

Wadlow Community Liaison Group (CLG) Minutes, 14 September 2010

In attendance: Cllr Mark Russell (MR)
Cllr Nigel Jobe (NJ)
Cllr Hedley Francis (HF)
Cllr Caroline Revitt (CR)
Cllr Mathew Shuter (MS)
Cllr Simon Redman (SRN)
Cllr Sisse McCall (SM)
Cllr John Bramwell (JB)
Cllr Ray Vidler (RV)
Cllr Sally Ramus (SR)
Cllr Sara Himsworth (SH)
Cllr Jan Cassidy (JC)
Cllr John Williams (JW)
Cllr Susan Lee (SL)
Cllr Richard Barrett (RB)
Cllr Nigel Start (NS)
Cllr Pauline Jarvis (PJ)
David Cox (DC), Amy Bambridge (AB), Rachel Ruffle (RR),
Vicky Tavener (VT) – RES
Phil Briscoe (PB) in the Chair, Matthew Horn (MH) - Bellenden

Venue: West Wrating village hall

Date: 14 September 2010

1. Welcome and Introduction

The Chairman welcomed the members to the third Wadlow wind farm CLG meeting. He asked the group to introduce themselves for the benefit of those present at the meeting.

2. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were given on behalf of Cllr Nicholas Beamish, Cllr Brian Cushion, Cllr Prue Addecott and Cllr John Batchelor.

3. Approval of Minutes of the Last Meeting

The Chairman moved on to discuss amendments to the previous set of minutes. The Chairman outlined an amendment made by RV. Page six, paragraph two should be amended to state that; *"RV stated that he did not believe a charity based administration system would be beneficial for the Wadlow community fund if its costs were excessive (i.e. circa 10% of the fund)."* This will replace the sentence; *"RV emphasised that he would be keen to investigate further into how the fund could be administered, he stated he did not believe a charity based administration system would be beneficial for the Wadlow community fund."*

SR outlined that Cllr Penny Smith was not present at the previous meeting and that the first page should state that Phil Briscoe was *"in the Chair"* and not *"Chairman"*. SR went on to state

that she could not recall asking what match funding would entail as stated on page three of the previous minutes. SR reiterated a previous comment made by MR, that the case for increasing the community benefit fund was discussed at a meeting prior to the previous CLG involving MR, SR and DC as opposed to the suggestion in the Minutes on page four, paragraph two. SR went on to state that on page four, paragraph three the minutes should read that; "...a tender was issued for the administrative body which was won by Essex County Council" rather than "...a tender was issued for the administrative body which was won be Essex County Council."

The Group agreed to confirm the minutes with the discussed amendments.

4. Matters Arising

The following issue was outlined under approval of the minutes, however, it has been placed under matters arising. SR stated that on page five of the previous set of minutes BC stated that the school at Balsham would be a good avenue for the benefit fund as it is used by each community. SR stated that this was incorrect as the Wilbrahams do not use it.

5. Community Benefit Fund Discussion &

6. Public Questions on the Community Benefit Fund

The Chairman outlined that, at the previous meeting, the group discussed the community benefit fund and went through case studies of how the fund had been administered and distributed for other wind farm developments. He went on to outline that a map had been issued to the group, as requested, with a set radius of 5km, 6km and 7km around the Wadlow site. The Parish boundaries had also been included on the map. The Chairman outlined that the group had been given the opportunity to take the information, gathered at the last meeting, back to their parish councils for discussion.

MR outlined that he did not think that the radius system of fund allocation was a good idea as it incorporated an additional nine parishes in to the funding area. He outlined that this system may work well at other sites but did not feel that it was suitable for the Wadlow development. MR outlined that the fund needed to benefit what he perceived as the four most affected parishes of West Wrating, Balsham, Weston Colville and Great Wilbraham.

JW outlined that he believed the radius based allocation of funds would be the fairer way for those perceived to be affected by the wind farm to benefit from the fund. He stated that he was quite happy with the 5km radius and that even those members of the community situated in close proximity to the A11 would still be able to see the wind farm. He stated that he thought it was right that those further away should benefit from the fund and stated that some people in Fulbourn actually live closer to the site than the four parishes outlined earlier by MR. NJ asked if Fulbourn had voted on the Wadlow wind farm. JW stated that no, Fulbourn hadn't, but that it was irrelevant.

