

---

**Wadlow Community Liaison Group (CLG) Minutes, 19 January 2011****In attendance:**

CLr John Batchelor (JB / Chair) - County Councillor  
CLr Nigel Job (NJ) – West Wrattling  
CLr Caroline Revitt (CR) – Carlton-cum-Willingham  
CLr Simon Redman (SRN) – Weston Colville  
CLr Sisse McCall (SM) – West Wrattling  
CLr Sally Ramus (SR) – Great Wilbraham  
CLr Sara Himsworth (SH) - Balsham  
CLr John Williams (JW) - Fulbourn  
CLr Susan Lee (SL) – Six Mile Bottom and Little Wilbraham  
CLr Prue Addecott (PA) – Six Mile Bottom and Little Wilbraham  
CLr Nicholas Beamish (NB) - Brinkley  
CLr Richard Barrett (RB) – District Councillor  
CLr Nigel Start (NS) – Great Wilbraham  
David Cox (DC), Amy Bambridge (AB) - RES  
Phil Briscoe (PB), Matthew Horn (MH) – Bellenden

**Venue:** West Wrattling village hall

**Date:** 19 January 2011

**1. Welcome and Introduction**

PB welcomed the members to the fifth 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 CLr Hedley Francis (Carlton-cum-Willingham), CLr Jan Cassidy (Balsham), CLr Brian Cushion (Weston Colville), CLr Mathew Shuter (Brinkley) and CLr Mark Russell (West Wrattling).

**3. Election of a new Chairman and Group Assistant**

PB highlighted that Bellenden would be ceasing their work assisting with the Wadlow CLG and requested that volunteers for the position of Chair make themselves known. NJ outlined that it would be beneficial to have a neutral Chair. JW highlighted that a Chair could not really contribute to the discussions of the group and it would therefore make no sense to have a member of the group Chair the meetings. NJ agreed. DC outlined that Bellenden had now successfully set up the group but that he hoped one of the parish councillors would be keen to take on the role of Chair. He went on to state that the Chairmanship could be rotated between the parish councils.

NJ suggested that one of the District or County councillors take on the role. JB highlighted that the County councillors would likely be the most neutral as they would cover most of the relevant parishes on the group. JW questioned if AB could Chair the group. AB stated that she

could but would prefer a member of the local community. NJ suggested that someone with experience of Chairing meetings should be proposed. RB suggested that JB become Chair and the nomination was seconded. The group agreed that JB should Chair the group and JB accepted the role (JB will now be referred to as the Chair for the remainder of the minutes).

The allocation of a group assistant was addressed. NJ suggested that RES retains the administrative role. DC questioned if the Parish Clerks could rotate the responsibility of taking minutes. NJ stated that it might be inappropriate considering West Wrating parish clerk has already been volunteered to take the fund panel meeting minutes. PA outlined it is very difficult to volunteer the parish clerks to do work outside their responsibility. AB agreed that a member of RES would assist with the meetings.

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

The Chair asked the group if they were happy with the content of the previous meeting's minutes. SL outlined that page 1 did not outline the parish each member represented. It was agreed that the minutes, and all further minutes, would highlight which member represented which parish. The minutes were approved

#### **5. Matters Arising**

SR questioned why there was not a section on the Heads of Terms in the agenda. AB outlined that the group could go through the Heads of Terms in Section 6 of the agenda.

#### **6. Update on Community Fund Panel meeting on 06/12/10 (AB)**

PA highlighted that the notes from the meeting did not include her attendance at the fund panel meeting. There were seven parishes represented at the meeting not six. SR highlighted that her name had been mis-spelt.

AB outlined that the group had elected her as Chair and that photos and notes from the meeting had been forwarded to the members of the CLG. The fund panel group was a sub group of the CLG and had met to work through the remit of the group going forward. AB outlined that the aims of the fund-group (Section 4 of the fund panel meeting notes) were the most important. Issues such as how often the fund group meets were discussed. In the medium term the group will be looking at what projects may be suitable for application for the fund and how to weight their priority for fund allocation.

It was agreed that projects would be viable for the fund up to a 5km radius around the site, if any applications came from further away then they would have a lesser weighting and lesser priority for fund allocation. Funding will be allocated on a geographical basis. The fund panel will look at the needs of the surrounding villages and will assess how to use the funds. The next meeting will be taking place on 8<sup>th</sup> February 2011 at the church institute, Balsham.

The Chair asked what responsibilities the fund group had and if they were a decision making body. AB outlined that the group would have authority to make decisions. The Chair went on to ask if the CLG had delegated responsibility to the fund group. AB stated that it had, the sub group will be used to give guidance as to what types of applicants would be considered for the fund but it is not there to vote on the actual applications. The fund group therefore sets out the

parameters for potential applicants but will not make the final decision about fund allocation to each applicant.

