

Jack's Lane Community Liaison Group (CLG) Minutes, 14 April 2010

In attendance:

Cllr Ann Harvey (AH)
Cllr Adam Bunkle (AB)
Cllr Barbara Lynn (BL)
Cllr Robin Maslin (RM)
Cllr Brian Poulson (BP)
Cllr Gerry Taylor (GT)
Cllr Mark Roche (MR)
Jonathan Powell (JP)
Cllr Michael Chenery of Horsbrugh (MC)
Cllr Nicholas Ullswater (NU)
Simon Peltenburg (SP), Dr Jeremy Bass - RES
Phil Briscoe (PB, Chair), Matthew Horn - BPA

Venue: Syderstone Village Hall

Apologies: Cllr Terry Austin
Cllr Gary Sandell
Cllr Jeremy Brettingham Smith
Cllr Pamela Austin

Date: Wednesday, 14 April 2010

1. Apologies for absence

The Chair gave apologies for Cllr Jeremy Brettingham Smith, Cllr Terry Austin, Cllr Pamela Austin and Cllr Gary Sandell.

2. Welcome and introduction

The Chair welcomed the Group to the third meeting of the proposed Jack's Lane wind farm CLG. He outlined the purpose of the Group for the benefit of the members of public present at the meeting and asked the members of the Group to introduce themselves.

The Chair highlighted that the meeting was a special issue-led meeting to discuss noise issues surrounding wind farms. He went on to outline the agenda for the meeting which would include a PowerPoint presentation by Dr Jeremy Bass. He asked if the Group was happy to have an extended period of public questions during the meeting to ensure that all could address particular concerns to the Group and Dr Bass. The Group agreed that as many questions as possible should be addressed during the meeting.

3. Approval of Minutes of Last Meeting

The Chair asked if any amendments were to be issued to the previous set of unconfirmed Minutes. JP and AH articulated amendments to the unconfirmed Minutes (Please see Appendix A, at the bottom of these Minutes, for the original text and relevant amendments).

The Group agreed to confirm the previous set of Minutes with the relevant additions suggested by JP and AH.

4. Presentation: Dr Jeremy Bass - RES noise expert (it is beneficial to have the slides from the [noise presentation](#) open alongside the notes listed below)

The Chair asked JB to begin his presentation on noise for the Group.

JB introduced himself as the Senior Technical Manager for RES and highlighted his responsibility for the company focuses on noise assessments for wind farms. He went on to state that he hoped his presentation would address issues relevant to the Jack's Lane site and other noise concerns that may be raised by those present. JP asked what qualifications JB holds. JB informed the Group that he has a PhD in Physics from Strathclyde University, he is a member of the Institute of Acoustics, was a member of IEC 61400-11: 'Wind turbine generator systems - Part 11: Acoustic noise measurement techniques', where he has been the primary UK expert for ten years, he has attended and spoken at various conferences on noise and has worked on wind farm projects throughout the UK, US and other locations abroad. JP asked if JB was a medical doctor to which JB replied he is not.

JB outlined the format for his presentation stating that he would discuss various issues including wind noise guidance and legislation, outline an assessment of the Jack's Lane site, discuss Jane Davis and Dr Nina Pierpont's work, and would go into detail about the "leaked" Whitehall report on noise issues surrounding wind farms. He stated he would then take questions from the CLG and members of the public. JB was questioned if ETSU-R-97 guidance on noise was out of date by a member of the public. JB informed the Group that national planning guidance states that ETSU is the appropriate form of assessment for noise assessment for a wind farm and that this has been reiterated in Government statements issued as recently as July 2007

Wind Farm Noise Assessment

JB went through the first slide outlining how noise assessments are made stating that the crosses ([outlined on slide 1.1](#)) indicate turbines and the red dots indicate areas of housing. JB went on to state that, at the planning stage, the developer is required to demonstrate that the noise impact from the turbines is acceptable for neighbouring residences. JB went on to outline how noise limits are defined referring to various instruments including the Welsh Technical Advice Note (TAN) 8 and the Planning Policy Statement 22 (on renewable energy) which both state that ETSU should be used to gauge noise immission (the noise that is experienced at a location) levels for wind farms no matter how old turbines are. JB went on to state that ETSU aims to provide a reasonable degree of protection to residents near to wind farms whilst ensuring that the national agenda of reducing the effects of climate change is addressed. He went on to highlight that ETSU sets out boundaries of acceptable noise levels for both day and night time and has an absolute limit of noise levels that must not be breached.

