<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feet</th>
<th>Meters</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32,808</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>m called for by a prominent physician (with many references)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32,808</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>m: Page 90 of this 10.9 MB report from Scotland recommends a 10,000m exclusion zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,404</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>from all habitation, because of the risks produced by infrasound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,561</td>
<td>3,219</td>
<td>m called for by a prominent physician (with many references)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,561</td>
<td>3,219</td>
<td>m: Page 90 of this 10.9 MB report from Scotland recommends a 10,000m exclusion zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,842</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>m (3km) for turbines greater than 150 metres – Wiltshire, UK 20120713 TIW QLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,842</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>m from homes and forested areas – Poland WCO(proposal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,920</td>
<td>2,414</td>
<td>m from property lines – Catarunk, Maine 2011/11/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,920</td>
<td>2,414</td>
<td>m from property lines – Moscow, Maine (2011/12/29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,392</td>
<td>2,253</td>
<td>m Wind farms should not be less than 1.4 miles from people’s homes (UK) planning minister GWEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,392</td>
<td>2,253</td>
<td>m (1.4 miles) from “a residential property” Lincolnshire, UK QLS Tel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,890</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>m for 3MW recommended in Denmark 2011/12/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,594</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>m (1.25 miles) recommended by this European Human Rights Study pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,601</td>
<td>2,012</td>
<td>Woodstock, Maine WCO AEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,562</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>m from the nearest residence – Haut-Richelieu, Quebec HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,562</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>m from a home and 1 km of a road in the Haut-Saint-Laurent, in the Montérégie, Quebec OWR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,562</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>m to habitations, and 5 km from 21 named agglomerations – Victorian Government, Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,562</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>m unless there is an agreement – Queensland, Australia (2011/04/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,562</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>m Ministry of Social Affairs and Health (Finland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,562</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>m restriction: Cambridgeshire, UK WCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,562</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Telegraph: Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,234</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>m was the distance that this scientific study found that residents still “expressed annoyance.” pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,807</td>
<td>1,770</td>
<td>m / 6,000-foot / 1.1 mile Fayette County PA 2008/06/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,279</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>m (1 mile) from non-participating property lines – Frankfort Maine 2011/11/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,279</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>m (1 mile) from inhabited structures Trempealeau County, Wisc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,279</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>m (1 mile) buffer zone to homes – Hillsdale County, Michigan 2011/07/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,279</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>m (1 to 1.5 mile) – UK Noise Association 2006 – 06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,279</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>m (1 mile) – Sumner, Maine, recently enacted a 1-mile (1.6 km) setback from property lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,921</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>m in an environment characterized by a 35 DB ambient noise level Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,921</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>m for a 150m turbine (10x height) – Bavaria spiegel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,921</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>m for a 150m turbine (10x height) – The little isle of Anglesey in the UK QLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,921</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>m for a 150m turbine (10x tip height) from rural residences – Ellis County, Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,921</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>m Acoustical Ecology Institute Special Report on Wind Energy Noise Impacts (pp 3-4) pdf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,921</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>m recommended by French National Academy of Medecine 2006/03/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,921</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>m recommended by Medical Officer of Heath – N. Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,921</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>m recommended in Wales – depending on the topography and ambient noise levels OWR BBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,921</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>m recommended in England by Dr Hanning WCO TBN2012/10/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,501</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>m (4500 ft) from rural villages Lyme NY May 2008 WCOWT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,999</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>m (4,000 ft) from property line – Rumford Maine 20110930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,999</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>m (4,000 ft) from occupied structures – Clifton, Maine 20110602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,937</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>m / 8 x total turbine height to residences San Diego California 2010/09/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,399</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>2011/11/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,281</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>m to 2km away: Bill would keep wind farms far from homes – The Irish Times WCO April 9, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3,281 1,000 m to habitable building – Halifax, Nova Scotia 2011/08/17
3,281 1,000 metres away from homes – District of Argyle, NS – July 21, 2012 Herald OWR
m setback in place for wind turbines in rural Pictou County (Nova Scotia) Credit: The News |
4,101 1,250 metres away from homes – District of Argyle, NS – July 21, 2012 Herald OWR
m setback in place for wind turbines in rural Pictou County (Nova Scotia) Credit: The News |
3,281 1,000 m (10x rotor diameter) to nearest receptor or residential zoned area – Barnstable County, Massachusetts 2011/04/24
4,101 1,250 m (10x blade diameter) from residential zones – Brewster, Cape Cod 2011/04/27
4,101 1,250 m (10x rotor diameter) Virginia Sept 15 2011
4,101 1,250 m (10x rotor diameter) Goodhue County, Minnesota(20110915)
3,281 1,000 metres between residential housing and wind power plants, a press release issued by the State of
3,281 1,000 Saxony
m (3,000 ft) from property line of nearest non-participating receptor Claybanks Township Michigan
2,999 914 m (3,000 ft) from residential areas Riverside California 2011/04/18
m (6x height) Carteret County ordinance in North Carolina has been long established at 6 times the
total height, measured from the farthest lateral extension of the turbine to the property line
3,005 916 m (6x height) from the nearest residence etc. Cape Vincent, New York 2012/06/20 WCO WTD
2,900 884 m (2,900 ft) Potter County PA 2007/10/10
2,799 853 m (2,800 ft) to closest residence Wareham, Massachusetts 2011/06/02
2,851 869 m (5.5x height) from property line – Lafargeville New York 2011/11/11
2,641 805 m (1/2 mile) from nearest homes Roanoke County Virginia
m (2640 ft) from a residence, and 1500 feet from a property line TIPTON COUNTY, Ind.
2,641 805 m (2640 ft) from residences Union Township Wisconsin 2008/11/13
2,641 805 m Perry NY 2011/05/17
2,641 805 m Rock County, Wisconsin 2008
2,641 805 m National Research Council 2007
2,641 805 m (2460 ft) from dwelling Hartsville NY 2009
m an expert opinion on the noise caused by the wind power plant (Lärmschutzgutachten) would
2,625 800 have to be submitted Bavarian wind power decree
2,500 762 m (2,500 ft) from turbine base to dwelling or building Charlton, Massachusetts 2011/08/17
2,500 762 m (2,500 ft) Allegeny NY 2007/08/28
2,500 762 m Frankstown Township, Blair County, PA 2009
m for a 150m turbine: five (5) times the turbine height from occupied buildings – Antrim New
2,461 750 Hampshire
2,461 750 m to residence or 2,000m to towns Quebec Province 2011/07/13
2,461 750 m for a 150m turbine (5:1 ratio) – Charlestown, Rhode Island (20010810)
2,297 700 m – Saskatchewan – 2011/07/13
2,297 700 m buffer zone – Lincolnshire County, UK WCO
2,297 700 m – the State of Baden-Württemberg (Germany)
2,001 610 m (2,000 ft) + consent + compensation for loss of value Lenawee County, Michigan 2011/08/15
2,001 610 m (2,000 ft) from homes and other buildings Douglas Twp., Illinois 2011/07/20
1,968 600 m / 4 x turbine height Denmark 2009/02/20
1,801 549 m (1800 ft) from nearest property line (better than 550m to homes) State of Wisconsin 2011/03/06
36 dB(A) noise limit Shepherd Flat Oregon 2012/01/03
35 dB(A) night time max noise Libertyville, Illinois 2011/06/29
1. 10,000 m called for by a prominent physician (with many references)
2. 10,000 m: Page 90 of this 10.9 MB report from Scotland recommends a 10,000 m exclusion zone.
3. 5,000 m (3.1 miles). This study from France concluded “wind turbines must not be sited less than 5 km from all habitation, because of the risks produced by infrasound.”