SH asked how long the CLG would continue to meet. AB stated that the CLG would meet as long the members felt it was useful and productive. At a previous meeting it had been suggested that the group meet for at least one year into construction of the site. The fund panel would cease their work prior to construction of the site and then the parishes would sit on the fund committee. The CLG could then feedback on the allocation of the funds.

SR outlined that she understood that the sub group would put in place a system of scoring applications but questioned if they would be taking the final decision on approving the system. NJ outlined that the fund group would put in place the system that would identify which applications are to be prioritised but would not make any financial decisions. SR asked if the scoring system would be approved by the CLG or fund panel. NJ stated that it would be approved by the fund committee. SM asked if the fund panel meetings were open to the public. NJ stated that they were and that the meeting notes would be published.

CR asked how the public would know about the CLG and fund panel meetings. The Chair highlighted that it was up to the parish councils to highlight that the meetings were taking place. The meetings dates will be on the Wadlow wind farm website.

DC outlined that the project is moving ahead very fast and that he hoped the Heads of Terms (HoT) could be agreed as quickly as possible. AB outlined that she had sent them to the group and had only had responses from SR and MR. She outlined that the comments made by both were acceptable but were maybe too specific for the Heads of Terms. She outlined that she hoped to simplify the document. NJ outlined that the HoT did not mention that the fund would be Retail Price Index linked. AB outlined that it was standard practice to be index linked and it will be added to the HoT. NJ went on to articulate that the HoT should highlight the size of the turbines as greater installed capacity would mean greater fund revenue. DC stated that RES was still undecided about which manufacturer was going to be used and therefore the size of the turbines. NJ questioned if the size of the turbine's capacity increased would the fund increase. AB stated that it would and that the document outlines 26MW as a lowest figure for capacity at the site.

It was raised that Little Wilbraham was excluded from the four core parishes on the fund panel. NJ outlined that the group had agreed at a previous meeting that there would be four core parishes on the fund panel and three additional representatives from the surrounding parishes. PA outlined that the notion of boundaries was pointless and that villages should be considered in regards to the fund panel grouping. The Chair highlighted that the group was going over issues that had previously been agreed and moved the meeting on from the issue.

## **7. Wadlow Site Update**

SM outlined that the CLG group were meant to be kept informed of all developments regarding the site and questioned why the group had not been informed of an application by RES for three temporary met mast applications.

DC apologised for not having updated AB and the CLG regarding the temporary met mast applications. He outlined that RES has applied for the three masts at the request of potential turbine manufacturers. He stated that he would hope they could be erected three months before the erection of the turbines and that they would be up for between 3-6 months. DC stated that he requested an application for 24 months to ensure that the masts could go back up if required. DC apologised again for the breakdown in communications.

DC went on to state that he could not disclose the turbine manufacturer at this stage but that they will be 2MW turbines or greater. He anticipated the discharging of conditions very soon for TV, shadow flicker, architecture and the construction method statement. He believed that the met mast applications would be before the council in March, if they are approved then RES could be on site by May 2011 with civils and tracks taking between 6-9 months to complete. The potential completion date for completion will be Summer 2012.

SM requested that when RES decide on the manufacturer that the CLG be told. DC agreed and stated that he hoped the construction manager would be in attendance at the next meeting of the CLG. The construction manager would be the main point of contact for concerns throughout the construction phase. DC stated that he would be happy to put the Construction Method Statement on the Wadlow wind farm web site. He highlighted that nothing had changed from the transport route identified in the ES. DC stated that the transport route would be on the web site by next week and he would send a link to the CLG.

SH asked if RES had approached many manufacturers. DC stated that RES are very close to finalising the manufacturer. When procuring anything it is standard practice to go out to a range of suppliers. He stated that until a turbine supplier agreement had been signed that he could not disclose the manufacturer.

SR outlined that RES had promised another newsletter be issued to the wider community. DC stated that the trigger for the next newsletter would be two months prior to likely starting on the site. He stated that he would inform local residents living near to the site and will discuss the process of transport.

## **8. Public Questions**

There were no public questions. DC requested that the parish councillors inform their communities that the meetings are taking place and that members of the public are welcome to attend the CLG. NJ asked that once the construction starts that RES initiates a meeting where members of the community can attend and ask questions.

## **9. Future Meeting Dates**

DC stated that he would be keen to have the next meeting within a month to six weeks and that he would like the construction manager to attend. NJ asked what the CLG meetings were for and what were they there to achieve. DC suggested that the next meeting have a construction theme where the manager could go through the detail of the project.

It was agreed that the next meeting would take place on 16 March at West Wratting village hall at 7pm.

**10. Any Other Business**

DC thanked Bellenden for their help setting up the CLG.

**The meeting closed at 7.55pm**

**The next meeting will take place on 16 March at 7pm at West Wrattling village hall.**

UNCONFIRMED