ETSU dictates that a minimum of seven days must be monitored by a sound level meter to assess background noise at a proposed site. JB informed the Group that RES implements an initial assessment above this figure normally lasting between one to three months. Once the noise has been measured an average noise level is determined for the site (slide 1.5). Once the

average background noise levels have been gauged ETSU dictates that the noise of the wind farm must not exceed the set limit of acceptable noise levels – the black line on slide 1.6 represents the absolute limit of noise levels for the site. ETSU sets the lower acceptable limit for noise levels generated by turbines as 35 – 40 dB, with the choice of value within this range being determined by a number of factors.

A member of the public suggested that the measurements of noise are not made for all wind directions around the site. JB informed the Group their studies do incorporate all directions for monitoring sound. JB went on to inform the Group that acceptable limits of noise may be increased if the property is owned by the landowner involved in the wind farm. A member of the public asked if all six turbines in unison would be considered when assessing noise levels. JB informed the Group that it would and that when assessing a site for noise, a propagation model is used that takes into consideration how noise is dispersed through various environmental conditions including humidity, wind speeds, topography etc. JB stated that if the predicted noise levels are below the ETSU limits then it will satisfy the guidance set out for planning.

A member of the public asked if the ETSU model of noise assessment was used by all developers. JB informed the Group that no developer would be permitted to initiate a site without having first been assessed according to the ETSU methodology. SP informed the Group that on some Brownfield sites some Environmental Health Officers (EHOs) may say there is no need for an assessment if they felt that the background noise levels were so high that such assessment would not be necessary. JB was asked if ETSU incorporated amplitude modulation in the assessment. JB informed the Group that it did, he went on to state that RES used a commercial model for general noise propagation predictions called ISO9613 Part 2, which is commonly available and can be used by anybody. JB highlighted that it was not only RES that used this model and that it is used by many other commercial groups. It was determined to be the most appropriate form of noise propagation model for wind farms through experimental research using a loud speaker system set at a height of 35m and measurements of noise levels in various topographical scenarios. A member of the public asked if the elevation in height of the noise from 35m to 400ft would affect the outcome of such calculations. JB informed the Group that in principle it would not, as the physics would be the same. In practical terms, increasing the height of a noise source would result in two opposing effects: reducing the noise level as the source of the sound is further away, but increasing it as any barrier effects are reduced.

Jack's Lane Wind Farm Noise

JB went on to discuss the specifics of the Jack's Lane project. JB introduced the noise assessment overview (slide 2.1) for Jack's Lane. He stated that the map outlined the best practice assessment of noise at the proposed Jack's Lane site. The map highlights the location of the six turbines assumed to be a 2.3MW Siemens turbine with a hub height of 80m. The black & white symbols represent properties and the red & white symbols represent properties where noise assessments were taken. SP highlighted that the closest property is 950m from the site and the others are all over 1km from the site. A member of the public stated that when the site is extended beyond the six turbines then the properties would be closer to the wind farm. SP highlighted that RES are only proposing six turbines, and went on to state that if RES

decided to extend the site then they would need to submit a new planning application for that larger scheme.

JB went on to state that the outermost ring (on slide 2.2) represented an area 35 dB(A) or higher, he highlighted that only three properties would be affected by the outer ring, all other properties would not be affected. JP requested a copy of the noise map. GT suggested that the slides from the meeting should be made available to the public. JB stated that he would have to look at the copyright for a few slides but believed it would be ok. GT suggested that printed copies were distributed for those without internet.

A member of the public asked if RES could guarantee that people won't hear the turbines when asleep. JB stated that he could not guarantee that you would not hear it, noise levels would be so low that hearing it would be unlikely and that sleep would not be disturbed. JB went on to state that if a noise issue develops after the completion of the project then individuals can issue proceedings to prove noise disturbance against the development.

JB went on to indicate how RES went about taking measurements for the wind farm site (slide 2.2). JB informed the Group that the sites for measuring the sound were chosen in conjunction with the local authority and that RES measured noise readings at these sites for 43 days, where ETSU guidance only demands seven days of readings. JB went on to state that after the readings were taken it was shown that the site adheres to ETSU regulation with the smallest margins of noise levels below derived noise limits is -0.8 dB and, if the property of the landowner is excluded, this margin is significantly greater.

