

Renewable Energy & Local Opportunities

Event Report

York

4 July 2013

Supported by



Contents

Agenda	3
Delegates	4
Presentation summaries	6
Workshop 1 – Community Benefits	12
Workshop 2 – Positive & Proactive Action	16
Evaluation	18

Your Climate
c/o Local Government Yorkshire & Humber
The Orangery
Back Lane
Wakefield, WF1 2TG

Website:	www.yourclimate.org
Twitter:	@your_climate
Email:	yourclimate@lgyh.gov.uk

Agenda

Renewable Energy & Local Opportunities

Twitter: #RELO

Thursday 4 July 2013

9.15am - 3.30pm

York CVS, Priory Street Centre, 15 Priory Street, York, YO1 6ET

Chair: **Dr Hugh Ellis**

Chief Planner

Town and Country Planning Association

Time	Agenda Item	Speaker(s)
09.15 – 09.45	Registration - Tea / Coffee Available	
09.45 – 09.50	Welcome	
09.50 – 10.00	Introduction to the day	Chair
10.00 – 10.10	Video from the Secretary of State	Rt. Hon Ed Davey MP
10.10 – 10.30	Policy Perspective from DECC <ul style="list-style-type: none">- UK Renewable Energy Roadmap- Call for evidence, on shore wind	Elin Williams - DECC
10.30 – 10.50	Sheffield & District Heating Network <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Strategic perspective- Costs, benefits, impacts and opportunities	Andy Nolan – Sheffield City Council
10.50 – 11.00	Questions to speakers	Chair
11.00 – 11.15	Planning Policy Framework <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Localism- National Planning Policy Framework	Dr Hugh Ellis - T CPA
11.15 – 11.30	Break	
11.30 – 11.50	Energy from Wind <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Yorkshire & Humber case studies	Stewart Provan – Banks Renewables
11.50 – 12.00	Questions to speaker	Chair
12.00 – 12.40	Workshop 1: Community Benefits <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Case studies and workshop 1	Elin Williams - DECC
12.40 – 13.20	Lunch	
13.20 – 13.30	Introduction to the afternoon session	Chair
13.30 – 13.50	Developing Renewable Energy in Harmony with Nature	Richard Barnard - RSPB
13.50 – 14.20	Planning for Wind Energy	Alastair Smith – Wind Prospect Group Ltd
14.20 – 14.30	Questions to speakers	Chair
14.30 – 15.15	Workshop 2: Positive & Proactive Action: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Barriers, Opportunities, Support	Introduced by Jon Clubb – Your Climate
15.15 – 15.30	Reflections, Summary & Close	Chair

Delegates

Organisation Name	First Name	Last Name	Position
Banks Renewables	Stewart	Provan	Senior Development Planner
Barnsley Council	Richard	Kershaw	Group Leader - Spatial Planning and Sustainability
Bishopthorpe Parish Council	Carole	Green	Councillor
City of Bradford MDC	Wendy	Brown	Planning Officer
City of Bradford MDC	Bhupinder	Dev	Team Leader, Development Plans
City of Bradford MDC	Richard	Williamson	Environment and Climate Change Manager
City of York Council	Andy	D'Agorne	Green Party Group Leader
City of York Council	Paul	Healey	Councillor
City of York Council	Jacqui	Warren	Sustainability Officer
Community Foundation Tyne & Wear and Northumberland	Mark	Pierce	Head of Policy, Projects and Programmes
DECC	Elin	Williams	Head of Onshore Wind
Derbyshire County Council	Wayne	Bexton	Principal Policy Officer
Durham County Council	Ian	Bloomfield	Principal Sustainability and Climate Change Officer
Durham County Council	Claire	Teasdale	Planner
East Riding of Yorkshire Council	Robert	Beardsworth	Community & Sustainable Development Officer
Environment Agency	Victoria	Slingsby	Principal Officer, Climate Change
Friends of the Earth - Yorkshire and the Humber and the North East	Simon	Bowens	Local and Regional Campaigner
Hambleton DC	Bryony	Wilford	Sustainable Development Officer
Hull City Council	Philip	Reese	Planning Policy
Kirklees Council	John	Atkinson	Environment Assistant
Leeds City Council	Tom	Knowland	Head of Sustainable Development
Leeds City Council	Helen	Miller	Principal Planner
Local Government Yorkshire and Humber / Your Climate	Ruth	Hardingham	Climate Change Skills Fund Programme Officer
North Kesteven DC	Diane	Jarvis	Sustainability Initiatives

