 | 13-05-1994 |
| Nordtank | NTK37 | NTK37/500 | 500 | 42.5 | 37 | | Lichtveld Buis & Partners BV | R52372A3.TK | 12-09-1997 |
| Nordtank | NTK43 | NTK43/600 | 600 | 40 | 43 | | Schreuder Groep Ingenieurs/Adviseurs | BOA\9450\FK | 02-12-1997 |
| Repower | MM82 | MM82 | 2000 | 80 | 82 | | Marshall Day Acoustics | Rapport nr. 03147C | 05-11-2003 |
| Repower | MM82 | MM82 | 2000 | 80 | 82 | | Windtest Kaiser-Wilhelm- Koog GmbH | WT3236/04 | 29-03-2004 |
| Vestas | V39 | V39-500kW | 500 | 41 | 39 | | Lichtveld Buis & Partners BV | R52 303A0.TK | 01-07-1994 |
| Vestas | V44 | V44-600kW | 600 | 41 | 44 | | Vestas Wind Systems A/S | Item no. 941688.R0 | 23-05-1996 |
| Vestas | V44 | V44-600kW | 600 | 55 | 44 | | Lichtveld Buis & Partners BV | R52 451A1.tk & R52 451A2.tk | 27-8-1997 & 20-7- 1999 |
| Vestas | V44 | V44-600kW | 60 | 41 | 72 | | Acoustica as | Item No.: 941687.R0 | 16-04-1996 |
| Vestas | V47 | V47-660 kW | 660 | 55 | 47 | | Lichtveld Buis & Partners BV | R52 500A0.tk | 23-12-1998 |
| Vestas | V52 | V52-850kW | 850 | 65 | 52 | | Lichtveld Buis & Partners BV | R052347abA1.tk | 24-07-2003 |
| Vestas | V66 | V66- 1650kW | 1650 | 70 | 66 | 15 rpm | Lichtveld Buis & Partners BV | R58 345A0.TK | 01-12-1998 |
| Vestas | V66 | V66- 1650kW | 1650 | 70 | 66 | 19 rpm | Lichtveld Buis & Partners BV | R58 345A0.TK | 01-12-1998 |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2,0MW | 2000 | 60 | 80 | | Lichtveld Buis & Partners BV | R068261aaA0.tk | 26-07-2006 |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2,0MW | 2000 | 80 | 80 | | Hayes McKenzie Partnership | Report 1610-R1 | |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2,0MW | 2000 | 68 | 80 | 101dBA | Lichtveld Buis & Partners BV | R052619aaA1.tk | 24-10-2003 |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2,0MW | 2000 | 68 | 80 | 102dBA | Lichtveld Buis & Partners BV | R052619aaA1.tk | 24-10-2003 |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2,0MW | 2000 | 68 | 80 | 103dBA | Lichtveld Buis & Partners BV | R052619aaA1.tk | 24-10-2003 |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2,0MW | 2000 | 68 | 80 | 104dBA | Lichtveld Buis & Partners BV | R052619aaA1.tk | 24-10-2003 |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2,0MW | 2000 | 68 | 80 | 105dBA | Lichtveld Buis & Partners BV | R052619aaA1.tk | 24-10-2003 |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2,0MW | 2000 | 78 | 80 | 101dBA | Vestas R&D department | Item no.: 944406.12 | 15-01-2004 |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2,0MW | 2000 | 78 | 80 | 102dBA | Vestas R&D department | Item no.: 944406.12 | 15-01-2004 |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2,0MW | 2000 | 78 | 80 | 102.5dB | Vestas R&D department | Item no.: 944406.12 | 15-01-2004 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|-----|-----------|------|-----|----|---------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2,0MW | 2000 | 78 | 80 | 104dBA | Vestas R&D department | Item no.: 944406.12 | 15-01-2004 |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2,0MW | 2000 | 78 | 80 | 105.1dB | Vestas R&D department | Item no.: 944406.12 | 15-01-2004 |
| A | | | | | | | | | |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2,0MW | 2000 | 100 | 80 | 101dBA | Vestas R&D department | Item no.: 944406.12 | 15-01-2004 |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2,0MW | 2000 | 100 | 80 | 102dBA | Vestas R&D department | Item no.: 944406.12 | 15-01-2004 |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2,0MW | 2000 | 100 | 80 | 102.5dB | Vestas R&D department | Item no.: 944406.12 | 15-01-2004 |
