

**Jack's Lane Community Liaison Group (CLG) Minutes, 28 July 2010**

**In attendance:**

Cllr Terry Austin (TA)  
Cllr Pamela Austin (PA)  
Cllr Gerry Taylor (GT)  
Cllr Robin Maslin (RM)  
Cllr Ann Harvey (AH)  
Jonathan Powell (JP) - CAPE  
Simon Peltenburg (SP) - RES  
Matthew Horn (MH) – Bellenden

Seven members of the public

**Venue:** North Creake Village Hall

**Apologies:**

Phil Briscoe  
Cllr Gary Sandell  
Cllr Nicholas Ullswater  
Cllr Jeremy Brettingham Smith

**Date:** Wednesday, 28 July 2010

**1. Welcome and introduction**

MH welcomed the Group to the sixth Community Liaison Group meeting to discuss the proposed Jack's Lane wind farm. MH highlighted that the Chairman of the group, Phil Briscoe, could not attend the meeting and sent his apologies. MH requested that before the Group selected a temporary Chairman that each member introduced themselves for the benefit of the members of the public. The members of the Group introduced who they were and who they represented on the Group.

**2. Election of Temporary Chairman**

MH requested that a member of the Group put themselves forward as temporary Chairman for the evening and suggested that if none were willing to do so that he would Chair the meeting if the Group agreed. TA offered to Chair the Group and SP seconded the nomination. The Group agreed that TA would Chair the remainder of the meeting.

**3. Matters Arising**

(The following section was discussed under 'Approval of Minutes of Last Meeting' but were agreed to be submitted under a new 'Matters Arising' section).

AH highlighted that at the previous meeting a member of the public had commented on the lack of attendance by the members of the CLG. AH stated that she and many other members of the Group are also members of other committees and always try and attend each meeting, she

highlighted that she had another important meeting on the evening of the last meeting and could not attend. PA highlighted that it is difficult to find a replacement for the Group in various Parish Councils.

AH outlined that on pg. 7 of the unconfirmed Minutes that the RSPB suggested that wind farms must be located away from narrow migration routes and concentrated feeding, breeding and roosting areas. She asked what the results had been into the studies undertaken by RES into migration routes. SP stated that the site is not located on a migration route but it is a foraging area. He went on to state that the site would not have a significant burden on the pink footed geese population. AH asked if the studies would have an effect on the planning application. SP stated that it would and that the Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust (WWT) had initiated studies on offshore wind farm sites and had shown that migratory birds bypass turbines.

AH highlighted the figure of 74 pink footed geese predicted to be hit each year by the turbines. SP stated that when using the Band collision risk model, taking into consideration physical characteristics of the birds, frequency of turbine rotation and physical size, and the assumption that the birds will fly around the site as normal, then the model predicts that 74 birds will be hit. He went on to state that this figure would not represent a significant effect on the bird population mortality rate and that although emotively it seems a large figure in practice the site will see much fewer collisions. At the last meeting, Dr Steve Percival stated that he only expected five birds to be hit each year. SP highlighted Blood Hill wind farm which sees pink footed geese arrive in the area for foraging and in the monitoring studies undertaken has only seen one goose collision.

GT stated that the presentation by Dr Percival enlightened the community much more but accepted the comment by AH about the 74 collisions. He went on to state that, in relation to population numbers, this figure would be exceptionally low. He highlighted, however, that if raptors were hit then it would be a serious matter. GT went on to state that there would be fatalities at both on and offshore sites.

#### **4. Approval of Minutes of Last Meeting**

The Chairman asked if there were any amendments to the Minutes of the last meeting. The Group agreed to confirm the previous set of Minutes.

#### **5. Jack's Lane site visit update**

SP outlined the visit to the proposed Jack's Lane site. He stated that the Group visited the main access tracks, areas where hedgerows would need to be moved back, the site entrance, and the location of the temporary construction compound, substation and turbines. SP stated that various individuals on the group suggested areas where additional hedgerows and ecological improvement could occur.