Amplitude Modulation

JB moved on to discuss Julian and Jane Davis. A member of the public informed the Group that Jane Davis had come to the area to give a presentation. A member of the public went on to state that ETSU does not factor in amplitude modulation as it did not exist when ETSU was written. JB highlighted that ETSU did incorporate amplitude modulation but it was referred to as 'blade swish' at this time. JB went on to outline what ETSU states about blade swish (see slide 3.2).

JB went on to highlight that in 2006 the Government commissioned Salford University to do a review into noise complaints concerning wind farms. The review highlighted that of 133 sites 27 had reported some sort of noise complaint. Of the 27 the majority of the complaints were teething problems caused by issues such as faulty gear boxes. JB informed the Group that RES has a considerable warranty on the blades and gearboxes used and would ensure that the supplier replaced either if there was a problem identified. A member of the public asked how long they would take to be changed. JB stated that RES would look to do it as soon as possible. A member of the public stated that the study done by Salford University was flawed as the older turbines are located further away from properties. JB stated that this was untrue and that in a lot of cases old turbines are actually located closer to properties than new developments. JB went on to highlight that only one occasion has the noise from a wind turbine been designated a 'statutory nuisance' and the installed turbines were subsequently shut down at various periods when the turbine was previously causing problems. JB went on to state that only four sites were identified by the Salford University report to have an amplitude modulation problem and, after remedial action, only one site is currently still deemed to be affected by the

problem – Deeping St. Nicholas. JB stated that they do not understand why there is a problem at this site. A member of the public stated that a study by Barbara Frey showed that 22 out of 28 sites developed by RES had received a noise complaint. JB refuted this statement and stated that, if this was the case, then he would not have enough time to do a presentation as he would be so busy.

JB went on to outline where the noise is generated by the turbine. He highlighted a study by Stefan Oerlemans that 99% of the noise is generated by a single blade at a time and only on one side of the turbine (as seen in slide 3.4). JB went on to state that this area is where the turbulent boundary layer is cut by the back of the blade and creates noise. Noise that is perceived by someone at ground level is generated from noise directed forward and down, and backward and down, from the blade. JB went on to state that peak to peak noise levels of amplitude modulation for a wind turbine blade is about 3-5 dB. JB stated that he could not comment directly on the Jane Davis case as she is currently fighting the case in court and would not like to pre-judge the outcome, however, he stated that it could be a problem with the specific model of turbines at that site. He went on to make three statements:

- 1) It is extremely rare for noise/amplitude modulation to become a problem and if it does it can be mitigated.
- 2) An amplitude modulation noise planning condition is being formulated to control the noise generated by wind farms
- 3) Amplitude modulation is unlikely to happen at Jack's Lane

Referring to slide 3.5, GT asked what NRMS stood for. JB stated that it stood for 'Noise Reduction Management System', a system of operating the turbines, based on wind speed, direction and time of day.

JB went on to outline a diagram of low frequency noise in relation to different vehicles for comparison. The inference from this was that wind turbines are not significant sources of low frequency noise.

Dr Nina Pierpont & Wind Turbine Syndrome

JB moved on to a discussion about Dr Nina Pierpont. JB stated that Dr Nina Pierpont is a paediatrician who has diagnosed an alleged condition called Wind Turbine Syndrome (WTS). Dr Pierpont has highlighted various physical and psychological symptoms from WTS including tinnitus, headaches, anxiety and sleeplessness. JB went on to state that Dr Pierpont's study is based solely on 10 families from around the world that Dr Pierpont had chosen as the basis of her evidence chosen from a grouping of 1,000 responses found through an anti wind farm website. JB went on to highlight that Dr Pierpont did not conduct any physical examinations on the individuals and conducted her research via telephone and email. JB went on to state that many of the respondents used by Dr Pierpont already suffered from significant hearing disorders and was not a good starting point to assess problems felt by the sample studied. A member of the public highlighted that many people around the Jack's Lane area had hearing problems too. A member of the public asked what qualifications Dr Pierpont possessed. JB replied that she was a paediatrician. JP stated that Dr Pierpont has a Ph.D. in behavioural ecology from Princeton and an M.D degree from the Johns Hopkins School of Medicine and certified paediatrician.