			Officer
North Kesteven DC	Tamara	Walters	Sustainability Initiatives Officer
North Yorkshire CC	Ray	Bryant	
Northumberland County Council	Hugh	Clear-Hill	Sustainability Programme Manager
Origin Energy CIC	Steve	Carney	Director
Pendle BC	Keith	Thompson	Planning Officer
Richmondshire DC	Peter	Featherstone	Planning and Development Manager
Rotherham MBC	David	Edwards	Senior Planner
RSPB	Richard	Barnard	
Sheffield City Council	Andy	Nolan	Sustainable Cities Programme Lead
South Kesteven DC	Michael	Rickard	Project Manager (Property Development)
South Yorkshire Forest Partnership	Sara	Parratt-Halbert	SEEDS Project Manager
TCPA	Dr Hugh	Ellis	
University of Leeds	Claire	Blissett	MSc Sustainability (Env. Consultancy and Project Management) Student
Wakefield Council	Neville	Ford	Service Manager - Planning and Transportation
Wind Prospect Group Ltd	Alastair	Smith	
Wheldrake Parish Council	David	Randon	CPRE Committee Member (York and Selby), Chairman
York Environment Forum	Richard	Adcock	
York Environment Forum	Anna	Bialkowska	
York Environment Forum	Ron	Healey	Cyclists Touring Club
York Environment Forum	Kate	Lock	Chair
Yorkshire Energy Partnership	Hugh	Cripps	Chief Executive
Your Climate	Jon	Clubb	Climate Change Co-ordinator

Presentation summaries

Introduction

All presentations are available to download from the Your Climate website at:

<http://www.yourclimate.org/pages/renewable-energy-local-opportunities>

The UK is legally committed to meeting 15% of energy demand from renewable sources by 2020. Achieving this will help meet the UK's energy security and carbon reduction objectives. Your Climate in partnership with Climate UK and the Department of Energy & Climate Change hosted Renewable Energy & Local Opportunities on 4 July 2013 to explore how local authorities can be supported to take positive and proactive action on renewable energy, in particular onshore wind, in the context of localism and the National Planning and Policy Framework.

The key areas explored by the event were the costs, benefits, impacts and opportunities of renewable energy and how this fits into local authority strategic plans. The outcomes to be achieved from the event were for delegates to be:

- Informed of costs, benefits, impacts and opportunities associated with action on renewable energy.
- Aware of the strategic links on this agenda to corporate policy and the vision for an area.
- Aware of the role that planning plays in the context of current government policy.
- Aware of the potential benefits to be gained from collaboration with a range of stakeholders and understanding of potential routes to achieve this.

Video from the Secretary of State – Rt. Hon Ed Davey MP

The Rt. Hon Ed Davey MP gave a welcome address via recorded video which can be viewed on You Tube at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-DALG84vPgA&feature=youtu.be>

Policy Perspective from DECC – Elin Williams

Elin Williams, Head of Onshore Wind at DECC, outlined the department's three key objectives:

- Energy security - powering the country; keeping lights on;
- Decarbonising industry and promoting energy efficiency
- Ensuring energy is affordable both for businesses and consumers; keeping bills down

Most people now believe global warming is man made. The latest decade was warmer than any previous decade and this pattern is highly likely to continue and get worse. A fifth of our power plants are set to close during the next decade because they are too old or too polluting. They will need to be replaced – with renewables. We need to have a diverse renewable energy

mix, and we are legally bound to be producing 80% of our energy from renewables by 2050 and 34% by 2020.

Elin listed the key technologies, saying none could be excluded if we are to meet targets – including new nuclear and there was a continued role for gas and oil. DECC had produced an updated roadmap, which took account of costs and timings of build. She presented a range of plausible scenarios up to 2020. Elin presented a graph showing progress made to date; we are currently on course to achieve next interim target, but will need to significantly increase activity to meet the target for 2020. DECC is providing initial financial support to ensure viability of different energy types, but will reduce subsidies as each becomes self-sufficient. Under the Renewables Obligation, utilities are penalised if targets not met. The Levy Control Framework enables DECC to achieve its objectives whilst minimising impact on consumers. There will be major announcements over next few weeks on financial incentives to stimulate the markets.