JW went on to ask about the purpose of the fund. AB outlined that the fund is a means of offering a benefit to the community hosting the wind farm and is not a means of compensation. AB outlined her concern about restricting the fund allocation on a geographical basis and outlined that there may not be enough projects in the local area to use the fund each year. MR stated that he was not suggesting that the fund should be restricted to the four parishes outlined above. AB stated that a scoring system could be used for those who live closer to the

site. MR stated that RES needed to take a lead on the issue of fund allocation. DC stated that RES would be happy to put forward a weighting process for allocation of funding from the site to the local community. JW outlined that the group should vote if they are in favour of a radius based system or not. NJ stated that the vote would be biased as there were more councils on the CLG than the four parish councils previously outlined by MR. No vote was taken on this issue.

SR asked if the fund would be used on a project basis or if it could be allocated directly to the Parish Councils. AB stated that she would not particularly want to see the funding go directly to the Parish Councils. SR outlined that if the fund went to Parish Councils then the funding would be available for the local community. PJ suggested that the group take a wider perspective towards the use of the fund. PJ outlined the need for funding for youth projects in South Cambridgeshire District. She stated that the fund could be something positive for young people at a District-wide level. Many of the group expressed their concern regarding PJ's suggestion. AB asked if the youth scheme would last the 25 years of the fund. PJ stated that youth clubs have been continuing for over 25 years.

MS outlined that Brinkley had taken an interest in the Wadlow wind farm project from day one and that the Parish had voted on the wind farm. He outlined that Brinkley falls within the radius system of fund allocation. He went on to suggest that a fund allocation could be initiated by weighting in regards to line of site to the wind farm and prevailing winds from the turbines. He stated that the radius system seemed to be very basic and asked what formulas for allocating funds had been used on other projects. RR stated that RES had never allocated a fund based on line of site and prevailing winds. She stated that it would be very difficult to implement and a complex process to map this scenario. RR went on to state that RES has only used the weighting system applied to either proximity to the site or based on preference for surrounding parish councils.

SL stated that Little Wilbraham was nearly the biggest settlement near to the site and that it should not be ignored in terms of funding. NJ stated that the ES for Jack's Lane, submitted by RES, outlines that only two villages are affected by the wind farm. DC highlighted that that referred to visualisation. MR stated that he did not dictate that any parish council should be ignored in regards to funding but that preference should be made for the four parishes of West Wrating, Balsham, Great Wilbraham and Weston Colville. JW went on to state that a scoring system should be in place for allocation of the fund with a set boundary around the site. The Chairman outlined that the group should not restrict itself to limiting where the money could be spent.

DC went on to outline to the group that RES would cover the 10% annual administrative charges for the Cambridgeshire Community Foundation (CCF) as discussed at the previous meeting. NJ stated that the debate was going around in circles and suggested that RES put forward three proposals for the administration and issuance of the fund and the group selects their preferred option. DC outlined that he did not want to dictate how the fund was used and allocated and that it was ultimately up to the community to use the fund for 25 years.

JW outlined that if West Wrating did not have a suitable project for the fund then the excess should be distributed to the wider community. NJ stated that this is what he suggested earlier.

AB outlined that she hoped to see parameters for the fund that would remain flexible for the duration of the allocation of the funding stream. AB suggested that a smaller community fund group be set up to discuss the fund. JC stated that AB's suggestion was a good idea. AB stated that an administrative body was very important for the running of a fund and that she was strongly in favour of a radius method of fund allocation. NJ stated that he felt that such a system would be unworkable, JC refuted this claim. AB asked the group how they would feel if the four parishes outlined by MR met to discuss the fund. HF stated that he believed it was important that other outlying parishes were included.

AB stated that the group needed to decide on an administrative body for the fund whether it be the CCF or a community interest company. AB went on to outline the CCF for the group. There are community foundations in each county and the CCF was set up in 2004 as an independent charitable trust. AB outlined that the trust has considerable experience dealing with funds including advertising existence of the fund to the wider community, dealing with fund request applications, producing application forms for funds and general administrative work. The CCF could also help set up a committee of local people who would then decide to which projects the fund was to be allocated. She went on to outline that the CCF has about six or seven members in their team and that they are all experienced fund managers.

JW questioned if RES would pay the 10% annual fee, as stated earlier by DC. DC stated that RES would. He went on to ask, if the group decided not to use the CCF would they receive the 10% on top of the fund. DC stated that they would not. NJ stated that the CCF works very well and that they are very effective at setting up and issuing funds. NJ went on to ask if the CCF had any experience of issuing a fund generated by a wind farm. AB stated that they had not, but that they adhere to best practice on similar funding streams. AB outlined the case study of the CCF's work issuing a fund for a landfill site. SH outlined that the CCF would bring continuity to the fund that would be important as parish councils and communities change over the 25 year period. RV asked if RES would pay the 10% annual fee. DC stated that they would.

