

<p align="center">Minutes 97 Tynron Community Council Sanquhar II EGM 2 May 2019</p>	<p align="center">Actions</p>
<p align="center">Present</p> <p>Members: Sue King-Smith (Chair), Linda McDonald, George Freeborn, Sue Hall, Jackie Buckham, Mary Newbold, Keith Lewis</p> <p>In attendance: Martin Williams and Rhys Thomson from Community Windpower Limited, 20 members of the public.</p>	
<p>Apologies: Adriano D'Oliveira</p>	
<p><u>Sanquhar II Wind farm</u></p> <p>SKS welcomed everyone to the meeting to discuss community concerns over recently submitted plans for Sanquhar II Windfarm. Information on the proposed development provided by TCC was on display in the hall. SKS introduced the CWL representatives who had attended to address issues and answer questions.</p> <p><u>Questions submitted from TCC & ancillary questions from floor</u></p> <p align="center">1. What does 'the community' refer to in the CWL name, and how can Sanquhar II (50 turbines, 200 metres high) be a 'natural extension of Sanquhar I' (9 turbines, 130 metres high)?</p> <p>Answer – MW</p> <p>CWL see it as an extension to Sanquhar 1 existing windfarm and fits in with the other windfarms in the local area and the topography, ie the new turbines will sit across the tops in line with current ones, not breaking the current skyline, so it is logical from developer's point of view. D&G Council look for a cluster of windfarms then an open space, CWL feel that SII fits in within the existing cluster.</p> <p>Name – Historic use of the name, and all their wind farms are called community wind farms. They use local contractors for construction, upgrading, roads, maintenance, and always try and involve themselves in the community. CWL will take a lead from the community as to how they can be involved – they are already involved in education visiting local schools. They provide community benefit and want to be a part of the community.</p> <p>LM said that this philosophy has not been borne out in the development phase – mostly companies do follow a different and more consultative approach early in the process. This has led to doubt in the community. TCC is accustomed to being approached regarding windfarms developments much further away than Sanquhar II and at an earlier stage.</p> <p>MW apologised for this.</p>	

SKS asked what are CWL going to do about the fact that a lot of people are unhappy about the proposals, how will he take these objections into account at this stage and how will CWL respond to these.

MW said they could do a mass email to contact the community, or CWL would be happy to do this through the TCC and let them take lead on that.

2. During the construction, how will contractors get onto the site? Will they stay on site?

A-MW

Abnormal loads will all come via the A76 coming off it north of Kirkconnel on C125 and use the existing Sanquhar 1 access road. New roads will be built on site and CWL have asked for use of HOV route but no answer from FC yet.

U404 N (Scaur Glen) has not been considered for construction workers accessing the site. D&G council has not yet responded to CWL's queries regarding road use. D&G council has previously told CWL that Scaur glen roads cannot be used for access. Construction workers will access the site from the North.

Re workers staying on site, very unusual for this to happen, maybe 1 security guard. CWL envisage use of local workers and others will be coming in daily in either private cars, local taxis or minibuses. Workers from out with the local area will be using local accommodation providers. MW categorically stated that workers will not use the Scaur Glen roads to access the site.

3. What work will be done to ensure that private water supplies to nearby properties are not affected, given the problems CWL have had at Sneddon Law.

A- MW said they could not discuss the Sneddon Law situation. All private water supplies have been or will be looked at within 3km boundary of the site. Natural Power are collecting and interpreting data. All monitoring and testing will be done by an independent lab before, during and after construction and issued to DG Environmental health Dept, who also test themselves. CWL has moved roads and borrow pits on other construction sites to avoid affecting private water supplies.

These proposals and systems are recognised as an industry standard and accepted by the government.

A number of people from the floor said they have not had a visit from anyone to look at their private water supply.

MW said every PWS will have to be tested once the consent has been given. Before they do ground work they will test every site., following info from DG

council on whereabouts of PWS. People were worried that Council water records are not great.

MW said they will speak to Natural Power regarding the work they have done on this to date and ask them to visit every property on a private water supply.

Question from floor regarding washing out concrete lorries on site – MW said they have been told use of water will not affect the water table. He has asked for expert opinion but doesn't have the answer at present and will come back on this once he has the info

Q from floor re turbine base after decommissioning. MW everything above ground taken away and bases left and re-seeded. The base is made of concrete and steel. Concern and questions about the pollution caused by rotting steel and concrete

MW – they do not know the answer.

- 4. Please could you bring the results of the audio tests carried out at specific locations and explain their relevance & the potential audio impact on residents closest to the turbines?**
- 5. How have you measured the noise & health impact of a 200 meter turbine on communities? This question is with particular reference to the fact that the Hunstanton pilot had to be ceased due to the impact on the health of the local community.**

A: MW

Audio tests have been carried out to the properties nearest the site and acoustic noise has been looked at by the noise expert in CWL . Ref to section in the application by Haze McKenzie, recognised experts on this.

Q- There was some disquiet expressed regarding infra sound.

MW - There is a noise limit for the turbines. Haze McKenzie assess the cumulative noise and the special circumstances eg valley situation are taken into account. CWL will have to work within the legal limits. CWL's turbine suppliers are Siemens and Vestus & the selected design must be approved regarding noise. 40 -45 decibels is the maximum legal level allowed.

