

---

**Jack's Lane Community Liaison Group (CLG) Minutes, 15 March 2010****In attendance:**

Cllr Ann Harvey (AH)  
Cllr Adam Bunkle (AB)  
Cllr Barbara Lynn (BL)  
Cllr Robin Maslin (RM)  
Cllr Terry Austin (TA)  
Cllr Brian Poulson (BP)  
Jonathan Powell (JP)  
Cllr Michael Chenery of Horsburgh (MC)  
Simon Peltenburg (SP), Amy Bambridge - RES  
Phil Briscoe (PB, Chair), Matthew Horn - BPA

**Venue:** Stanhoe Village Hall

**Apologies:** Cllr Gerry Taylor  
Cllr Gary Sandell  
Cllr Jeremy Brettingham Smith  
Cllr Pamela Austin  
Cllr Len Ringwood

**Date:** Monday 15 March 2010

**1. Apologies for absence**

RM gave his apologies for Cllr Len Ringwood. The Chair gave his apologies for Cllr Gary Sandell, Cllr Jeremy Brettingham Smith and Cllr Gerry Taylor. Cllr Terry Austin gave apologies for Cllr Pamela Austin.

**2. Welcome and introduction**

The Chair welcomed the Group to the second meeting to discuss the proposed Jack's Lane wind farm. He reiterated the introduction issued at the first CLG meeting for the benefit of the public in attendance. The Chair highlighted that the Group was set out as a forum of information exchange through bringing together Parish Councils from the immediate area to initiate communications between RES and the local community. The Chair stated that inclusion of other members of the Group would be up to the members to decide. He went on to emphasise that each meeting is open to the public and questions can be submitted to the Group via the members of the Group (Please see **Appendix 2**). Each question submitted one week prior to the next CLG meeting will be addressed by the Group. BP suggested that a poll of local parish residents be taken of the public in attendance. Eight local Parish Councils were represented at the meeting.

The Chair stated that the members had been selected as they are elected representatives for their communities and had chosen the Parish Councils based on immediate proximity to the suggested site. BP stated that he believed that the Parish Councillors were the best placed for membership of the Group. Repeating the question posed at the first CLG meeting, the Chair went on to ask if the Group would like to see any additional members incorporated into the Group. TA suggested the incorporation of a member of CAPE on to the Group and this was seconded by AB. SP stated that he couldn't see any reason why a member of CAPE should not be welcomed on to the CLG. The Group agreed to include a member of CAPE on to the CLG by a majority vote.

The independence of the Chair was questioned. The Chair highlighted that the position of Chair had been offered to each member of the Group at the previous meeting and none had been willing to accept the role. It was agreed by the Group that, although Phil Briscoe was under the employ of RES, he would act as a neutral Chair for the Group.

**It was agreed that:**

Jonathan Powell, from CAPE, would join the Group. Phil Briscoe would remain as Chair of the Group. No further Parish Councils would be invited to join the Group.

**3. Approval of Minutes of Last Meeting**

Four points were raised that had not been incorporated in to the last Minutes (Please see **Appendix 1**)

It was noted that apologies were given for the Vice Chair of Syderstone Parish Council and not South Creake Parish Council. Cllr Peter Poulson is to be changed to Cllr Brian Poulson.

**It was agreed that:**

Pending the issuing of the updates the previous Minutes would be approved.

**4. Terms of Reference Amendments**

The Chair informed the Group that a 15 minute window for public questions had been incorporated into the Terms of Reference. TA highlighted that there is a need for discipline with the way questions are addressed but suggested a further 15 minute window for public questions at the end of the meeting.

**It was agreed that:**

A further 15 minute window for the public to address questions would be included in the Terms of Reference.

**5. Public Questions**

The Chair issued the questions posed to the Group prior to the second meeting.

Q. Will RES release a copy of the raw data from the anemometer mast and, if so, when will it be available? – Mr. Reg Thompson (submitted 24/02/10).

A. SP stated that RES would be releasing the data for the period of noise monitoring at the point of planning submission – this will be a period of six to eight weeks worth of monitoring. It was highlighted that the anemometer mast had been in operation for considerably longer than the period of six to eight weeks. SP stated that the information received from the mast was commercially valuable and would not be released beyond the period required for planning submission. MC questioned if the Development Control Board at King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council demanded the information for the last five years would it receive it? SP reiterated that there is the opportunity for other wind farm manufacturers to be able to use the data and it is therefore commercially sensitive. He went on to highlight that if RES were to release the data it could speed up other applications in the area, as seen in a recent example after an anemometer mast was vandalised.