DC went on to ask if the group would like the CCF to come and make a presentation to the group. He outlined the substantial amount of work that would be required of parish clerks in the administration of the fund and outlined the potential danger of a loss of interest by individuals in the administrative duties required to manage the fund.

AB asked the group if they were still interested in discussing a community interest company. NJ suggested that the group use the CCF. The Chairman asked if the group agreed to this proposal. The group agreed to use the CCF for the administration of the Wadlow wind farm community fund. The Chairman asked the group if they would like the CCF to present at the next meeting. The group agreed that the CCF should attend the next meeting. AB stated that RES would draw up a set of Heads of Terms for the legal agreement with the CCF and would circulate them to the group to be agreed at the next meeting.

NS questioned if there was a formula for issuing a fund to a local community. AB stated that no there wasn't. She outlined that on other wind farm sites they use the radius approach to allocation and on one particular site a river acts as a natural boundary for fund allocation. SRN asked how issuing the fund would work on a scoring basis and that the group would have to assume that there would be too many projects for the fund to contribute to all requests. AB

outlined that a matrix system of scoring has been set up before where there are set parameters for fund allocation which are then scored by an allocation committee (for example, a scoring system for applications in relation to proximity to the site etc...) SR questioned if those with the highest score would get a greater sum or all of the fund. MR stated that if one looks at most case studies then the money issued to an applicant ranges from £200 to £10,000. RV stated that criteria for issuing the fund needed to be agreed upon from the start. AB suggested that the experience of the CCF could be called upon for suggestions about how the fund is allocated.

7. Wadlow Site Update

DC outlined that he had submitted the discharging conditions for the Traffic Management Plan (TMP), TV interference and Shadow Flicker to the District Council. He will be submitting the Ecology, Mitigation and Archeology conditions this week.

He expects financial close to occur on the project in the spring of 2011, with first construction activity seen on the site in the summer of 2011 and energisation of the site in summer 2012. DC went on to apologise that a turbine manufacturer had not yet been decided upon and stated that he hoped to confirm the supplier soon. RR outlined that RES could not guarantee a supplier but could only articulate a preferred supplier.

RV asked when the community benefit fund would begin to be issued to the community. DC stated that once the fund allocation process is organised and in place then the fund would usually be issued at the same time as the energisation of the site, however, an advance payment to the community could be discussed. SH asked if enough turbines were currently being manufactured to supply the site. RR outlined that the lead time for delivery of turbines is about six to nine months for a project.

SR asked about the construction traffic in the TMP. DC stated that it had not changed much and access would still go past the Camgrain stores off the A11. DC stated that he would put the TMP up on the Wadlow wind farm web site (www.wadlow-farm.co.uk) once he has waited for it to be registered with South Cambs District Council. SR asked if DC would issue an email to the Group when the TMP is registered. DC confirmed that he would do so.

8. Future Meeting Dates

DC asked if, in light of the commitment to use the CCF, the next meeting could occur quite soon. Tuesday 12 October was suggested as a possible meeting date. RV stated that if the next meeting is to take place that soon then there needs to be something to discuss. RR outlined that Heads of Terms for the CCF could be provided for the Group prior to the next meeting. RV outlined that the document would need to be taken back to each member's parish council and did not want to rush any decisions. AB suggested that the next meeting incorporates an introductory briefing by the CCF.

JC suggested that a smaller group be used to discuss the community fund. MS stated that the CLG group needed to agree how the smaller community fund group should be formed. DC suggested that one member from the four parish councils outlined earlier by MR (Great Wilbraham, West Wrating, Weston Colville and Balsham) should be included and potentially two or three councillors from Parishes in the peripheral areas around the wind farm that would

represent the interests of all the other relevant parish councils. It was agreed that the following representatives would be placed on the smaller fund committee:

- Jan Cassidy – Balsham
- Nigel Jobe – West Wrattling
- Ray Vidler – Weston Colville
- Sally Ramus – Great Wilbraham
- Prue Addecott – Six Mile Bottom and Little Wilbraham
- John Williams – Fulbourn
- Hedley Francis - Carlton

PB asked the CLG if they were happy with the membership of the group. The members of the CLG agreed to the composition of the community fund group. PB stated that the fund group would be emailed about the next meeting to discuss the community benefit fund and that RES would draft a Heads of Terms for the next CLG meeting.

9. Any Other Business

DC outlined that although Bellenden has been Chairing the group, he would be keen to have a volunteer from within the CLG to eventually take over the role from PB. He requested that any member of the group who wished to be considered for the role contact him (david.cox@res-ltd.com).

The meeting closed at 8.15pm

The next meeting will take place on 12 October at 7pm at West Wrattling village hall.