| A | | | | | | | | | |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2,0MW | 2000 | 100 | 80 | 104dBA | Vestas R&D department | Item no.: 944406.12 | 15-01-2004 |
| Vestas | V80 | V80-2,0MW | 2000 | 100 | 80 | 105.1dB | Vestas R&D department | Item no.: 944406.12 | 15-01-2004 |
| A | | | | | | | | | |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 65 | 90 | mode 0 | Vestas Wind Systems A/S | Item no. 950011.R7 | 25-01-2005 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 80 | 90 | mode 0 | Vestas Wind Systems A/S | Item no. 950011.R7 | 25-01-2005 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 90 | 90 | mode 0 | Vestas Wind Systems A/S | Item no. 950011.R7 | 25-01-2005 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 105 | 90 | mode 0 | Vestas Wind Systems A/S | Item no. 950011.R7 | 25-01-2005 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 65 | 90 | mode 1 | Vestas Wind Systems A/S | Item no. 950011.R7 | 25-01-2005 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 80 | 90 | mode 1 | Vestas Wind Systems A/S | Item no. 950011.R7 | 25-01-2005 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 90 | 90 | mode 1 | Vestas Wind Systems A/S | Item no. 950011.R7 | 25-01-2005 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 105 | 90 | mode 1 | Vestas Wind Systems A/S | Item no. 950011.R7 | 25-01-2005 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 65 | 90 | mode 2 | Vestas Wind Systems A/S | Item no. 950011.R7 | 25-01-2005 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 80 | 90 | mode 2 | Vestas Wind Systems A/S | Item no. 950011.R7 | 25-01-2005 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 90 | 90 | mode 2 | Vestas Wind Systems A/S | Item no. 950011.R7 | 25-01-2005 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 105 | 90 | mode 2 | Vestas Wind Systems A/S | Item no. 950011.R7 | 25-01-2005 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 65 | 90 | mode 3 | Vestas Wind Systems A/S | Item no. 950011.R7 | 25-01-2005 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 80 | 90 | mode 3 | Vestas Wind Systems A/S | Item no. 950011.R7 | 25-01-2005 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 90 | 90 | mode 3 | Vestas Wind Systems A/S | Item no. 950011.R7 | 25-01-2005 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 105 | 90 | mode 3 | Vestas Wind Systems A/S | Item no. 950011.R7 | 25-01-2005 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 65 | 90 | mode 4 | Vestas Wind Systems A/S | Item no. 950011.R7 | 25-01-2005 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 80 | 90 | mode 4 | Vestas Wind Systems A/S | Item no. 950011.R7 | 25-01-2005 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 90 | 90 | mode 4 | Vestas Wind Systems A/S | Item no. 950011.R7 | 25-01-2005 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 105 | 90 | mode 4 | Vestas Wind Systems A/S | Item no. 950011.R7 | 25-01-2005 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 85 | 90 | | Van Grinsen Advies | Kenmerk GR-Doelwijk.TS1.doc | jun-05 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 85 | 90 | | Van Grinsen Advies | Kenmerk GR-Doelwijk.TS1.doc | jun-05 |
| Vestas | V90 | V90-3.0MW | 3000 | 105 | 90 | | Van der Boom Advies | opdrachtnummer 05-269 | 20-12-2005 |

