
**WOOLLEY HILL WIND FARM
COMMUNITY LIAISON GROUP**

Minutes of the Meeting held on Monday 9th June 2014

In attendance: Cllr Mark Chapman (Chair, Ellington) - **MC**
Dr John Simmonds (WHAG) - **JS**
Cllr Norman Grundy (Barham and Woolley) - **NG**
Cllr Peter Harrison (Barham and Woolley) - **PH**
Cllr Bernard Plummer (Spaldwick) - **BP**
Cllr Graham Leach (Spaldwick) - **GL**
Alison Jones (RES) - **AJ**
Noel Breslin (RES) - **NB**
Phil Briscoe (Bellenden) - **PB**

Plus 5 members of the public

Date: 9th June 2014 - 7pm
Venue: Ellington Village Hall

Apologies: Cllr Jill Elliott (Chair, Ellington)
Mr Shailesh Vara MP (North West Cambridgeshire)

1. Welcome and Introduction

The Chair, MC, welcomed the group to the Woolley Hill Wind Farm CLG.

2. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received as per the above list.

3. Approval of the Minutes of Last Meeting

The Chair asked for approval of, or amendments to, the minutes of the last meeting of the CLG, which took place on 16th September 2013. 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 that were not already covered elsewhere on the agenda.

5. Woolley Hill Project Update

NB gave a presentation setting out the updated construction timescale, and also showed images of the site itself, including the groundworks, compound, on-site facilities, turbine

foundations, drainage swales and site security. There were no questions from the members.

Updated construction timescale:

Activity	Date
Start on site	17 March 2014
Civil works – track and hard standing	March – August 2014
Civil works – turbine foundations	June – August 2014
Electrical works – cabling	July – August 2014
Electrical works – equipment installation	August – October 2014
Turbine works – delivery	October 2014
Turbine works – erection and commissioning	October 2014 - January 2015

6. Community Benefit Fund Update

AJ provided an update, emphasising that there was a 6-7 month period to get everything in place for distribution of the Fund. The first phase of this was to appoint the fund administrator, an independent company, when RES would take a step back to enable that fund administrator to contact members and seek nominations for the fund panel.

AJ added that the need for the CLG itself would fall away over time, as the site becomes operational and the fund panel takes over the only remaining element of work. She asked members to start considering what they thought a suitable timescale would be for winding up the CLG, with a view to agreeing an exit strategy at a future meeting.

AJ concluded that following this meeting, she was proposing to go away and ask the Cambridgeshire Community Foundation (CCF) to commence making contact with the parish councils and seeking nominations for that fund panel.

NG agreed and added that the most important element was that the fund panel should be established and operational, for when the money begins to come in.

GL asked when the first meeting would be and AJ said she could not confirm, but it would be as soon as physically possible, with the CCF in conjunction with the parishes.

GL also asked when the first payment would be made and AJ confirmed that this is usually one calendar month after the site becomes operational.

MC asked if the contact from CCF would be via parish clerks and AJ confirmed this would be the case.

JS asked about parishes not affected such as Buckworth and AJ confirmed that Buckworth should be included and the CCF would invite them to participate. PB agreed to check the minutes of previous meetings to understand why Buckworth had not been directly represented on the CLG to date. JS added that although he lived in Buckworth, he was a representative of WHAG rather than the parish council. AJ circulated a map of the fund area of benefit, which included Buckworth.

JS asked if other members of the CLG (but not parish councillors) would be invited to join the fund panel and AJ confirmed she would discuss this with the CCF.

MC sought clarification on the option of the fund panel members being representative of their parish councils, but not necessarily requiring them to be members of the parish council. AJ confirmed this was the case and that any local resident could effectively be a member of the panel.

7. Site Visit for the Community Liaison Group

AJ added that one action which had not happened to date, was a site visit to Wadlow Wind Farm, and this had been down to a combination of adverse weather and intensive agricultural land use on the site. She asked if members would be interested in going on site at Woolley Hill during the foundation and concrete pouring phase.

All members agreed and welcomed this suggestion and AJ suggested that this site visit would effectively take the place of the next meeting.

NB agreed to circulate dates of the concrete pouring as soon as they are known, and he would try to co-ordinate the visit between the first pour of concrete and the backfilling of the other foundations. This would enable members to see the foundation process at various stages of completion. The site visit would likely take place in July-August but exact dates would be confirmed as soon as they were known.

MC endorsed the support for the site visit and concluded that there would therefore be only two or three more CLG meetings before the project was operational.

8. Public questions

A member of the public asked about the timelines for the project and being able to advertise for funding applications, and key dates that the fund panel needed to meet to maintain momentum. AJ said that she would advise as soon as certain and able, but didn't want to advertise too soon – however, this issue would be one for discussion with the CCF and the fund panel members.

GL also added that it was important to hold a fund panel meeting first, to agree terms and dates for funding applications.

A member of the public asked about the employment on site and how much of the labour was local. He was also concerned that a number of vehicles were stopping in and around the village to ask for directions to the site.

NB outlined that two HGV delivery vehicles had ignored the clear instructions on delivery routes and RES had informed the suppliers not to allow those drivers back on site, in line with RES' zero tolerance policy regarding any deviation from the agreed construction traffic route. This stance was welcomed by all members and residents present.

JS asked if RES could put up a bigger sign to inform drivers which route to take and NB confirmed that this had already been ordered and was due to arrive any day.

With regard to local employment, NB commented that the concrete supplier had not been finalised yet, but this would be reasonably local.

The member of the public asked specifically about employees on site and NB confirmed that he knew at least one person was from Ellington, but didn't have an accurate figure to report to hand. He confirmed that there are now 40-50 people working on site and other contracts such as catering and waste collection have been sourced via local suppliers.

The member of the public suggested that he would have expected there to be more local employees on site and perhaps better links with local colleges on training opportunities.

9. Any Other Business

MC asked if there were any other items of business and there were none.

The meeting ended at 7.50 pm.