4. 3,219 m (2 miles) to a rural home – Umatilla County, Oregon (20110628)
5. 3,219 m (2 miles) from a residential development – Riverside, California pdf
6. 3,000 m (3km) for turbines greater than 150 metres – Wiltshire, UK 20120713 TIW QLS
7. 3 kilometres from homes and forested areas – Poland WCO(proposal)
8. 2,414 m from property lines – Catarunk, Maine 2011/11/18
9. 2,414 m from property lines – Moscow, Maine (2011/12/29)
10. 2,253 m Wind farms should not be less than 1.4 miles from people’s homes (UK) planning minister GWEI Tel
11. 2,253 m (1.4 miles) from “a residential property” Lincolnshire, UK QLS Tel
12. 2,100 m for 3MW recommended in Denmark 2011/12/22
13. 2,010 m (1.25 miles) recommended by this European Human Rights study pdf
14. 2012 m (6600 ft) new rules would require setbacks of 1.25 miles to non-participating property lines – Woodstock, Maine WCO AEI
15. 2,000 m from the nearest residence – Haut-Richelieu, Quebec HR
16. 2,000 m from a home and 1 km of a road in the Haut-Saint-Laurent, in the Montérégie, Quebec OWR
17. 2,000 m to habitations, and 5 km from 21 named agglomerations – Victorian Government, Australia
18. 2,000 m unless there is an agreement – Queensland, Australia (2011/04/12)
19. 2,000 m Ministry of Social Affairs and Health (Finland)
20. 2,000 m restriction: Cambridgeshire, UK WCO
21. 2km (1.2 miles) to 2.5km (1.6 miles): examining increasing the recommended distance between wind farms and the nearest town or village Wind farm companies warn against wild land ban – Telegraph: Scotland
22. 2,000 m away from housing in Scotland under plans to be unveiled by the Conservatives today 2013/01/29 QLS
23. British House of Lords debates 2km wind farm setback bill
24. 2,000 m from existing homes proposed in New South Wales, Australia 2011/12/23
25. 1,950 m (13 times the turbine height) – Montville Maine 2009/03/28
26. 1,950 m (13 times the turbine height) – Buckfield Maine 2010/06/26
27. 1,900 m was the distance that this scientific study found that residents still “expressed annoyance.” pdf
28. 1,770 m / 6,000-foot / 1.1 mile Fayette County PA 2008/06/20
29. 1,609 m (1 mile) from non-participating property lines – Frankfort Maine 2011/11/01
30. 1,609 m (1 mile) from inhabited structures Trempealeau County, Wisc.
31. 1,609 m (1 mile) buffer zone to homes – Hillsdale County, Michigan 2011/07/23
32. 1,609 m (1 to 1.5 mile) – UK Noise Association 2006 – 06
33. 1,609 m (1 mile) – Sumner, Maine, recently enacted a 1-mile (1.6 km) setback from property lines
34. 1,500 m in an environment characterized by a 35 DB ambient noise level Germany
35. 1,500 m for a 150 m turbine (10x height) – Bavaria spiegel
36. 1,500 m for a 150 m turbine (10x height) – The little isle of Anglesey in the UK QLS
37. 1,500 m for a 150 m turbine (10x tip height) from rural residences – Ellis County, Kansas
38. 1,500 m Acoustical Ecology Institute Special Report on Wind Energy Noise Impacts (pp 3-4) pdf
39. 1,500 m recommended by French National Academy of Medicine 2006/03/14
40. 1,500 m recommended by Medical Officer of Heath – N. Carolina
41. 1,500 m recommended in Wales – depending on the topography and ambient noise levels OWR BBC
42. 1,500 m recommended in England by Dr Hanning WCO TBN2012/10/17
43. 1,372 m (4500 ft) from rural villages Lyme NY May 2008 WCOWTD
44. 1,219 m (4,000 ft) from property line – Rumford Maine 20110930
45. 1,219 m (4,000 ft) from occupied structures – Clifton, Maine 20110602