GT stated that the site visit was very useful for identifying the hedges and trees necessary to be removed and the lanes that needed to be widened. He highlighted his concern over the width of the lanes and their appearance after having been widened. He also highlighted his concern over the King's Lynn to Fakenham road as the other wind farm proposed may also use that route. He highlighted that RES hoped to make the junction at the Four Winds more accessible and that this may be a good opportunity to improve the junction as RES would pay for the upgrades. He

stated that more pressure needed to be put of Highways for the Four Winds junction to be improved as part of the proposed wind farm development. He requested that those present write to Highways to improve the junction. JP questioned if RES would be transporting the loads from the King's Lynn direction and highlighted that it was a tight bend. GT stated that RES had explained that they would put a hard surface down in the corner of the B1454 junction specifically for the wind farm, the hard surface will have grass that will grow through. SP stated that if any other improvements were necessary on the route that RES would be happy to do the work.

GT asked if once the abnormal load has been delivered to the site the lorry would be shortened. SP stated that once the load has been delivered the lorry trailer can be shortened to the usual HGV length, about 16m.

AH outlined her concern about the uprooting of hedgerows and the effects on birds who have nested in the hedges for years and that the area would turn in to an industrial landscape. SP stated that on a project in Mid Wales hedgerows were removed and re-established with great results of them springing back. SP stated that he had asked his ecologist what would be better on an ecological basis for the site; either moving the original hedge further back, or planting a new hedgerow. The ecologist stated that the new hedgerow would have greater biodiversity benefit as it would grow more vigorously being younger, and would be more species diverse. AH outlined her concern about the effects on bird life when removing the hedgerow. SP stated that the removal of hedges would take place outside of the breeding season.

TA outlined that he was reassured with the site itself and stated that the hedgerows were quite a width apart down the access tracks. He stated that it would merely be a case of widening the track and not the hedges. He highlighted that the lane to Barwick Hall Farm would be widened with hardcore. SP stated that a crush stone track used for the road does tend to have grass grow back through over time.

GT asked if the proposed access for the site has vehicles arriving and departing using the same road. SP stated that it was.

## **6. Public Questions**

A member of the public asked about the number of meteorological masts required for the site. SP stated that for turbine manufacturers to warrant the turbines they need to know what the wind regime is for the site. Therefore a calibrated, guyed mast set at 80m may be required 200m upwind at two of the proposed turbines. The upwind masts would stay in place for up to 18 months in total. Two other masts would be erected at the turbine locations for six months prior to turbine erection to calibrate wind speeds with the upwind masts. There will therefore be four masts in place; two for six months and two for 18 months. A lattice mast will also be in place on a permanent basis for continual monitoring of wind speeds set at 80m high. A member of the public asked when these would be erected. SP stated that he was unsure of the exact time during the construction timetable but certainly 6 months prior to turbine erection. The member of the public asked if the masts would help with micrositing. SP stated that no, it would not as the wind regime at the site is well understood and micrositing doesn't tend to occur for minor variations in wind character.

A member of the public asked if RES were still intending on Jack's Lane becoming a right of way. SP stated that this was unlikely as they were unsure who owns the land. SP stated that he had discussed this with the County Rights of Way Officer who had suggested that the 'Lost Green Lanes Project' might have been an appropriate body to assist in this matter but SP has been unable to find out more about the project which seems to have been discontinued.

A member of the public asked if the track leading from turbines three to five could be extended to Jack's Lane and then that track and the section leading west could all be made a right of way. SP said he would put the request to the landowner and see if there are sound reasons for not having such a right of way or if it would be possible.

A member of the public asked if a turbine didn't generate the power expected would it have to be removed. SP stated that no it would not, but the manufacturer would have to fix it so it generates the amount of electricity the wind data suggests it should.

JP highlighted that in a letter to residents, RES had quoted a capacity factor of 31.4% and questioned if this was the likely capacity factor RES would expect to see at the site. SP stated that no it wouldn't, that figure was a statistic generated via a wind map of the whole of the UK. He stated that the Advertising Standards Agency suggests developers use the NOABL database for conservative estimates of capacity factor. SP stated the on site wind measurements suggest a higher capacity factor, however, they have used the NOABL-derived figure until the wind speed data is released.

JP asked SP what his opinion was of the coalition government. SP stated that as he understood it onshore wind will be an integral element of a future renewable energy strategy. JP asked if that would be good for RES. SP stated that we need to act responsibly in both our energy consumption and generation. JP stated that RES would be much more knowledgeable about government policy and have greater access to government. SP stated that he doesn't but believes that onshore wind has to play a part in the energy mix.

