

Some Locations, Sources, and/or Reports that have (are recommending, or are considering) 1± Mile (1500± m) Setbacks from Wind Turbines

1. 10,000 m (**6.2 miles**) exclusion zone recommended (p 90 of this Scottish [report](#)).
2. 10,000 m called for by a [prominent physician](#) (with many references: 2011).
3. 5,000 m (**3.1 miles**). This French [study](#) concluded “wind turbines must not be sited less than 5 km from all habitation, because of infrasound risks.” (2004)
4. 5,000 m - Dr. Robyn Phipps, New Zealand conducted a survey and wrote a detailed [report](#) concluding “wind turbine noise may well extend more than 5 km.” (2007)
5. 5,000 m - Professional engineer [discusses](#) infrasound problems (2016).
6. 4,800 m (**3.0 miles**) from residences – [Divide, North Dakota](#) (2017).
7. 4,000 m (**2.5 miles**) 1 mile *per MW*: [Rutland \(VT\) Regional Planning](#) (2015)
8. 3,220 m (**2.0 miles**) to properly address infrasound. This is found in an outstanding [study](#) done by the town of Heath, Massachusetts (2013)
9. 3,220 m to a rural home – [Umatilla County, Oregon](#) (2011)
10. 3,220 m - Coconino County, Arizona (see [this report](#) page 29: 2011)
11. 3,000 m (**1.9 miles**) for turbines taller than 150 m – [Wiltshire, UK](#) (2012)
12. 3,000 m Poland adopts 10x as [national standard](#) (2016)
13. 3,000 m recommended as [setback](#) by German doctors (2016)
14. 2,600 m (**1.6 miles**) going from 2000 m: examining increasing the recommended distance between wind turbines and the nearest town or village: [Scotland](#) (2013)
15. 2,414 m (**1.5 miles**) from property lines – [Caratunk, Maine](#) (2011)
16. 2,414 m – [Moscow, Maine](#) (2011)
17. 2,414 m – Peru Maine (see [this report](#) page 29: 2012)
18. 2,414 m recommendation of [Dr. Amanda Harry](#) (British physician) (2007)
19. 2,253 m (**1.4 miles**) Planning Minister: Wind turbines should not be less than 1.4 miles from people’s homes - ([Lincolnshire, UK](#): 2012)
20. 2,100 m for 3MW turbines - recommended in [Denmark](#) (2011)
21. 2,010 m (**1.25 miles**) – from property lines in [Woodstock, Maine](#) (2013)
22. 2,000 m (**1.24 miles**) – Poland’s [National Institute of Public Health](#) (2016)
23. 2,000 m – Retexo (a wind energy consultant) [advisory](#) (2014)
24. 2,000 m – by [Director of Finland’s Ministry of Health](#) (2014)
25. 2,000 m – by [Dr. Hazel Lynn](#), who has extensively studied this issue (2014)
26. 2,000 m – by Dr. Robert Thorne’s [study](#) (2014)
27. 2,000 m – [Bavarian law](#) (10x height) (2014)
28. 2,000 m – “[Bad Science Behind Wind Noise Guidelines](#)” study (2013)

29. 2,000 m from a home in the [Haut-Saint-Laurent](#), in the Montérégie, Quebec (2013)
30. 2,000 m restriction: [Cambridgeshire, UK](#) (2013)
31. 2,000 m away from housing in [Scotland](#) (2013)
32. 2,000 m to habitations & 5000 m from agglomerations – [Victoria, Australia](#) (2011)
33. 2,000 m from existing homes proposed in [New South Wales, Australia](#) (2011)
34. 2,000 m advised by [Noise & Health Journal](#) study: “setback distances need to be greater than 2000 m in hilly terrain”. (2011)
35. 2,000 m turbine setback bill [debated by British House of Lords](#) (2011)
36. 2,000 m setback affirmed by Scotland [Government Official](#) (2009)
37. 2,000 m for a 200 m turbine (10x height) - The little [Isle of Anglesey](#), UK (2012)
38. 1,950 m (13 times the turbine height) - [Montville, Maine](#) (2009)
39. 1,950 m (13 times the turbine height) - [Buckfield, Maine](#) (2010)
40. 1,900 m was the distance that this [scientific study](#) found that residents still “expressed annoyance.” (2003)
41. 1,770 m - [Fayette County, Pennsylvania](#) (2008)
42. 1,740 m average of numerous communities found in this excellent [study](#) (2013)
43. 1,609 m (**1.0 mile**) from property lines - [Craven County, NC](#) (2018)
44. 1,609 m from properties - [Buffalo Township, ND](#) (2017)
45. 1,609 m from non-participating property lines - [Letcher Township, SD](#) (2016)
46. 1,609 m from non-participating property lines - [Carteret County, NC](#) (2014)
47. 1,609 m from non-participating property lines - [Sumner, Maine](#) (2013)
48. 1,609 m from non-participating property lines - [Frankfort, Maine](#) (2011)
49. 1,609 m from the nearest existing residence, school, church, hospital, place of employment or public library - [Madison County, Idaho](#) (2011)
50. 1,609 m buffer recommended - [Acoustical Society of America](#) (2010)
51. 1,609 m from inhabited structures - [Trempealeau County, Wisc.](#) (2007)
52. 1,609 m (1 to 1.5 mile) - [UK Noise Association](#) (2006)
53. 1,524 m from non-participating property lines - [Town of Newport, NC](#) (2014)
54. 1,500-2,000 m recommended by this European Human Rights [study](#) (2012)
55. 1,500 m in an environment characterized by a 35 DB ambient noise level [Germany](#)
56. 1,500 m “Weight of expert opinion is that this is the health limit” [study](#) (2015)
57. 1,500 m larger buffer zones needed in [Wales](#) (2012)
58. 1,500 m sleep expert [warns of effects of wind turbines](#) (2012)
59. 1,500 m Acoustical Ecology Institute [Report on Wind Energy Noise Impacts](#) (2009)
60. 1,500 m recommended by [French National Academy of Medicine](#) (2006)

Thanks for the helpful information on this [site](#), and on the [US DOE site](#).

For additions and/or corrections please contact [John Droz](#).

Rev: 3/9/18