Q. I'd like to see some independently verified figures comparing the projected output of a turbine system, similar to the ones you're proposing in Jack's Lane, against the actual output as contributed to the grid of the same system once up and running. If possible it would be useful to take the figures from a site with similar geographical & meteorological characteristics as the Jack's Lane site. – Mr. Jeremy Brettingham Smith (submitted 02/03/10).

A. SP highlighted that wind farms typically generate about 30% of capacity. SP informed the Group that Ofgem provide reports on the number of Renewable Obligation Certificates (ROCs) awarded to wind projects and had independently verified that the North Pickenham project had a capacity factor of 31.3% for the site. BP highlighted that Jeremy Brettingham Smith had requested raw data. SP will release the data from the site upon request for non-commercial use.

Q. Will the planning application, especially the Environmental Statement, be available to the public on a computer CD? – Mr. Reg Thompson (submitted 03/03/10).

A. SP stated that copies would be made available on CD. Each Parish Council will be receiving a CD copy.

The Chair went on to open questions to the floor for the first 15 minute window.

Q. RES was questioned about the nationality and ownership of the company.

A. SP highlighted that RES is a wholly British owned company and a subsidiary of Sir Robert McAlpine. It has multiple offices abroad and has experience of building wind farms at an international level.

Q. RES was questioned about the height of the turbines being 600ft and the potential for gear boxes failing every three years.

A. SP highlighted that the turbines would be 80m to the top of the tower and the total height would measure about 414ft to the tip. SP went on to state that although gear boxes do fail he refutes the figure of three years.

Q. RES was questioned about the effects on tourism and if the local tourist industry would be compensated if there is a reduction in tourism.

A. SP responded highlighting an Ipsos Mori poll taken in Scotland stating that 75% would still return to a particular location if a wind farm was erected in the area. SP responded that he believed that compensation would be a legal matter but that compensation had not been given elsewhere as effects were unproven.

Q. JP responded to SP's point about tourism and said that it was completely inaccurate to talk about tourism in this way in North Norfolk. It was a much wider net which included not only short term visitors but also retirees, second home owners and holiday homes as well. This very large group provided the work for a wide range of local people including plumbers, cleaners, gardeners, carpenters, builders, B&Bs etc etc. This list is long and it represents the greatest part of our local economy. Most of these people will move away over time with devastating effect.

A. SP responded stating that he had not seen conclusive evidence that house prices fall with the introduction of wind farms. A local estate agent stated, at the meeting, that he believed that house prices had already reduced in the area due to the wind farm proposals within the area.

Q. RES was questioned if it would give assurances that it would not develop on the Bluestone farm site in the future.

A. SP stated that if the opportunity to develop on the Bluestone site arose it would consider it and a completely new application would have to be submitted. He highlighted that an application from another developer could also be submitted for the Bluestone site.

Q. MC asked if RES were in competition from Eon to develop their site first and if ice could form on the blades.

A. SP stated that, yes, RES would like to have their application in prior to the other developers and that ice does form on wind farm blades but that it is very unlikely at this site. GT went on to question the coincidence behind the timing of interest in the area by three developers. GT went on

to question if RES had colluded with the other developers, highlighting Bellenden's work alongside the BWEA. The Chair highlighted that although Bellenden has worked alongside the BWEA there was not enough contact to be able to know what Eon's intentions for the site. SP went on to state that he has sat on various BWEA Boards and the relationship between developers is more of competition than collusion. SP went on to highlight that the RES application was the result of a natural progression and could not comment about Eon's reasoning about current interest in the site. SP went on to state that if other developers put in an application for a wind farm in the area then they would have to submit planning applications with any other developments already in the planning system being considered in their environmental assessments.

Q. MC went on to ask when an application for Jack's Lane may be submitted.

A. SP responded that if RES receive significant levels of information from assessments of the site and depending on feedback from the public consultation exhibitions, planning could be submitted in a few months.

Q. RES was asked if lights would be placed on the wind turbines.

A. SP stated that 25 candela lights or infra red lights would likely to be placed at the furthest reaches of the wind farm site.

#### **6. Jack's Lane Project Update**

Amy Bambridge informed the Group that the newsletters had been issued with the proposed layout for the site. Public montages will be available at the public consultation exhibitions which will be taking place.

#### **7. Planning Timetable Update**

SP informed the Group that there was nothing further to report.