Elin presented a comparison on impacts, showing what would be the likely outcomes with and without interventions. Other incentives were in hand, such as Green Deal and smart meters. All these would have economic benefits via investment in jobs, particularly for onshore wind, and at a local level; for example in the manufacture of turbine components and their maintenance. There will also be community benefit incentives that will reward communities who host renewables schemes.

Public opinion varies and there is a wide range of strongly held views, particularly over onshore wind. DECC's latest research shows 82% support overall for renewables (varying by technology). Support remains constant, but tends to change when a proposal becomes local. However, even at local level 56% would support a scheme in their area. This is a very complex issue, driven by misinformation. It is also affected by whether or not people feel empowered in their local area. A high level of engagement is crucial and LAs need to work closely with developers to maximise results.

Thus there will be a package of measures, including subsidies set at the right level to bring stability. There must be a change to ensure communities are consulted earlier. Best practice guidance for developers will soon be issued by DECC. They will be asking for a 5-fold increase in the amount developers pay to communities – who would decide themselves how this should be spent – e.g. whether on reducing bills or on some other form of community benefit.

Sheffield & District Heating Network – Andy Nolan

Andy Nolan, Lead - Sustainable Cities Programme at Sheffield City Council, gave a presentation covering the drivers for and history of district / community heating in Sheffield, the role of Planning and plans for scaling up work at a City Region level. District heating in Sheffield dates back to the 1960's with a central oil fired boiler system, but this was later upgraded to use 'waste heat' and reduce reliance on fossil fuel back up. Current plans include an aspiration to expand, decarbonise and add resilience to the existing network and integrate with new networks planned in the Don Valley – in partnership with private sector.

Planning will play a principle role in securing the vision; through facilitating political commitment and dealing with key issues such as; land use, securing feedstock (waste),

community engagement, facilitating discussion with developers and helping shape the bigger picture for the area.

Questions

- On the issue of whether feedstock for 'waste heat' would need to travel further we noted that recycling had increase from 5% to 30%, which was regarded as a success. Thinking strategically about dealing with waste collection (including from neighbouring authorities) was required.
- With regard to heat mapping, it was confirmed that this had been done and a further project to capture and distribute heat was being investigate – drawing on an example from Sweden.
- Pipe networks cost around £1-2m per kilometer and were often funded by developers, although opportunistically.

Planning Policy Framework – Dr Hugh Ellis

Dr Hugh Ellis, Chief Planning at the TCPA, drew attention to the Ministerial statement. It was evident the role of spatial planning was key. It plays a wider role in social inclusion, sustainable development and addressing climate change. The TCPA has guidance on energy planning and spatial planning on its website, including heat mapping.

The last three years has seen more changes to the planning system than at any other time since 1947 – and the changes keep coming. Strategic regional planning was a good model; however, the full weight of responsibility now falls on the local level. Authorities need evidence and ambition to deliver – and need to convince their politicians.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was issued just over a year ago. It has become evident that area-wide viability tests are not possible. There are tensions over what types of renewables to deploy. Hugh referred to the relevant parts of the NPPF, which provides a strong framework for renewable energy (e.g. footnote 16 regarding the Climate Change Act) – but ultimately it is up to the local authority. There will be additional guidance issued as part of the Taylor review, which will remove all other guidance not covered by NPPF (due sometime in summer/autumn). This will be an on line resource in form of Q & A – a new format and system which will provide critical support.

The new Ministerial statement was produced in response to 100 Conservative MPs who said too much onshore wind was being approved in sensitive areas (often as a result of appeal decisions). The statement is NOT a veto on onshore wind. Nor does it imply a significant policy change.

Hugh referred to the following points from the statement:

- the need for renewable energy does not automatically override environmental protections and the planning concerns of local communities;
- decisions should take into account the cumulative impact of wind turbines and properly reflect the increasing impact on (a) the landscape and (b) local amenity as the number of turbines in the area increases;

- local topography should be a factor in assessing whether wind turbines have a damaging impact on the landscape (i.e. recognise that the impact on predominantly flat landscapes can be as great or greater than as on hilly or mountainous ones); and
- great care should be taken to ensure heritage assets are conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, including the impact of proposals on views important to their setting.

None of these points indicate any change to current policy. Hugh's view was that the statement was in fact a response to people who are NOT implementing the NPPF policy correctly at present. Politicians seem to have interpreted it as a veto: however, this is not what the statement says and it is not the government's intent. There is confusion between the technical and rational interpretation and political interpretation. There does need to be a coherent evidence base, but Member support is the most important issue. Strong messages need to be reiterated to Members. Our landscapes will not continue to be there unless we tackle climate change. Planetary survival is paramount.