JB went on to state that Dr Pierpont investigated cases within a range of 350m to a wind turbine which he believes is far too close for a suitable assessment in light of current distances required for properties to be away from turbines. He stated that he believed that Dr Pierpont had rediscovered 'noise annoyance'. JB also went on to highlight that usually when releasing an academic report peers would critique the work prior to submission, JB stated that this did not happen with Dr Pierpont's work.

A member of the public stated that the research into wind farm noise and public health was not an exact science and that more research needed to be pursued, JB agreed. A member of the public questioned why they should believe an employee of RES about noise issues. JB stated that yes, he is an employee of RES, however, he questioned the point of him lying due to the fact that if the wind farm was erected it would merely be taken down if it did not adhere to noise regulations. JB went on to state that the NHS had reviewed Dr Pierpont's report and stated that: *"there is no conclusive evidence that wind turbines have an effect on health or are causing the symptoms described as 'WTS'"*. A member of the public asked what evidence was used by the NHS. JB stated that the report used a scientific analysis of Dr Pierpont's work and can be seen as an objective analysis of her evidence. JB went on to reiterate that Dr Pierpont's work is not a conclusive study.

A member of the public stated that RES should take responsibility for potential noise effects of the turbines and should be proving that noise issues won't be a concern. JB stated that he was reflecting the view of both independent examiners and the NHS about Dr Pierpont's work. MC stated that he had been in the NHS since 1976 and asked who was incorporated in the NHS Knowledge Service (the Group that initiated the study into Dr Pierpont's work). He went on to ask if the Group included psychologists and psychiatrists. JB stated that he would find out for MC. JB went on to highlight the review of wind turbine sound and health effects by an independent expert panel entitled *"Wind Turbines Sound and Health Effects"*. JP asked who had commissioned the review. JB stated that it had been commissioned by the American and Canadian Wind Energy Associations but was conducted by an independent panel of experts. He stated that their conclusions were similar to those of the NHS Knowledge Service.

'Whitehall Cover-Up' of Low Frequency Noise

JB went through the alleged Whitehall cover-up of information regarding a report on low frequency noise generated by wind farms. JB stated that the Whitehall cover-up allegedly relates to this report. In the released documentation the report outlines work done at three problem wind farm sites (as discussed earlier in the meeting) where low frequency noise and infrasound were investigated. The report stated that infrasound and low frequency noise were unlikely to be the cause of the problems at the three sites but it speculates that amplitude modulation may have been causing the problems. The Government recommended that a noise working group was formed to understand why problems were seen at these sites and the Group, alongside Salford University, concluded that ETSU is still the best method of calculation for noise levels at the site. In 2009 Mike Hulme requested that he be allowed copies of the notes on the study under a freedom of information act. He was sent through three draft copies which had notes written on them that were believed to have been suppressed in the final document. JB spoke to the author of the study who responded to him that he had not had his opinions suppressed in the final report.

A member of the public stated that the noise data from the Den Brook wind farm site had been ruled by a judge as having serious errors. JB refuted the claim and stated that there were not serious errors in the noise data, a judge had never stated that in a High Court and the case did not go to the court of appeal.

The Chair read out a question posed by Jeremy Brettingham Smith in his absence:

"I would suggest that someone speaks to the issue of low-frequency noise as I have heard that some residents of Burnham Overy Staithe sense a pulsating coming from the off-shore installations in the Wash when the wind is in that quarter (NNW)"

JB stated that this was unlikely and that he would like to see evidence supporting noise reaching the shore generated by wind turbines.

BP asked if in an array of wind turbines which are not operating at the same frequency would there be peaks of noise that would reinforce each other and exacerbate noise levels. JB stated that this could be true if turbines were producing coherent noise but not incoherent noise. He went on to state that if this was a common problem it would have been observed and studied. BP went on to ask whether the disposition of the individual turbines and the spacings between the turbines could cause coordinated peaks in noise levels. JB stated that it hasn't occurred in the past and would not know how to conduct such research and would not pursue any until a complaint had been made of this sort. BP went on to ask if any theoretical models had been made for such an issue by RES. JB stated that they haven't been investigated and having never heard of any cases of it happening were unlikely to do so. BP expressed his concern that with many unknowns about noise peaks how anyone could build wind farms. BP went on to state that RES has not investigated individual noise complaints regarding their wind farms. JB stated that this was not true and that RES has done six months of studies about complaints at a site in Cornwall. He went on to state that one of the things preventing advancement in the area of amplitude modulation was that there was so little data available in the public domain to study, and there has only been one wind farm where amplitude modulation has been an apparently unaddressed concern.