#### **8. Newsletter & Exhibition Update**

Amy Bambridge informed the Group that the newsletter had been issued to 5,000 homes in the local area. Some members of the public highlighted that they had not received copies. Amy informed the Group that RES purchases databases of addresses from the Royal Mail and some omissions do occur. Amy informed the Group that the next newsletter would be issued in June/July.

The public consultation exhibitions will be taking place at:

- Tuesday 30 March, 3pm – 8pm at North Creak Village Hall
- Wednesday 31 March, 10am – 4pm at Stanhoe Village Hall
- Sunday 11 April, All Day at Syderstone Village Hall

Amy Bambridge informed the Group that each exhibition will be exactly the same and had been staggered to ensure maximum attendance.

TA expressed concern over the figure released by Renewables East, quoted on the RES newsletter, that in achieving the 2020 targets for renewable energy production in the East of England over 24,000 jobs and £1billion of GDP could be generated. TA questioned how this could be achieved. Amy Bambridge highlighted that areas such as Great Yarmouth and Lowestoft had seen a considerable push for job creation in the renewable energy sector.

#### **9. Wind farm Visits**

Amy Bambridge informed the Group that a coach would be laid on for a visit to a working wind farm on the morning of 11 April and would then take people back for the public consultation

exhibition at Syderstone village hall. Amy informed the Group that she had been trying to arrange such a visit for North Pickenham or Swaffham wind farm. SP emphasised that it was important to take any interested parties to an equivalent site to the one proposed at Jack's Lane. Amy informed the Group that as many coaches as necessary would be provided for the visit and that she had received about ten requests for a site visit so far. JP stated that he didn't believe it was appropriate for the CLG to attend a site visit as a group.

### **10.Future Meeting Dates**

The Chair highlighted that at the last meeting the frequency that the CLG would meet was agreed to be every two months. He went on to ask if the Group was still happy to do so. AB suggested that meetings should take place every month and TA agreed. The Chair suggested that meetings should take a thematic approach over the course of the next few meetings to address issues such as noise and transport. SP asked if any other issues should be addressed and AH suggested cabling. AB highlighted that the next meeting would be taking place after the public exhibitions and that the Group would be keen to cover the noise issue at the next meeting.

### **It was agreed that:**

The next meeting would take place on 14 April at Syderstone village hall if available. SP suggested that depending on availability of the RES noise expert the next meeting should be used to discuss noise issues. It was also agreed that there should be a meeting on 19 May.

### **11.Any Other Business**

The Chair asked the Group members if they were happy to have their contact details published at the bottom of the Minutes. The Group were happy for their contact details to be published.

Amy Bambridge asked how the Minutes could be distributed more efficiently as many do not have internet access. The Group agreed that the Minutes should go to the Members of the CLG who can publish them if either confirmed or clearly highlighted as being unconfirmed.

AH raised concern over the effects of the turbines on pink footed geese. SP highlighted that RES had consulted with the RSPB about the effects of a potential wind farm on local birdlife. SP highlighted that although a collision can never be discounted the reduction of turbines to six has reduced the possibility and there is potential for habitat management to discourage birds away from the site; including not growing sugar beet between the turbines. SP informed the Group that if the RSPB oppose the site then it is unlikely to receive planning permission. SP also highlighted to the Group that around 20,000 geese were shot each year in the UK. MC stated that problems may occur for the geese on foggy days. MC went on to articulate concerns for Stone-curlew, Montagu's Harriers and Marsh Harriers in the area. SP stated that he had discussed such birds with the RSPB and the site was some distance away from nesting sites and should not be a problem. Concern was articulated for bats in the local area. SP informed the Group that wind turbines can cause a barotrauma in bats, however, at sites like Jack's Lane noctule bats are those considered at greatest risk as they fly quite high. The use of the site by noctule bats is low.

JP stated that RES had come to the wrong place to develop the wind farm and the effects of the development will threaten potential incomers to the area. JP went on to state that the development was about money and profit for the developer and that developments should be situated in places where people don't live. JP stated that no benefit would come to the local community through the development. JP questioned if electricity bills would go up with onshore wind farms. AH stated that they would.

JP questioned why SP was involved in the wind farm development. SP stated that he believed strongly in wind farm technology and that he was doing whatever he can to address climate

change. SP went on to highlight that offshore sites are taking a long time to come to fruition and many investors are pulling out of sites due to costs and therefore sees onshore developments as a suitable solution.

TA asked SP how many permanent jobs would be created by the development of six turbines. SP responded that there would be the equivalent of one permanent job created for the site.