Q- Will there be noise monitoring equipment at each property – often this is a condition of planning permission.

MW - they will have to turn the turbines down if there is a complaint regarding noise levels – this has never happened on any of their windfarms.

- 6. You state 2 long-term permanent local jobs will be created. Please define what these jobs will be & define your understanding of local. e.g. would there be priority for those with the correct skillset living in the Tynron community? There is**

worry about local jobs in tourism being lost, and an impact on local tourism businesses.

A:MW

CWL will provide 4 permanent local jobs for wind turbine technician jobs from the communities around the turbine site. There will also be either a windfarm maintenance company employed or CWL are thinking about setting up a new company to do that. Approx. 6 jobs.

There will be employment in construction as well as infrastructure and maintenance work – eg electrical, telecoms. Construction workers will be advertised and employed through agencies and a windfarm company are thinking of setting up an agency for employing local workers.

Accommodation providers will be used throughout the area to put up workers. MW said they will speak to local householders regarding putting up workers during the construction process, and if there are concerns they will speak to local businesses and accommodation providers individually in private and ask them what they want and see what can be done.

Visit Scotland have previously asked ECU for a tourism survey which has not been done regarding SII, and it has to be checked out to see if they still require this.

Q from the floor - re Light pollution and impact on our Dark Skies.

A-MW :CWL were told by Dark Sky Park they could not envisage any visual problem from SII. The turbines will have to be lit with flashing lights for aircraft showing the tip height of the blades. There will be a worst-case scenario of every turbine being lit – this is what is in the application. MW said they are not fixed to use what is in the planning application, and SNH have asked CWL to look at a separate radar installation for SII through the CAA. However this solution is not currently approved for UK use.

7. How much experience do CWL, the proposed installers and the transport company have of erecting & transporting 200 m high turbines?

A- MW: they will use contractors with experience of local roads and similar size loads. Police will also be involved. On site similar experienced contractors will be used. Bridge and culvert assessments will be done in advance along with other tests which are then given permission by D&G Council for use of road. Traffic management plan will use a computer-generated scheme which will see if proposed route is possible. Transport Scotland will be involved in planning. If not possible to come through tolbooth there are options on using more expensive kit with smaller parts.

- 8. Please can you provide the calculations & explain clearly the cost benefit of installing 200 metre turbines rather than those in the next bracket down? (calculations to include installation cost comparison, including additional transport, foundation costs etc.) Please can this information be provided ahead of the meeting? What is the benefit of the bigger turbines?**

A-MW:

Using 200M turbines gives them a 79% increase in yield –CWL says these larger turbines give them a double return but are not double in size. The yield is known for a large turbine at a similar location – therefore they have forecasts of costs/benefits etc meaning they can accurately assess the additional benefit to them.

- 9. Community Benefit: Have you followed government guidelines when paying out community benefit to communities affected by your other windfarms? If so what rate per kilowatt generated did you use?**

A-MW: Yes – 5000 per MW – they are in discussion with CCs and KPT to see what they will do here – govt guidelines under discussion at present and the amount per MW may change.

- Q - Does the 5K per MW include jobs, education tourism benefits? What specific Community Benefit will Tynron receive if the Scheme is consented?**

A: Community Benefit won't be looked at as part of the decision process. 8 CCs involved including Tynron. CWL have never agreed to specific Community Benefit commitments prior to planning decision, so cannot say how much Community Benefit Tynron would receive, or how this will be decided.

LM emphasised that at a recent informal meeting with Tynron and Penpont CC it had been agreed that any community benefit payments would be made directly to the respective CCs. **MW** confirmed this.

Questions and comments from the floor

Question re impact on wild birds

A - CWL have surveyed on site for 12 years, using local people and RSPB and SNH who sign off the surveys – the info is within the planning app and expect to get a condition that they will have to employ further surveys on the new site.

Question/comment re human well-being being ignored in planning application – eg no mention re health, tourism, cumulative impact on human beings who live next to the turbines.

A-?? explained that they feel wind farms are necessary to combat climate change and that is a greater threat.

Question re finance – person worried about company being sold on and not being able to finance project bearing in mind the company’s capitalisation.

A – there is nothing to be concerned about regarding finance.

Q – Why have they concentrated on SW Scotland for wind farms. How did CWL decide upon this particular site for this large windfarm development?

A- Grid infrastructure very good. Impacts on less people.

Q – Bothies - this has been put into the plan without consultation

A-CWL said it came from a suggestion from an exhibition in the local area, however the CC said they would rather have been consulted formally.

SKS closed this section of the EGM and thanked the CWL reps for their attendance.

MW asked for permission to put our questions on the Sanquhar II website and left some form letters of support for Sanquhar II for residents to submit to ECU if desired.

FORMAL VOTE

Motion- To object to the Sanquhar II windfarm proposal

Proposed: SKS Seconded: LM

Carried unanimously that we wish to object.

ACTIONS

1.Circulate and send out TCC draft objection letter to TCC members for approval. **LM**

2.Send formal objection from TCC to the ECU -paper copy and online copy. **LM**

3.TCC letter to DG Council – **LM**

4. Speak to/email residents and get as many signed letters/email submissions to ECU before submission deadline Wed 8th May 2019. **ALL TCC members**