5. Public Questions

The Chair read out the following question submitted to Terry Austin to be addressed to RES:

"Our house is the nearest to the proposed development. If we find the noise to be intolerable and wish to move away, but find that our house is devalued and so have to sell for a much lower figure than would have been the case without the wind farm, will we receive compensation from RES?"

SP stated that if the noise was deemed to be intolerable by a member of the community then an injunction could be used to stop the wind farm from creating that noise should it be deemed a nuisance by the relevant authority, however, there would be no compensation. Simon went on to state that statistical studies had shown that house prices do not drop near wind farms in the long term. MR asked why RES is paying the landowner and not the community and why is

RES industrialising the landscape. SP denied that RES was industrialising the landscape and that six turbines did not constitute industrialisation – SP went on to highlight the large developments in the USA as an example of industrialisation of the landscape. A member of public highlighted that in the USA the sites were vast and this was not the case in the UK. SP highlighted the Whitelee wind farm south of Glasgow is a massive development. SP went on to state that there is a domestic need for both offshore and onshore wind farms.

The Chair went on to articulate another question that had been posed to the Group (that also answers a request from Reg Thompson):

"Many residents are rightly concerned about the impact of noise from wind turbines. At another RES wind turbine project in Devon, RES repeatedly refused to make public the raw data on which they had based their predictions of noise immission levels at nearby dwellings. Following a High Court action, RES were ordered to release the data and it was then discovered that there were serious errors in the calculations, and RES had significantly under-estimated noise levels in their planning application."

In response to the question posed SP stated that:

RES will now make a solemn commitment to make available at the time of any planning application:

- The complete report on measurements of background noise levels*
- The complete anemometry data relating to the measurements of background noise levels*
- The turbine manufacturer's full data relating to noise emission including dB/A and dB/C*
- (If the make and type is still uncertain, then data for all machines under consideration)*
- The method of calculation of noise immission at given separations, including any assumptions made regarding topography, vegetation and ground reflectivity, as well as all algorithms used in the calculation.*

SP was asked if all the raw data over the five years of analysis would be available when planning is submitted to the Council. SP stated that, yes, it would. JB went on to dispute the claims about the reasoning behind not releasing the Den Brook data as articulated in the original question and stated that the data had been independently examined and was not released as it would be very difficult to analyse by the public. He also stated that the 'error' that was found had been identified by RES from the outset and did not make any difference to the noise assessment findings.

AH went on to state that North and South Creake are situated in a valley and asked if the possibility of echo could compound a noise problem. JB stated that echoes bounce off hard surfaces such as walls, however, soft ground such as the land around the Jack's Lane proposed site would absorb the noise and would therefore not likely be a problem – he went on to state that this had never been a problem in the past.

JP asked RES if they rely completely on ETSU when planning for a wind farm development. JB stated that they did. JP went on to state that RES was operating within government guidelines by using ETSU which was based on policy initiated by a government that has not generated enough electricity. He went on to state that the present government will not change policy for only a few people and that it would not be in the government's interest to change ETSU. JP articulated that in reality the Group was attacking the wrong people and that RES are doing what they are expected to do. JP went on to state that there is a need for change in government policy.

A member of the public asked if ETSU had been modified since 1997 and stated that the guidance was designed for smaller turbines. JB stated that ETSU sets out immission noise guidance regulation and if a larger noisier turbine is proposed then it would need to be located further away from houses. He went on to state that in 1997 the guidance allowed turbines to be situated closer to a property. He went on to state that other countries such as New Zealand and Australia have also adopted ETSU.

A member of the public asked what sort of ground the turbines would be situated on. He went on to articulate concern over vibrations caused by the turbines on chalky ground. SP went on to state that Res would only do a full site investigation post- consent, but the land is likely to be chalk. JB went on to state that in 1997 Dr Snow conducted a study that showed very low levels of vibration caused by turbines. JB went on to explain that vibrations from wind farm were only really a concern in southern Scotland where the Eskdalemuir monitoring station measures vibrations that may be caused by nuclear weapons around the world. JB highlighted a study by Professor Peter Styles at Keele University that vibrations caused by wind turbines is very small and could not be felt by humans.

