

---

**WOOLLEY HILL WIND FARM  
COMMUNITY LIAISON GROUP**

**Minutes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 14<sup>th</sup> May 2013**

**In attendance:** Cllr Jill Elliott (Chair, Ellington) – **JE**  
Cllr Bernard Plummer OBE (Spaldwick) – **BP**  
Cllr Grahame Leach (Spaldwick) – **GL**  
Cllr Keith Baker (Huntingdonshire Council ward member) – **KB**  
Cllr Jeremy Adams (Alconbury) – **JA**  
Cllr Norman Grundy (Barham and Woolley) – **NG**  
Cllr Peter Harrison (Barham and Woolley) – **PH**  
Jon Knight (RES) – **JK**  
Alison Jones (RES) – **AJ**  
Chris Carey (RES) – **CC**  
Noel Breslin (RES) – **NB**  
Matthew Cassidy (RES) – **MC**  
George Saliagopoulos (Bellenden) – **GS**

Plus some members of the public

**Date:** 14<sup>th</sup> May 2013 - 7pm

**Venue:** Ellington Village Hall

**Apologies:** Cllr Jane Baker (Alconbury Weston)  
Mr Shailesh Vara MP (North West Cambridgeshire)  
Cllr Mark Chapman (Ellington)  
Dr John Simmonds  
Revd. Jonathan Young  
Rosemary Massey (Clerk, Barham and Woolley)

**1. Welcome and Introduction**

The Chair, JE, welcomed the group to the Woolley Hill Wind Farm CLG and asked the group to introduce themselves.

**2. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received for Cllr Mark Chapman, Dr John Simmonds, Cllr Jane Baker, Shailesh Vara MP, Revd. Jonathan Young and Rosemary Massey.

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

The Chair explained that the last meeting of the CLG took place on 12<sup>th</sup> February 2013 and asked the group if there were any amendments to the minutes. All were happy to confirm the minutes of the previous meeting.

### **4. Matters Arising**

The Chair asked members if there were any arising matters. No matters were raised and members were happy to continue the meeting.

### **5. Woolley Hill Project Update and Timeline**

JK gave a brief update, stating that the construction team – Chris Carey (CC) and Noel Breslin (NB) – would go over the construction timeline and other details in greater depth.

JK informed the members that more minor details had been submitted to the council and were now available on the Huntingdonshire website. JK said that if members requested he could send a PDF copy.

JK said that RES are looking to discharge the traffic management plan and talked through the design of the substation – detailing that it would be reduced in size following consultations with the UK Power Networks (UKPN). JK added that hedgerow planting and indicated that planting would be placed around the site.

JE asked how many planning conditions were still outstanding. JK said that there had originally been 31 outstanding planning conditions. JE asked how many there is now. JK informed the members that there are now 8 or 9 conditions outstanding.

JE asked JK for an updated timeline. JK said that the overall construction timeline had changed and that CC would run through this.

### **6. Introduction to RES Construction Team**

The Chair asked the construction team to introduce themselves. CC and NB subsequently introduced themselves.

---

CC said that he will be the project manager and based between the office and site. NB stated that he would be solely site-based during the construction phase and said that a couple of others would be based on-site but iterated that he would be the primary contact.

CC said that construction is due to begin at the end of September/ start of October and subsequently ran through some of the key construction dates for the civil works, electrical works and turbine works.

CC showed the members images of what to expect on site and briefly explained the construction process, landscaping and habitat management.

Members were shown an image by CC of the foundations which would be set to hold up the turbines (consisting of 300 cubic feet of concrete). CC stated that it would take around three weeks to build each foundation.

CC did note, however, that the construction dates have scaled back – now due to start at the end of September/ start of October and subsequently ran through the key dates for the start of the civil works, electrical works and turbine works.

CC showed members images of what to expect on site and briefly explained the process as well as the premise behind landscaping and habitat management. He ran through images of the following:

**Foundations** – these are due to include 300 cubic feet of concrete and take up to three weeks to build.

**Electrical works** – ran through the grid connections and showed images of transformers, substations and underground power cables.

**Turbine works** – showed images of the blades and the vehicles which will transport these and gave an overview of the tower section, three blades, hub and small sub-station.