MC asked RES if the electorate and the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council Development Control Board did not want the development whether RES would go to appeal. SP stated that RES would look at the reasons for the rejection and if there weren't strong planning reasons behind the decision they would go to appeal.

The meeting opened up to a second 15 minute public question period.

Q. RES was asked why it had chosen this part of Norfolk and did not develop in places that are not beautiful.

A. SP informed the Group that when selecting a site there are limitations such as wind speed, population distribution, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and National Park land. He stated that it was difficult to find areas that were not constrained and that throughout the UK people state that their local area is a spot of significant beauty.

Q. RES was asked, if it was proven that people suffer health problems due to the wind farm and it was a problem that could not be resolved would they remove the wind farm and if this occurred would compensation be paid by RES.

A. SP answered that RES would first seek to fix the problem that was perceived to be causing health problems but if they couldn't they would probably be forced to remove the problem turbine. SP stated that he was unsure what the standard guidance was regarding compensation.

Q. SP was asked how much RES was paying the farmer for the site rental and if it would be public money used to pay the farmer

A. SP highlighted it would not be reasonable to answer how much the rental would be and that the money would not be public money.

Q. RES was asked if it was proven that a majority expressed concern over the development of the wind farm would RES halt its application.

A. SP stated that no it wouldn't, but he would try and find out why people didn't want the wind farm and try and address any concerns. SP went on to emphasise that he believed it was a good project that had been sensitively designed.

Q. RES was asked what can the community do to stop the project going ahead.

A. SP informed the Group that the project would probably be submitted to King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council in June or July and submissions can be made by the public opposing the development to the Council and the relevant Planning Officer for the site.

Q. RES was asked if there would be a legally binding contract for the after sale of the turbines.

A. SP answered that the removal of the turbines would be part of the planning conditions for the site.

Q. RES was asked if the reduction in number of turbines was a PR exercise and if six turbines would be the limit of production.



A. SP stated that he would have outlined the final turbine layout at the last meeting, however, the negotiations with Ms Papworth were still ongoing and was not a suitable time to discuss the issue in public. SP stated that it was his intention to let everyone know at the same time, via the newsletter, about the proposed layout of the site. SP highlighted that the six turbine layout was sensitive to the site and that they had not crammed turbines into the site. JP stated that the public should not be misled by RES and requested assurances that SP would not be dishonest. SP stated that he would be honest but sometimes he would be unable to answer questions. AB and AH highlighted their concern over SP's answer at the last CLG about an agreement being made for the site between the landowners and RES. AB articulated his anger at being embarrassed about the answers he gave to his community having been informed by RES that an agreement had been made. AB went on to demand that the CLG be a forum where everyone is honest and if RES cannot answer a question, due to commercial sensitivity, then SP needs to highlight that at the meeting. SP informed the Group that though the statement about the site was factually true it was potentially misleading. SP went on to state that he was embarrassed about the incident and that he would highlight if he cannot answer a question at future CLG meetings.

Q. RES was asked about the transport of the turbines to the site.

A. SP stated that the lorries used for transport are very large and that some hedges would need to be moved back away from the road. SP informed the Group that the hedges would be replaced with an indigenous species for the area after the traffic route is widened.

Q. RES was asked how much would be generated as profit from each turbine. AH stated that Nigel Farage had put a figure of £300,000 subsidisation generated each year by each turbine.

A. SP stated that he couldn't say.

Q. RES was asked how long it would take to construct the wind farm.

A. SP answered that the construction takes 12 months from digging the foundations to powering up. SP informed the Group that the tracks to the site would take 2/3 months then the foundations would be put in place and then the turbines would be erected. SP went on to inform the Group that the work tends to be carried out in intervals where there will be multiple lorries on one day and extended periods of time without any construction traffic.

The Chair concluded the meeting by reiterating the dates for the public consultation exhibition and stating that although the Group meetings were not mandatory for RES to initiate he hoped they were better than just a newsletter. The Chair finished by stating that questions are welcomed and should be directed through the relevant member of the CLG one week prior to the next meeting so that they can be incorporated into the agenda before it is sent out.