Questions

- An issue was raised about shale gas extraction and did this have an 'easier ride' now? The general view was the guidance will be very permissive.

Energy from Wind – Yorkshire & Humber case studies – Stewart Provan

Stewart Provan from Banks Renewables presented a number of case studies from across Yorkshire and Humber to demonstrate the benefits to local communities and businesses from investments in on-shore wind farms. Four projects were highlighted as per the summary table below.

Wind Farm	Location	Capacity (no. turbines)	Key features
Marr	Doncaster	8MW (4)	On-going community liaison, strong links to Eco-Schools programme, substantial use of local materials and businesses c£500k
Hazelhead	Barnsley	6MW (3)	Site specific environmental plan (green belt)
Penny Hill	Rotherham	20.4MW (6)	Video montages used during consultation, pump primed local Warm Zone (fuel poverty).
Hook Moor	Leeds	15MW (5)	Opportunity cost – 7 years from application to commencement on site

Questions

- With regard to appeals against wind farms, we noted politicians often felt the pressure from residents to turn down planning permission, but appeals were often upheld as the frame of reference was quite different.

WORKSHOP 1 - Community Benefits

Elin Williams, Head of Onshore Wind at DECC introduced this first workshop that focused on different models for community benefits from local wind farm developments. After an introductory presentation, delegates were asked to review the five case study community benefit schemes and give their comments. See the workshop write up on page 13 for the outputs from the session.

Developing Renewable Energy in Harmony with Nature – Richard Barnard

Richard Barnard, RSPB, talked about the impact on biodiversity and the environment of renewable energy schemes. The RSPB considers planning applications for major infrastructure projects including both on and offshore wind farms, to support the need to meet targets in a way which doesn't impact on wildlife. The greatest long term threat to birds is from climate change. Some species will be able to adapt, but others will not.

The RSPB headquarters is submitting a planning application to install a wind turbine and solar PV is being installed on office roofs. They also have a role in lobbying government e.g. on the Energy Bill and in supporting green businesses.

Wind and solar farms may have a direct impact by using land which could create habitat loss. There is a need to minimise the impact. There can be a direct impact from wind turbines killing birds as some are attracted to them. If they are located in their flight paths it could have an impact on their survival; they also use more energy diverting around the obstacles. Bats also tend to fly at turbine height across fields.

The challenge is how to design to be in harmony with nature. The RSPB has plenty of data on bird paths and important sites, enabling them to map high risk areas to avoid when undertaking strategic plans. Developers should be encouraged to consult early with local authorities and the RSPB, to maximise benefits for the community and wildlife together. Properly managed sites can attract birds in. There are some good examples around the country where local authorities have used masterplanning principles to identify constraints at particular sites in an area. The RSPB favours this strategic approach so that suitable sites can be integrated into planning documents. Early and close collaboration is needed - pre-construction site surveys, using mathematical models to estimate numbers of species in flight path and also post construction monitoring. There may be an opportunity for enhancements through the planning process e.g. planting a wild flower meadow between turbines on wind farms to attract biodiversity.

Questions

- With regard to bird collisions with wind turbines there was no national evidence to support any concerns, although locally interest groups do look for physical evidence.
- We noted there was no requirement to do natural resource planning, but perhaps in the instance of wind, we should.
- We heard about the difficulties of working across local authority boundaries, but that the general duty to cooperate should support this.

- In response to a question about whether we need on-shore wind, Elin Williams stated that the technology was mature, affordable and clean.

Planning for Wind Energy – Alastair Smith

Alastair Smith of Wind Prospect gave a presentation from a developer's perspective on the development process and key issues for energy generation from on-shore wind. It was highlighted how wind farm development was like any other, so interactions were the same as they would be for other development. Local Planning Authorities were challenged on how local capacity studies were translated when it came to approving developments. The big issues for development management were cited as landscape, residential amenity, heritage consideration and the ongoing under-delivery of renewables projects.

WORKSHOP 2 – Positive & Proactive Action – Barriers, Opportunities, Support

Jon Clubb, Climate Change Coordinator at Your Climate introduced the second workshop session that was designed to help delegates and the event organisers to start to translate some of what they have heard into actions to take forward. Issues discussed at tables were:

- The barriers to positive and proactive action on this agenda?
- The opportunities?
- What would help?