AH outlined the ODA's decision not to have a wind turbine at the Olympic site highlighting Shaun McCarthy's comments that the ODA was *"not in favour of 'eco-bling' solutions that look good but don't do anything"*. SP stated that to his knowledge the decision not to have a turbine at the Olympic site would have been taken on account of on-site constraints and engineering concerns – it was always going to be a challenging site for a large wind turbine given all the activities proposed there.

A member of the public asked what happens to the turbines after the 25 year period is over. SP stated that after 25 years a decision would be made whether to apply to refurbish the site or remove the turbines. The member of the public asked what would happen to the concrete bases after 25 years. SP stated that the concrete would stay in the ground. A member of the public asked why they don't build nuclear. SP stated that the member of the public could request that a nuclear power plant be put up in the wind farm's stead.

A member of the public stated that subsidies drive the wind farm agenda and that those countries with renewable obligations will become a lot less competitive. He stated that the only reason RES were proposing the site was due to subsidies. SP stated that there was a need for a

balance between reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and generating power and that all countries have a support mechanism for renewable energy. TA highlighted that the Group had gone through this discussion at every meeting of the CLG and that the Group was here to discuss the individual site of Jack's Lane. He went on to state that if the members of the public have a problem with government policy then they should approach Henry Bellingham MP. The member of the public stated that the discussion was merely rearranging deckchairs and that the real issue is to discuss the development of six large turbines next to small villages. TA highlighted that only seven members of the public were present at the meeting which does not show much interest either for or against the development. GT highlighted that RES wants to put turbines up at the site and that landowners have allocated some of their land for RES to do so. He stated that the Parish Council had already given a response in regards to the Chiplog proposal and that the response would no doubt be the same for the Jack's Lane site, however, whatever government says the decision comes down to whether the councillors making the decision vote for or against the development.

A member of the public highlighted the 31.4% load factor and asked which make of turbine is proposed for the site. SP stated that the calculations given to date have been based upon a Siemens 2.3MW turbine which is the largest physical machine that would be suitable for the site at this time, the turbine manufacturer would not be decided upon until after planning consent. SP stated all turbines can be rated to produce less noise but with some loss in electricity generation. A member of the public stated that if RES go to the expense of putting up a turbine then they will likely want to get the most out of it. SP stated that if the Environmental Health Officer (EHO) assessed that a turbine was making too much noise then the wind farm owner would have to remedy the problem, and one way to do so would be to de-rate the turbine so that it makes less noise.

A member of the public stated that the carbon emissions generated by the manufacture and installation of the turbine was much higher than the carbon it offsets in its lifetime. SP stated that that was not true and that the carbon emissions from the whole process of manufacturing and erecting a turbine are offset in 6-9 months of that turbine's operation. The member of the public asked if that was for every part of the turbine's existence. SP stated that as far as he was aware that that was true and that he would send a copy of the study to that person.

A member of the public asked if a noise complaint was substantiated what this would mean for the site. SP stated that under the guidelines set out in ETSU-R-97, imission levels (received at a house) can be up to 5db above the background noise levels. A member of the public stated that that was very high. SP stated that it was about perception of noise levels. SP stated that multiple sites had been approached to assess noise levels. He highlighted that he had approached Shammer House who had responded that they did not want any measurements taking place at their property and so measurements were taken at Shammer cottage. A member of the public stated that they lived at Shammer House and had received no such letter. SP stated that he had received a response from the house with 'We don't want this' written on the envelope. SP asked if the member of public had lived there for a long time. The member of public stated that they had, but had no recollection of a letter. SP said he would look into the matter.

A member of the public asked how he could assess if the background noise had got louder if he hadn't had any measuring equipment in place. SP stated that he could use data from the nearest source of measurement. The member of the public asked if SP could forward the noise monitoring locations. SP stated that he could. GT asked if there was anyone at the Borough Council who could make their own noise assessments. SP stated that he did not know, but that the instruments used by RES were regularly calibrated and certified. A member of the public asked how the noise assessment locations were chosen. SP stated that an EHO discussed the proposed assessment locations with RES.