46. 1,200 m / 8 x total turbine height to residences San Diego California 2010/09/15
47. 1036 m from non-participating property lines recommended by advisory board – Ashfield Mass 2011/11/25
48. 1km to 2km away: Bill would keep wind farms far from homes – The Irish Times WCO April 9, 2012
49. 1,000 m to habitable building – Halifax, Nova Scotia 2011/08/17
50. 1,000 metres away from homes – District of Argyle, NS – July 21, 2012 Herald OWR
51. 1,000 (m) setback in place for wind turbines in rural Pictou County (Nova Scotia) Credit: The News | Published on January 06, 2015 | www.ngnews.ca
52. 1,000 m (10x rotor diameter) to nearest receptor or residential zoned area – Barnstable County, Massachusetts 2011/04/24
53. 1,000 m (10x blade diameter) from residential zones – Brewster, Cape Cod 2011/04/27
54. 1,000 m (10x rotor diameter) Virginia Sept 15 2011
55. 1,000 m (10x rotor diameter) Goodhue County, Minnesota(20110915)
56. there will be a one-kilometre buffer between houses and wind farms – South Australia
57. 1,000 metres between residential housing and wind power plants, a press release issued by the State of Saxon
58. 914 m (3,000 ft) from property line of nearest non-participating receptor Claybanks Township Michigan 2011/03/14
59. 914 m (3,000 ft) from residential areas Riverside California 2011/04/18
60. 900 m (6x height) Carteret County ordinance in North Carolina has been long established at 6 times the total height, measured from the farthest lateral extension of the turbine to the property line www.jdnews.com
61. 900 m (6x height) from the nearest residence etc. Cape Vincent, New York 2012/06/20 WCO WTD
62. 884 m (2,900 ft) Potter County PA 2007/10/10
63. 853 m (2,800 ft) to closest residence Wareham, Massachusetts 2011/06/02
64. 830 m (5.5x height) from property line – Lafargeville New York 2011/11/11
65. 805 m (1/2 mile) from nearest homes Roanoke County Virginia
66. 805 m (2640 ft) from a residence, and 1500 feet from a property line TIPTON COUNTY, Ind. www.wishtv.com 2013/10/17
67. 805 m (2640 ft) from residences Union Township Wisconsin 2008/11/13
68. 805 m Perry NY 2011/05/17
69. 805 m Rock County, Wisconsin 2008
70. 805 m National Research Council 2007
71. 800 m an expert opinion on the noise caused by the wind power plant (Lärmschutzgutachten) would have to be submitted Bavarian wind power decree
72. 762 m (2,500 ft) from turbine base to dwelling or building Charlton, Massachusetts 2011/08/17
73. 762 m (2,500 ft) Allegheny NY 2007/08/28
74. 762 m Frankstown Twshp., Blair County, PA 2009
75. 750 m for a 150 m turbine: five (5) times the turbine height from occupied buildings – Antrim New Hampshire
76. 750 m to residence or 2,000 m to towns Quebec Province 2011/07/13
77. 750 m (2460 ft) from dwelling Hartsville NY 2009
78. 750 m for a 150 m turbine (5:1 ratio) – Charlestown, Rhode Island (20010810)
79. 700 m – Saskatchewan – 2011/07/13
80. 700 m buffer zone – Lincolnshire County, UK WCO
81. 700 m – the State of Baden-Württemberg (Germany)
82. 610 m (2,000 ft) + consent + compensation for loss of value Lenawee County, Michigan 2011/08/15
83. 610 m (2,000 ft) from homes and other buildings Douglas Twp., Illinois 2011/07/20
84. 600 m / 4 x turbine height Denmark 2009/02/20
85. 549 m (1800 ft) from nearest property line (better than 550 m to homes) State of Wisconsin 2011/03/06
86. 36 dB(A) noise limit Shepherd Flat Oregon 2012/01/03
87. 35 dB(A) night time max noise Libertyville, Illinois 2011/06/29