See the workshop write up on page 17 for the outputs from this session.

Reflections, Summary & Close – Hugh Ellis

- There was a clear objective at the start - to help local authorities better understand the cost benefits and impacts.
- We have identified the challenges – resources, morale, policies and clarity, and the local politics.

The science about climate change is overwhelming. We have created a global problem which we are tackling in an interesting way. Politicians find it difficult and we could just walk away. There is no massive national resource – we are it – and we cannot fail. We may need to put ourselves in difficult situations and have difficult conversations with politicians.

'Middle Earth stands upon the brink of destruction; none can escape it. You will unite or you will fall. Each race is bound to this fate, this one doom'. (Lord of the Rings).

Workshop 1

Community Benefits

Elin Williams, Head of Onshore Wind at DECC, introduced this first workshop that focused on different models for community benefits from local wind farm developments. After an introductory presentation, delegates were asked to review the five case study community benefit schemes and give their comments.

Kettering Borough Council, England

In 2004 planning permission was granted for ten turbines at Burton Wold in Kettering, England. Working closely with developers, local press, schools and community groups, the council has worked to encourage community engagement and increase local knowledge of renewable energy.

A community benefit fund was set up from the wind farm which has been used for a number of renewable projects, bringing benefits to many in the local area. The first project funded was at Yeoman's Court, a sheltered housing scheme, where a solar powered water heating system was put in place to provide hot water to all communal areas with major saving benefits.

Other projects included the heating at a local Guiding Centre to deliver efficient heating and hot water to the community facility, the installation of sun pipes at a local school to provide natural daylight and a solar powered lighting scheme in the town centre providing light for the church.

Carbon Free Development – Earlseat Wind Farm, Fife, Scotland

Earlseat Wind Farm is a recently consented eight turbine wind farm on the site of a former open cast coal mine in Fife, Scotland with a number of nearby communities that experience a very high overall level of unemployment. In 2010 the Carbon Free Development signed a contract to provide funding equivalent of £3,000/MW (RPI) for six new apprenticeships each year, once the wind farm is operational, to provide students at the local college with the training and qualification to find employment in the renewable energy industry.

Up to £10,000 will be made available per apprentice and over the lifetime of the wind farm the scheme should fund over 150 apprenticeships for school leavers and adults returning to work.

RES – Carmarthenshire, Wales

In 2012 RES launched a Local Electricity discount Scheme (LEDS) as part of a proposed community benefit package at a site in Carmarthenshire. Through the scheme qualifying residential, community and business properties can receive a minimum discount of £100 per year on their electricity bill.

Following positive feedback, RES launched the scheme at four further proposed wind farms, bringing the proposed community benefit package at new sites to a value of £5,000 per installed megawatt, made up of LEDS and a community benefit fund.

In addition to this, in May 2013 RES launched LEDS at two of its wind farms that are in the final stages of construction – Meikle Carewe in Aberdeenshire and Tallentire in Cumbria.

RWE npowers renewables – Little Cheyne Court Windfarm, Kent/East Sussex, England

Little Cheyne Court is a 26 turbine wind farm with a capacity of 59.8MW situated near the coast in the South East of England.

Developers RWE npower's renewables offer a diverse community benefit package. In addition to a community benefit fund of £60,000/year, a local Habitat Management group, with representatives from natural England and the RSPB was set up and £450,000 was placed on deposit to be used to fund initiatives such as bird monitoring and habitat creation for bees.

A number of initiatives have taken place such as habitat creation, where, in consultation with Natural England, it was agreed the planting of clover species on land isolated from main agricultural use would take place. After several years management surveys have demonstrated the habitat creation to be successful with very strong numbers of locally rare bumblebees recorded.

Falck Renewables – Earlsburn wind farm, Campsie Hills, between Stirling and Glasgow, Scotland

Earlsburn is a fifteen turbine wind farm in Stirlingshire, Scotland. RDC and Falck Renewables initially proposed a 14-turbine wind farm. Through engagement with the local residents of Fintry and Fintry Renewable Energy Enterprise (FREE), RDC and Falck Renewables helped with the planning permission, financing and operation of a fifteenth community turbine.

Under the scheme Falck Renewables paid for the initial cost of the turbine and FREE pay it back over time. Whilst the initial cost is being repaid over the first 15 years FREE gets a return of around £50,000 - £100,000 a year depending on electricity prices and this is expected to increase to about £400,000 a year after the debt has been paid off.