Appendix F:

Transformation of response to wind turbine sound

In order to allow comparisons between studies, Miedema and Vos have suggested standardized transformations of proportion of annoyed measured at different scales, based on previous meta-analyses of Schultz¹. The base is a scale from 0 (no annoyance at all) to 100 (very annoyed). The cut-off point for %A (proportion of respondents annoyed) is 50 and for %HA (proportion of respondents highly annoyed) is 72.

Response to wind turbine sound was in the study WINDFARMperception measured on a 5-point scale, starting with "do not notice" and with point 2 worded "notice, but not annoyed". The scale should start with "no annoyance at all" according to Miedema and Voss. Scale point 1 and 2 were therefore merged so that the scale became a 4-point scale from "not annoyed" to "very annoyed". The boundaries for the new 4-point scale were 0 – 25 – 50 – 75 – 100. For transformation to %A and %HA the following procedure was carried out in accordance with Miedema and Voss:

- %A:
 - Scale points 1, 2 and 3 were set to 0.00 (not annoyed)
 - Scale points 4 and 5 were set to 1.00 (annoyed)
- %HA:
 - Scale points 1, 2 and 3 were set to 0.00 (not annoyed)
 - Scale point 4 was set to $(75 - 72)/(75 - 50) = 0.12$
 - Scale point 5 was set to 1.00 (highly annoyed)

The mean values of the variables %A and %HA for each category of exposure are presented below. The mean values correspond to the prevalence of annoyed and highly annoyed, respectively. In this case, the 95% confidence intervals are calculated in SPSS, i.e. $1.96 \times SE$ (standard error of the mean). This could be questioned, but it simplifies the procedure and it is the common way to calculate the confidence interval of a mean value.


The proportions of respondents annoyed or highly annoyed by wind turbine noise outdoors are presented in table F.1. The proportions of respondents annoyed increased with increasing sound levels up to 40 – 45 dBA, and then decreased.

Table F.1: %A and %HA by wind turbine noise outdoors

| | Sound pressure levels, dBA | | | | |
|---------|----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-----|
| | <30 | 30-35 | 35-40 | 40-45 | >45 |
| n = 708 | 178 | 213 | 159 | 93 | 65 |
| %A | 2 | 8 | 18 | 18 | 12 |
| %HA | 1 | 2 | 7 | 13 | 7 |

¹ H.M.E.Miedema, H.Voss, Exposure-response relationships for transportation noise. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 104 (1998), 3432 - 3445.

The proportions of respondents annoyed and highly annoyed are plotted in figure F.1.




The number of respondents that benefited economically from wind turbines was higher at higher sound levels than at lower. The proportions of respondents that were annoyed or highly annoyed by wind turbine sound were larger when the respondents who benefited from wind turbines were excluded in comparison to all respondents (table F.2).

In table F.2 also the average sound level in each sound level interval is given. This is the logarithmic average of the calculated sound pressure levels of all respondents in that interval.

Table F.2: %A and %HA by wind turbine sound outdoors; only respondents that did not benefit economically from wind turbines

| | Sound pressure levels, dBA | | | | |
|----------------------|----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| sound level interval | <30 | 30-35 | 35-40 | 40-45 | >45 |
| average sound level | 28.1 | 32.7 | 37.4 | 42.7 | 49.0 |
| n = 586 | 166 | 199 | 140 | 60 | 21 |
| %A | 2 | 8 | 20 | 25 | 29 |
| %HA | 1 | 2 | 8 | 19 | 16 |

The proportions of respondents annoyed or highly annoyed by wind turbine sound, but not benefiting economically from the wind turbines, are also shown in figure F.2. The confidence intervals were large, especially at the higher sound levels, due to a low number of respondents not benefiting economically in these group.



Appendix G: Comparison with previous Swedish studies

The present study shows similar results as two previous studies in Sweden. One Swedish study (“study A”) was carried out in 2000 in a flat landscape that was mainly agricultural but also comprised built-up areas ($n = 341$). The second study (“study B”) was carried out in 2005 in complex terrain (hilly or rocky) as well as in flat landscape, including both rural areas and built-up areas ($n = 754$). The levels of sound from wind turbines outside the dwelling of the respondents were calculated with a slightly different model than in the present study, but it is of interest to compare the proportion of respondents that noticed sound at different sound levels despite the differences in calculations. Almost no respondents in the Swedish study benefited economically from wind turbines. The Swedish respondents are therefore compared with the Dutch respondents that did not benefit economically from wind turbines.

The proportion of respondents that could hear sound from wind turbines outside their dwelling in the Dutch study were about the same as in the Swedish study A, carried out in a flat landscape (figure G.1).




Figure G.1: perception of wind turbine sound; comparisons between the Dutch study (only respondents that did not benefit economically) and the Swedish studies A and B (with 95% CI for the Dutch study).

The proportion of respondents that were rather or very annoyed by sound from wind turbines were approximately the same in the Dutch study and in the Swedish study A up to 35 – 40 dBA. The Dutch study showed a lower proportion of annoyed persons at 40 – 45 dBA than the Swedish study A (flat terrain), but a higher than the Swedish study B (mixed terrain).