CC stated that concerns about construction were raised at the previous CLG meeting in February and that RES are keen to address these. CC showed a plan which showed an outline of construction traffic which would come off the A14's Junction 20 eastbound slip road. He added that there would also be signs signalling construction traffic to slow down which would minimise construction traffic problems in the village.

---

NB also added that RES would be lodging an application with regards to the footpath – closing it for the duration of the construction process.

### **Questions**

An audience member asked how many lorry movements would take place. CC said that an approximate estimation would be available in the CMS document, though he could not come up with an exact figure at that time.

CC then stated that the busiest days in terms of construction traffic would be when the process of laying the foundations begins. CC was keen to reiterate that all traffic would come via the A14 and so shouldn't be too much of a disturbance for the local community.

A member of the audience asked when exactly the busiest period would be. CC said that it is likely to be around Christmas for a period of six weeks (when the foundations would be laid).

Another audience member asked what safety measures would be put in place in regards to the footpath. CC said that construction vehicles would only be using the eastbound slip road. The same audience member pointed out that people walk their dogs down there and that no footpath exists.

CC said that RES would look into this issue. JK added that vehicle speeds would also be restricted as it was an issue which was raised at a previous meeting. JK said that he was now happy that the Traffic Management Plan (TMP) is ok.

CC said that RES could also look at some sort of segregation between the road and walkers/ dog walkers.

JE emphasised that this issue is a serious safety concern for the village and mentioned the road marking near Grove Lane. JK said that he had held a conversation with highways at the council and that this has been factored in the TMP. JK also reiterated that this is an issue for the Highways Agency and the county council.

CC said that RES would look at signage and segregation (i.e. a physical barrier) going forward and highlighting the issue to delivery drivers. JE agreed and said that RES could certainly put up signs and speed restrictions.

An audience member asked if any of the RES employees present have ever had to live through a scenario like this. Another audience member subsequently highlighted their

---

concerns in the context of health and safety and said that they hoped RES would do all they can to minimise problems.

Another audience member asked how the power cable would go through the village. CC said that the exact route had not yet been worked out but showed the audience a proposed route.

There was a brief discussion on the safety implications on the road network and the potential to exacerbate the 'rat run' in the village. CC emphasized that the cables would be 'trenched' and that there is currently no exact timescale for the cabling.

JK added that RES does not have as much say on this, however, as it's the remit of the UK Power Networks (UKPN). He subsequently explained that the locations of the power cables are decided by UKPN and the power companies.

## **7. Noise**

MC introduced himself and briefly outlined his role as an acoustics analyst and the purpose of his presentation and ran through the following items:

1. Turbine and noise guidance;
2. Noise assessment;
3. Resident protection – noise conditions and warranty and;
4. Other aspects e.g. Amplitude Modulation.

### **Turbine and Noise guidance**

MC explained the noise level of the wind farm in the context of a quiet bedroom, car driving etc. and explained the noise propagation model which worked out what noise levels are.

MC explained 'ETSU-R-97' i.e. the measure of background noise as a factor and ran through some of the details. MC subsequently showed a figure from the environmental impact assessment and described the process behind it stating that the 'worst case' figures are always factored in.

### **Noise Assessment**

MC then ran through the process taken by which noise was measured, stating that background noise had been measured at three separate properties round the proposed site using sound level meters. He said that the nearest turbine to any property is 890 metres away and therefore the maximum noise level would be 37.6 decibels (dB).

---

### **Resident Protection**

MC then moved on to resident protection and was keen to state that noise levels could not exceed a certain level, describing conditions 16 and 17 – explaining that if a complaint is lodged then the onus is on RES to get an independent noise consultant to undertake the measurements.

MC then moved on to the subject of the turbine warranty. He explained to members that RES have a warranty with the turbine manufacturers to ensure that turbines do not exceed certain noise levels, adding that the warranty protects both RES and residents in case turbines are faulty or ‘make funny noises’, in which circumstance the manufacturer is liable.

### **Other Aspects**

MC gave a very brief overview of Amplitude Modulation (AM) and elaborated on a study undertaken by a leading university on behalf of the government which concluded that Amplitude Modulation is a very rare occurrence.