The income from the community turbine has been used to deliver projects such as insulation of properties, installation of heaters in the local community hall and the provision of a new wood chip boiler for the local sports hall.

Summary of outputs from workshop

The outputs from the group discussions are summarised below.

1. Which example do you think brings the most positive benefits to the community? Why?

- All very different.
- Not one size fits all – whatever is best for that community x2
- Funds that go to additional energy and new jobs – focus on outcomes.
- Keep flexible to area – e.g. brownfield, conservation, cooperatives, and shared ownership.
- Falck Renewables x 3
 - Community ownership of turbines.
 - Control over income longer term x2.
- All the case studies have different 'positives' – specific to local situation.

- Earlseat Wind farm x 2
 - Liked apprenticeships and local skills investment, but must be tailored to what those affected want.
 - Wider societal benefit, long term wealth / jobs agenda.

2. In each example, how would you define the community? Is this appropriate?

- Its variable, different locations, carbon footprints.
- Community could be a narrow definition, stakeholders could be better.
- Those immediately impacted upon.
- Little Cheyne Court Windfarm – probably has the widest application as it's not specific to a single interest group.
- Kettering has stimulated a diverse range of community energy projects so its had a multiplying effect.
- Banding / scale communities i.e. those next to developments get more say, but those who are part of the wider community may also benefit and get their voice heard.
- Different scales:
 - Borough area
 - Wider area e.g. Fife administrative area
 - Immediate area of wind farm
 - Local area and users of improved habitat area
 - Residents immediately local to site

3. How would you administer the community fund in each example?

- In County Durham the Liaison Sub Committee uses a scoring system.
- Attention to low cost administration should be key.
- Local authority administration extenuates boundaries when community it should benefit may be in another authority area.
- Money should go down to Parish level – better change of consensus and participation / involvement.
- Have an independent body to do this – either local government or independent trust. Possibly a role for the local planning authority?
- Get the community on your side – have a principal advocate from the community.
- Community fund with wide range of shareholders / partners including local authorities.
- Developer should not have control over funds – should be independent.
- Independent body – no politics
- Local authority, planning committee, development trust.
- Local authority or body appointed by them or independent group

4. What could be done to improve these schemes?

- Improve administration of money, better planning, consider forming Community Interest Company to attract additional money.
- Need a neutral 'referee'.
- Consider an endowment fund model x2.
- Form a community group and look at their wider role.
- Make sure where money comes from and how it is spent is transparent.

- Get back into energy provision – become more proactive.
- Centralise to get more for your money.
- Allow individuals to invest in the wind farm upfront and also be gifted shares so people own or feel they have ownership of the scheme.
- Encourage communities to build schemes and seek private sector partners.
- Ensure options remain flexible, incentives may need to change over the 25/35 year operation.
- Use funds to support transport and village schools.
- Catalyse a person to lead and gain buy in from the community for the scheme.
- Where local groups don't want the local authority involved work with a developer to build a community owned scheme – e.g. share scheme.
- Levels of community support – more benefit for those immediately in the vicinity, with a lower level for those 'who can see it', effectively the district level.

5. What benefits do you think renewable energy can bring to an area and what does this need to be balanced against?

- Unites the community, especially when against a scheme.
- Cheaper energy especially for areas where energy efficient measures cannot be installed easily.
- Energy security, more awareness of energy use and its reduction (equally as important as providing more generation capacity), income for insulation and further smaller scale renewables, arts and community project – not necessarily anything to do with energy.

6. Any other comments?

- Are there any limits on spend?
- How wide an area could a scheme cover?
- Much more support needed on both information and finances for community energy schemes. These need not necessarily be any smaller than current schemes if sufficient support and community buy-in can be gained.

Workshop 2

Taking Positive & Proactive Action: Barriers, Opportunities, Support

Jon Clubb, Climate Change Coordinator at Your Climate, introduced the second workshop session that was designed to help delegates and the event organisers to start to translate some of what they have heard into actions to take forward.