PA asked if the noise assessment limits were averaged out or were the maximum noise levels. SP stated that they were averaged out, where peaks such as cars driving past are removed from the assessment and therefore have to use an average. SP went on to state that out of the 264 wind farm sites that are operational in the UK there is only been one ongoing complaint from one household relating to amplitude modulation. A member of the public stated that it was only the fact that the household was suing the landowner and developer that was unique. SP questioned why other people living near to the site and other locations had not complained. PA outlined that her point was that if the noise levels are averaged out then do they take into account the quiet periods at night time. SP stated that night time guidelines are different to those during the day. A member of the public stated that it can be very quiet and that people could have their windows open. SP stated that in that case if it is very very quiet it is unlikely that the wind would be blowing sufficiently for the turbines to be operating.

A member of the public asked how individuals could make their own noise assessments. SP stated that he was unsure what is available for the public to use. He went on to state that if the wind farm breaches the guidelines for noise levels then the EHO would become involved.

**7. Jack's Lane Project Update &  
8. Planning Timetable Update &  
9. Public Questions**

SP went through the planning timetable. He stated that he was currently finishing off the Environmental Statement (ES). There will be a review meeting internally at RES on 4 August and if the proposal is given the go ahead then a cheque will be raised for the planning application. He stated that he expects to submit in the second week of August.

GT asked if the second wind farm (Chiplow) had been added to the ES. SP stated that it had and that there had been cumulative assessments carried out. TA asked if there was anything in the E-On application that had given RES cause for concern. SP stated that he had not seen anything to give concern. AH asked if the views from Barmer church would be taken into consideration. SP stated that Dr Simon Colcutt had considered the effects on the church and, from recollection, he didn't feel there would be a significant effect. If there was a significant effect then mitigation measures would be proposed. AH asked if the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) had been involved with the Jack's Lane project. SP stated that they had. CPRE came to one of the exhibitions and have been consulted over the last two years. AH outlined an article in the EDP that stated that CPRE have opposed various wind farm developments. SP stated that CPRE have objected to projects across the UK and that some sites are not as good as others. He stated that CPRE would object if they felt that a site was not suitable. He stated that it would be interesting to hear their response to the Jack's Lane project.



TA outlined that the site at Chiplow had reduced their turbine heights to 100m to the tip due to radar issues. SP stated that RES had chosen a site out of range of the radar and that 100m tall turbines will still likely affect the radar system at Chiplow. He went on to highlight that RES do not have an objection from the MoD. SP stated that multiple turbine heights had been investigated for the Jack's Lane site, to see if more turbines could be included while avoiding effects on MoD radar, however they felt that a site with a mixture of turbine sizes might be visually discordant.

SP went on to highlight that, at the time of an application, RES will also submit an application for another temporary met mast. A member of the public asked if another anemometer mast was required due to the fact that the data from the Bluestone site was irrelevant. SP stated that that was not the reason but that RES wanted more data. He went on to highlight that RES already has enough data to finance the project but energy yield predictions are important and that they want to measure for longer periods of time. A member of the public asked if the data collected already was not good enough to get financing. SP stated that they have more than enough data but to have more is always better to reduce uncertainty in the wind and energy yield predictions. SP stated that the met mast application was going in as a separate application so that it could be consented and erected even if the wind farm application had not yet been determined.

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

Future meeting dates were discussed. The Group agreed to hold the next CLG meeting on 26 August at 7pm. SP asked if the Group would like a session to discuss the ES as it should have been submitted by 26 August. MH will issue out the location of the next meeting.

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

GT thanked RES for giving the Group the opportunity to have a site visit.

TA thanked the members of the public for taking the time to come to the meeting. A member of the public outlined that he believed it was a poor reflection on the community that so few members of the public had attended the meeting. He went on to state that whether you are for or against the development it has a potential effect on all homes in the area.

TA stated that there is opposition to the wind farm but that their role as members of the CLG is to ensure that if the development does go ahead that it is as environmentally friendly as possible and can hopefully to mitigate the effects of the wind farm.

GT stated that credit should be given to Simon and RES for initiating the public meetings. He went on to state that other proposed projects in the area have given no consultation whatsoever and have put an application in at the least beneficial time for Parish Councils. A member of the public stated that he believed the meetings had been professionally conducted by RES.

**The meeting finished at 8.40pm**

**The next meeting will be held on Thursday 26 August at Stanhoe village hall at 7pm**