MC then talked about low frequency noise and infrasonic, pointing out that studies have been undertaken which demonstrates that low frequency noise is not an issue. He added that no peer-reviewed scientific evidence would support claims that low frequency sound could harm human health.

‘Wind Turbine Syndrome’ (WTS) was then raised. MC said that independent analysis undertaken by organisations such as the NHS and Renewable UK had discredited WTS as pseudo-science.

A member of the audience mentioned a *Daily Telegraph* article which he had recently read and said that he didn’t know what is right to believe anymore. He said that he wanted to hear a ‘totally independent’ analysis.

Another member of the audience said that some studies have indicated that some turbine blade designs negate the possibility of causing WTS.

MC said that none of RES’ wind farms have ever had any problems with this, stating that RES’s wind farms are well designed. He did add, however, that not all other developers would necessarily design wind farms quite as robustly as RES.

MC also reiterated the importance of the turbine manufacturers’ warranty, stating that it’s up to them to ensure that this isn’t an issue in accordance with their business interests.

An audience member asked if RES’ turbines would minimise noise impact. MC said that RES would work with the manufacturers to ensure that no health concerns would arise.

An audience member asked what the likelihood was of the turbine blades going into low noise frequency and asked if people could have access the specification of the blades which will be used. MC explained the turbine supply process and re-emphasised the importance of the turbine manufacturer's warranty as a guarantee against malfunctioning blades or blades which exceed the noise specifications.

There was subsequently a long discussion into the processes and guarantees that any development wouldn't harm residents' health, with some audience members insistent that independent consultants should be brought in make an assessment.

After a long discussion it was brought to the attention of the meeting that that there are many independent sources which completely discredit 'wind turbine syndrome' and that the turbine manufacturer's warranty (in addition to numerous planning conditions) guarantees the health of local residents will not be affected by any wind farm development and that any potential noise implications are minimised to the greatest extent.

AJ said that RES is a responsible developer and not just interested in installing the turbines and walking away. She said that the manufacturer's warranty will protect both RES and local residents, stating that if a fault is suspected then the manufacturer has just days to respond and resolve the issue.

AJ informed members that a lot of testing and commissioning work is undertaken before a wind farm can be 'signed-off' and stated that it is not in RES's interest that a wind farm makes too much noise.

JE said that the problem for the local community is the 'unknown.' AJ said that she understood this concern and told the group that it would help if RES could organise a site visit.

JK said that RES as a company always used best practice and scientific knowledge to ensure that noise issues and concerns are minimised. MC agreed and added that RES has assurances that noise conditions will not be breached and subsequently explained the noise assessment.

Next the conversation moved on to the effect of wind turbine developments on farm animals. MC was keen to iterate that there have never been any noise issues with animals.

---

KB said the problem here with wind farms is people object and the planners still approve them.

JE asked about RES's wind farm in Wadlow, which is close to Newmarket. An audience member asked if there was much noise at Wadlow emanating from the gears. MC said that, if anything, the blades generate more noise than the gears.

JE asked if a trip to Wadlow could be organised. AJ agreed and said that RES would need to check provisional dates and subsequently arrange a bus to pick people up from Ellington to go to the site. AJ said that she would liaise with JE directly to arrange a convenient time and date once JE has had an opportunity to liaise with residents.

One audience member asked if the control building for the site would be manned or unmanned. NB said that it would be an unmanned but single-storey building.

## **8. Future meeting dates**

AJ said that RES are keen to hold another CLG meeting before construction starts and mentioned that RES would also send a newsletter out round the area in due course. AJ added that RES would be looking to fix a site visit for late June/ early July. JK added that the newsletter would include a construction timeline and that this would also be advertised in the parish council magazines and parish clerks.

JE asked members of the audience and CLG members if members of the public had seen RES's advertisement for the CLG meeting. No members disagreed.

A brief discussion was held and the subsequent CLG meeting date was agreed for Monday 16<sup>th</sup> September 2013.

## **9. Public questions**

N/A – questions were asked following each presentation.

## **10. Any Other Business**

JE asked if there were any last orders of business.

The meeting ended at 8.30pm