Figure G.2. Annoyance with wind turbine sound; comparisons between the Dutch study (only respondents that did not benefit economically) and the Swedish studies A and B (with 95% CI for the Dutch study).

Appendix H: Annoyance from road traffic noise

For transformation of the results in this study to the standardized proportion of annoyance proposed by Miedema and Vos see Appendix F. Annoyance from road traffic was measured in two questions in the questionnaire: questions 10-6 and 10-8

Below the mean values of the variables %A and %HA are presented for each category of exposure. The mean values correspond to the prevalence of annoyed and highly annoyed, respectively. In this case, the 95% confidence intervals are calculated in SPSS, i.e. $1.96 \times SE$ (standard error of the mean). This could be questioned, but it simplifies the procedure and it is the common way to calculate the confidence interval of a mean value.

The proportions of annoyed and highly annoyed by road traffic noise were compared with Lden-values of road traffic (Table H.1). The proportions increased with increasing immission levels. Also for annoyance with road traffic noise, the two measurements showed similar result, indicating good internal consistency of the questionnaire.

Miedema and Oudshoorn have presented third grade polynomials for annoyance with road traffic noise based on 18 previous studies [Miedema and Oudshoorn 2001]. Their polynomials do not comprise an intercept. Instead, the Lden-values are subtracted by 37 and 42 respectively to force the curve towards null. Their proposed polynomials are

$$\%A = 0.0001795 \cdot (Lden-37)^3 + 0.021 \cdot (Lden-37)^2 + 0.535 \cdot (Lden-37)$$

$$\%HA = 0.000987 \cdot (Lden-42)^3 - 0.014 \cdot (Lden-42)^2 + 0.512 \cdot (Lden-42)$$

The proportion of annoyed persons by road traffic noise according to these formulae is also shown in tabel H.1.

Table H.1: %A and %HA by road traffic noise outdoors in 5-dB Lden intervals

| Lden: 5-dB intervals | <30 | 30-35 | 35-40 | 40-45 | 45-50 | 50-55 | 55-60 | 60-65 | 65-70 |
|----------------------------|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| <i>Question 10-6</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| n = 715 | 82 | 66 | 96 | 143 | 145 | 111 | 54 | 17 | 1 |
| %A | 0 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 14 | 30 | 47 | 0 |
| %HA | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 37 | |
| <i>Question 18</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| n = 700 | 78 | 64 | 96 | 139 | 142 | 107 | 55 | 18 | 1 |
| %A | 4 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 12 | 21 | 34 | 67 | |
| %HA | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 14 | 41 | |
| <i>Miedema curve</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Lden: midpoint of interval | | 32.5 | 37.5 | 42.5 | 47.5 | 52.5 | 57.5 | 62.5 | |
| %A | | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 14 | 21 | 30 | |
| %HA | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 15 | 25 | |

In figure H.1 the percentages of (severe) annoyance are compared with the standardized curves of Miedema *et al*. It shows that the standard curves match the the 95% confidence intervals of the percentages in this study, except for %A values at 35-40 and 60-65 dBA.




Figure H.1: comparison of percentage annoyed (above) and highly annoyed (below) with raod traffic, with 95% confidence intervals, with standardized percentages from Miedema et al; based on response from questions 10-6 and 18 in questionnaire used in this study.

Appendix I:

Remarks in the questionnaires added by respondents

Most questions in the questionnaire required ticking one of the answering possibilities. To some questions respondents could add a remark. Although the remarks were varied, they could be classified in a small number of categories that seemed appropriate for each question.

Changes in the living environment

Before any specific questions on wind turbines were presented, two questions were posed about changes for the better or worse in the living environment during the last years. To question 7 respondents could add remarks on positive changes, to question 8 on negative changes.

There were 157 remarks on positive changes. These have been categorized as follows in order of prevalence:

- 73 on improvements in the area (walking, cycling, green spaces, playing areas, meeting places, shops, better housing, schools);
- 36 on personal changes;
- 34 on infrastructure (sewage, roads), public transport and (slower/less) traffic;
- 14 on industrial and economical improvements (wind turbines included) and other issues (5).