A member of the public asked if RES would be monitoring noise levels after the construction of the wind farm for members of the public. JB stated that if the public made a complaint then yes they would but if not then no.

A member of the public asked what the permissible distance was between turbines and homes was in comparison to Europe. This question related to a question issued in the agenda:

"Please tell me why you are proposing to put up turbines unacceptably near people's houses when the research evidence shows (as confirmed by other countries' practice, notably Germany) that anywhere nearer than 2 km is potentially dangerous to health and wellbeing. Please also comment on the reported suppression by civil servants in Whitehall (Times 13 Dec 2009) of a report recommending that the maximum noise of the blades should be 33 decibels (not 38)."

SP stated that in Germany the distance is set at 300m and was unsure where the 2km distance had come from. In Denmark and the Netherlands the minimum distance is 400m and Switzerland is 300m away from residential property. In Scotland the recommended distance set out in SSP6 legislation states that zones designated for wind farm development should be situated 2km from settlements (considered to be over 3,000 homes). He thought that in the Planning Policy Statement (PPS) for England, the guidance is set at a minimum 500m distance

and RES has put in place a much larger distance in place for Jack's Lane –10 times the rotor diameter (930m) away from properties. A member of the public commented that the Netherlands had to have turbines further away from properties than the UK. SP restated that it did not and that the distance from turbines to properties had to be only 400m in the Netherlands.

A member of the public asked whether the limit of 35 dB would be considered a nuisance. JB stated that 35 dB would not be considered a nuisance. A member of the public stated that RES could not categorically state that an individual would not hear the turbines rotating. JB stated that it would be a very low level of noise that would be incorporated into lots of other surrounding noises, and so would be very unlikely to be audible. However, inaudibility could not be guaranteed.

MR asked a question on behalf of a parishioner from Stanhoe Parish. MR asked if the road from Bircham to Barwick would be widened by 15m under current proposals and increase traffic flows. SP stated that the road would not be widened by 15m but by 5 – 6m in total width.

6. Jack's Lane Project Update

SP outlined that the public consultation exhibitions had taken place as scheduled. He went on to state that the Environmental Assessments were being finalised, internally approved and would be added to the application for submission in the Summer – probably June or July. SP outlined the RES organised visit to a working wind farm at North Pickenham and the Ecotech centre at Swaffham. SP informed the group that ten members of the public attended the wind farm visit.

(The following sections 7,8 and 9 were briefly addressed as above due to time constraints)

7. Planning Timetable Update

8. Exhibition Feedback

9. Wind Farm Visit Feedback

10. Public Questions

The Chair outlined the question submitted below:

"While travelling up to Lincolnshire yesterday I saw three turbines rotating out of a total of twenty three. Explain please."

SP responded stating that he had no idea about the specific site but usually when turbines aren't turning they have been shut down for maintenance or the wind wasn't sufficient for all to be turning. SP went on to state that if wind turbines aren't working and have the thin edge of the blade into the wind then it has been stopped for a reason. A member of the public stated that the Tick Fen wind farm wasn't feathered and only three out of twelve turbines were turning. SP stated that the overall output of wind turbines is factored into the development of a project and turbines have to adhere to their annual output obligations. JP asked where feathering for the proposed Jack's Lane site would be controlled from. SP stated that it depends on the manufacturer; he thought that Siemens has a control centre in the East of England [However it is actually in Wales]. SP stated that both the manufacturer and RES would monitor

the site but he would have to get back to the Group about who would have overall control over halting the turbines.

The Chair introduced the next question:

"Is there any significant loss of power in transmission over e.g. 100, 200 miles? If the power generated is contributing to the national grid, does it matter where the generation is in the country? - e.g. a large number of turbines somewhere on the southern shore of the Wash and therefore none in rural Norfolk?"

SP stated that a 132kv line 50km long would lose 1/30th of power whilst one 100km long would lose 1/6th of the power. SP stated that he believed everybody should be both aware of where electricity is produced and in turn be responsible for the energy we use.

The Chair raised the next issue raised by a member of public that:

1. The present Chair be asked to resign so that an independent chair can be elected as was stated in the constitution.
2. Parish Councillors to be reduced to one per P.C + substitute (The four places can then be occupied by other interested people).
3. Question time for public questions be extended considerably.