**The meeting closed at 8:55pm.**

**The next meeting will be held at 7pm on Wednesday 14 April, Syderstone village hall.**

---

## Appendices

### Appendix 1 - Minute Corrections (03/02/10)

- 1) RES were asked if permission had been granted by the landowners to erect turbines at the proposed site. SP stated that RES had reached agreement for the proposed turbines.
  - 2) AH questioned the potential effects of shadow flicker at the site. SP stated that RES would be conditioned to avoid shadow flicker effects and that the proposed turbines are over 950m from all houses - this is more than ten rotor diameters distance and so shadow flicker will not occur.
  - 3) AB raised the issue of noise generated by the turbines and in particular the work of Dr Nina Pierpont. SP highlighted that Dr Pierpont is a paediatrician and not a noise expert. He went on to emphasise that her research appears to be based on ten individual families around the world that have complained about noise issues surrounding wind farms. SP highlighted that to his knowledge, of the 250 wind farms in the UK there is only one ongoing case surrounding noise. Amy Bambridge emphasised that Dr Pierpont's research does not stand up to scientific scrutiny highlighting that the study has a sample of only ten individual cases. Amy suggested a special meeting with RES' noise experts. The issue of a well know noise concern near a wind farm in Lincolnshire was addressed by the Group. SP informed the CLG that RES noise experts had requested to make noise measurements in the home of the individual in Lincolnshire but were refused permission. SP emphasised that to his knowledge only one member of the community near the Lincolnshire site had issued a concern about noise generated by the wind farm. GT suggested that the CLG ask the community around the Bicker Fen wind farm about their experiences. SP highlighted that the Bicker wind farm was located on a completely different topography to the Jack's Lane site which has a rolling landscape. GT stated that the onus should be up to individuals to go to a wind farm site and listen to it working.
- TA questioned if there was the potential for the project to expand at a later date. SP answered that it was a possibility, as another developer might propose a project on adjacent land. Should RES try to develop more turbines they would need to apply for planning permission and would need to do various surveys to demonstrate whether such expansion had acceptable environmental effects. SP informed the Group that if it is considered that the expansion was not acceptable then planning permission would not be granted.



**Appendix 2 - Group contact details**

- **Chair**

**Phil Briscoe**

18 Swan Court  
9 Tanner Street  
London  
SE1 3LE  
0207 234 3333  
07968 807377  
[philbriscoe@bellenden.co.uk](mailto:philbriscoe@bellenden.co.uk)

- **North Creake**

**Cllr Adam Bunkle**

8 West Street  
North Creake  
Norfolk  
NR21 9LQ  
01328 738 103  
[abunkle@aol.com](mailto:abunkle@aol.com)

**Cllr Barbara Lynn**

108 West St  
North Creake  
NR21 9LH  
01328 738 067  
[Barbara.lynn999@btinternet.com](mailto:Barbara.lynn999@btinternet.com)

**Cllr Jeremy Brettingham Smith**

[jezzab@mac.com](mailto:jezzab@mac.com)

- **South Creake**

**Cllr Robin Maslin**

4 Avondale Road  
South Creake  
Fakenham  
NR21 9PH  
01328 823 350  
[robin@rmaslin.fsnet.co.uk](mailto:robin@rmaslin.fsnet.co.uk)

**Cllr Ann Harvey**

Mayfield  
2 Avondale Road  
South Creake  
Fakenham  
NR21 9PH

01328 823 234

- **Stanhoe**

**Cllr Terry Austin**

Longwall Barn  
Bircham Road  
Stanhoe  
Norfolk  
PE31 8PT  
01485 518 033  
[terryaustin@talk21.com](mailto:terryaustin@talk21.com)

- **Syderstone**

**Cllr Gerry Taylor**

2 Rectory Gardens  
Syderstone  
King's Lynn  
Norfolk  
PE31 8SD  
01485 578 524  
[Cobblers2u@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:Cobblers2u@yahoo.co.uk)

**Cllr Brian Poulson**

Little Barn  
2 Beechwood Court  
Syderstone  
Norfolk  
PE31 8TR  
[poulson@btinternet.com](mailto:poulson@btinternet.com)

- **CAPE**

**Jonathan Powell**

Creak House  
North Creak  
Fakenham  
NR21 9LG  
01328 730 113  
Email contact via: [www.creakesaction.com](http://www.creakesaction.com)

- **RES**

**Simon Peltenburg**

RES UK & Ireland Ltd

Beaufort Court

Egg Farm Lane

Kings Langley

WD4 8LR

01923 299 233

[simon.peltenburg@res-ltd.com](mailto:simon.peltenburg@res-ltd.com)

**Amy Bambridge**

RES UK & Ireland Ltd

Beaufort Court

Egg Farm Lane

Kings Langley

WD4 8LR

01923 299 328

[amy.bambridge@res-ltd.com](mailto:amy.bambridge@res-ltd.com)