There were 254 remarks on negative changes. These have been categorized similarly:

- 87 on wind turbines
- 79 on deteriorations in the area (youth, recreation, busier, having to move because of new planning);
- 71 on busier infrastructure and less agriculture;
- 17 on personal changes.

In all, changes in the area were most often mentioned, the positive ones balancing the negative ones in numbers. Infrastructure was the next topic, with twice more negative than positive remarks. Wind turbines were most frequently mentioned in a negative way. Personal changes were least often mentioned, but mostly in a positive way.

Impact of busy roads and wind turbines

To question 13, the first question in the road traffic section, respondents could add a remark on the positive or negative impact of busy roads on the landscape scenery. The 101 remarks can be categorized as:

- 22 were positive (nice trees, no problems/disturbance, easy for a car, lively);
- 29 were neutral (economical necessity, part of society) or (19) not clear about the impact;
- 50 were negative (heavy/fast traffic, spoils the landscape/tranquillity, fragments the countryside, restless).

To question 21, the first question in the wind turbine section, respondents could add a remark on the positive or negative impact of wind turbines on the landscape scenery. The 209 remarks can be categorized as follows:

- 110 were negative on the visual impact (of which 8 specifically mentioned the shadows), mostly because of the inappropriateness in the landscape and the restlessness caused by the movement;
- 27 were positive on the visual impact, mostly because it added a dynamic character or made wind direction and speed readily visible;
- 37 commented on the environmentally friendly character or (7) economical benefits of wind energy, two of these were negative (low yield);
- 16 concerned not visual, but (negative) noise impact.

To question 25 respondents could add a personal characterization of wind turbine sound, other than the eight possibilities given. 26 remarks were given, of which:

- 7 gave a description (liking the sound to an agricultural machine, many frogs, a washing machine, lightly clapping, ticking);
- 7 were clearly positive about it (like music, pleasant, makes one sleep nicely, rhythmic, restful);
- 5 mentioned the changing character of the sound.

Number of visible wind turbines

In question 33 respondents were asked whether they could see one or more turbines from their dwelling or from their garden/balcony. 401 respondents gave a number for the indoor view, 287 for the outdoor view. The numbers are summarized in table I.1. Remarkably, respondents see a lower number outdoors compared to from within the dwelling, the more so when there are less than 15 wind turbines. Perhaps this is because they usually have a garden or balcony on one side of the house, but windows at several sides; or perhaps they have a better view from upstairs windows.

Sounds disturbing sleep and final remarks

In question 42 respondents were asked by which sound(s) their sleep was disturbed. 244 respondents mentioned one or more sources. These can be categorized as follows, in order of prevalence:

- road traffic (in 93 cases of which 17 mopeds/scooters/motorcycles);

| Table I.1: number of wind turbines visible from respondents' dwellings or garden/balcony (as reported by resp. 401 and 287 respondents) | | |
|--|--|----------------|
| Number of wind turbines visible | number of respondents seeing wt's from ... | |
| | dwelling | garden/balcony |
| none | 5 | 3 |
| 1 | 62 | 39 |
| 2 | 63 | 53 |
| 3 | 67 | 47 |
| 4 | 25 | 9 |
| 5 | 25 | 14 |
| 6 | 14 | 14 |
| 7 | 8 | 4 |
| 8 | 16 | 7 |
| 9 | 4 | 3 |
| 10-14 | 39 | 22 |
| 15-19 | 14 | 12 |
| 20-24 | 19 | 18 |
| 25-49 | 18 | 21 |
| 50-74 | 8 | 8 |
| 75 or more | 7 | 7 |
| 'many' | 7 | 6 |

- outdoor music, parties and people, in many cases youth, (42)
- wind turbines (35);
- animals, mostly dogs and cows (26);
- indoor sources, mostly children and –snoring- partner (22);
- neighbours (17);
- agricultural activities (15);
- airplanes (13).

Finally, respondents could add a remark that they thought might be of interest for this study and not sufficiently addressed in this questionnaire. 178 respondents added a remark here, ranging from very personal to more general observations of their living environment. With respect to the topic of this study, 31 remarks referred to wind turbines (of which 9 positively, 22 negatively), 15 to other noise sources and 5 to other supposedly environmental hazards (radiation, waste).