The Chair put these suggestions to the Group. A member of the public stated that he thought it was unbelievable that a grouping of District and Parish Councillors could not find a Chair within their own membership and believed that a representative from the list of elected representatives should become the Chair. GT stated that he is the Chair of a Parish Council (Syderstone) and that although he has personal views about the development he will listen to the views both for and against. He went on to state that he would not let the Parish know what he thought about the development but will take away the information from the Group and will endeavour to answer any questions the Parish may have. The same member of the public reiterated his surprise that no member of the CLG would nominate themselves for the role of Chair.

GT stated that he did not agree with the comment about the need to reduce Parish Council members on the Group and highlighted that there was a need for two representatives from each Parish Council to sit on the group. He went on to state that if the Chair or Vice Chair from the Parish Councils cannot attend the meeting then two other representatives from the Parish Council could attend in their stead. JP stated that one member of the Parish Council should sit on the Group.

The same member of the public went on to question the bias of the Chair. SP questioned the member of the public about what way the Chair had been biased. The member of the public highlighted that it was the principle not the performance of the current Chair. A member of the public asked how the Group membership was chosen. The Chair stated that the Group had been selected as they are the three tiers of local elected representatives for the area. A member of the public stated that Bircham Parish should be included. The Chair stated that the membership had been based on the immediate local area and it was up to the other members

of the Group to elect further members on to the CLG, not the Chair or RES. JP stated that he was happy with the CLG meetings as he gets the information he requires out of the meetings. He stated that he happened not to agree with all the information but reiterated that he is getting information from the meetings. BP stated that the Group were getting the information that they had requested from RES at the last meeting regarding the noise-led topic issues. BP stated that he agreed that the Chair was not independent but was satisfied with the way the meetings were run. He went on to state that it was only the agenda that was not democratically proposed. GT highlighted that the group was there to collect information and distribute it out to their local communities. He expressed concern that members of the public had interrupted the presentation and advised attendees to write down questions and address them after the presentation at the allotted question slot in the agenda. A member of the public stated that it was easier and more pertinent to ask questions during the presentation. GT accepted this to a certain extent but highlighted that questions articulated expand and moves away from the presentation topic. AH stated that through the CLG the community can generate dialogue whereas none could be had at all if the Group was not in place.

The Chair addressed another question from the agenda:

"How do you overcome the problem of lack of generation when there is high pressure & no wind? Surely a wind farm also needs a back-up capacity equal to its average output - which probably ends up being "dirty" energy doesn't it?"

SP stated that when the turbines are not turning then electricity will be generated from other sources, however, when the wind is blowing then 'dirty' electrical generation can be reduced. SP stated that the introduction of a smart meter grid would support the mix of energy use required for the UK energy supply.

A member of the public asked if the cabling for the site would be laid over or under-ground. SP stated that they would be underground. A member of the public asked if trenches would need to be dug across fields. SP stated that the trenches would most likely be dug on highways verges.

A member of the public asked what other forms of renewable energy were being developed by RES. SP stated that RES produce energy from Biomass, woodchips, photovoltaic, solar thermal and are investigating tidal stream and tidal barrages.

11.Future Meeting Dates

The Group decided to hold the next meeting at Stanhoe Village hall on 19 May. The Chair asked if the Group would like to set a date for the June meeting - The 16 June was proposed and will be discussed at the next meeting.

12.Any Other Business

GT asked if the allotted questions slot could be extended. AB stated that the question period should be kept flexible and that, if questions aren't addressed in the first slot, then the second

CONFIRMED

**CLG Minutes
Bellenden
Jack's Lane, Norfolk**

question period should be extended but also ensure that the meetings do not go on too late. GT questioned if the first set of questions should relate to the previous meeting.

The next meeting will be held on 19 May at Stanhoe Village Hall at 7pm

Appendices**Appendix A – Amendments to last set of Minutes**

The sections below highlight the amendments to the last set of Minutes outlined in red.

Original text

Q. JP asked RES about the effects on house prices and the potential reduction in second home owners coming to the area. He went on to state that he believed that for every job created by the site there will still be those who will suffer economically.

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.

To be replaced with:

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. 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.

Original text

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 profit generated each year by each turbine.

A. SP stated that he couldn't say.

To be replaced with:

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.