Questions	Delegate comments
<p>The barriers <i>Please consider organisational barriers and those with stakeholder engagement as well as barriers in technology and public perception</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local plans – speed and rapidly changing nature. • Resource issue and technical expertise is too expensive. Staff capacity, knowledge and expertise are often not available in LAs to move with the development of science around topic area. • Timely to complete consultation effectively. • Perception barriers (public). • Elected representatives refuse applications not always based on public consultations but often with lack of knowledge of the pros/cons of the proposed technology. • Myth of ‘heritage landscape’ being open green countryside, when it is actually pylons and power stations often in less affluent areas. • Too much focus on turbines as whole solution. • The national press. • Mis-match between evidence and national policy (regarding need to tackle climate change) and local perceptions (local members, general public and housing developers). • Excitement over ‘fracking’ potential – could be a short term distraction to detriment of renewables agenda. • For communities – getting different advice and landowner role on what is possible. • Wind – grid connection was prohibitive. • AONB – restricted areas. • All communities are different. • Land ownership – can be different. • Cost of dealing with schemes/consultation/challenge. • Politicised and inaccurate nature of public/media discourse. Encouraging people to speak up with silent majority. Council need to work more corporately. • Lack of planning applications/developer interest. Perception from developers that it’s not worth it, lack of pre-feasibility studies to identify initial community interest or public statements to say ‘X council welcomes renewable energy development.’

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘NIMBYism’, lack of awareness of planning committees as to what they think their communities want (not always correctly) and other councillors public hysteria fuelled by vested interest. • Public perception – hearts and minds advertising campaign needed over a long period of time, consistent, positive and professional message. Like the ‘Love Food Hate Waste’ campaign. Cannot be left to local level. • Lack of helpful direction from national government (‘they have left the room’). • Lack of resources at local government level and lack of leadership. • Fear and hostility – mob mentality – stirred by media (intimidation). • Political involvement by MPs/Ministers. • ‘Unrepresentative’ representation on planning committees. • ‘Real’ community voices not heard. • Misinformation/out of date information. • Prejudice.
<p>The Opportunities <i>Please consider opportunities for organisations and for areas as a whole, e.g. reputational and financial opportunities as well as jobs, growth, investment into an area, etc.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District heating in Sheffield is a good example of a successful project. • City region mechanism (in absence of former regional arrangements). <p>Energy - within context of LCR and individual local authority priorities Strategy / Policy - economic growth (low carbon economy)</p>
<p>Support needed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss different opportunities with the community – communities need to know the options available. Capacity and feasibility studies do have some value, especially in the evidence base. • Remove local decision making. National plan is needed and it should remain at national level and in the hands of experts. • Regular updates from DECC to planning authorities then they can disseminate to planning committees etc. • Education / training for planning authorities. • Clear leadership at City Region and local level for renewables and benefits • Clear re: affirmation from DECC regarding commitment to renewables agenda and risk of it getting crowded out by fracking • Clarification on business rates retention for low carbon projects.

Evaluation

23 delegates completed an evaluation form which included an opportunity to rate the event overall in terms of content and organization as well as specific feedback on how we've met our event outcomes specified at the beginning of this report.

Overall ratings for the event:

	Excellent		Good		Poor
Content	13		10		
Organisation	15		8		

100% of delegates rated the event overall as excellent or good.

Has the event helped you become more informed of the costs, benefits, impacts and opportunities associated with action on renewable energy? Please explain your response.

- Aware of most of it already but now reminded of how it all (needs to) fit together and why it's so important. More aware of why the system is currently not working.
- Yes - helped to understand approach from speakers' organisations e.g. RSPB.
- Yes - given a wide range of information from a range of perspectives.
- Yes, excellent presentations, balanced both for opportunities and threats. Great debate especially the topics outside of wind e.g. Sheffield's heat network. Some participants seemed to be keen to explore more/other technologies i.e. biomass and hydro. May have been good to build this in.
- Yes - strengthened my understanding of contribution to economic growth.
- Not any more than I knew.
- Useful update and debate on a subject that I have been involved with over a number of years.
- Yes. All the presentations were very informative.
- A useful mix of views and debate.
- Yes, very interesting range of speakers. Good to have public/private viewpoints.
- Yes - helpful overview. Good, well informed speakers and case studies. Well structured event.
- Yes, getting more involved with turbine development especially and this event has been useful.
- Neutral impact. Much of the debate has been prevalent in DC to date. Like the developers said, this is old discussions and we/public are going backwards in cracking climate change.
- Yes, the Sheffield example was very interesting.
- Gave greater insight into the planning process regarding renewables and the conflict between public policy and the media response.

- No - too much concentration on onshore wind, with little reference to it's downside or lack of efficiency. Planners seem not to appreciate potential of other technologies. Contributors did not provide real detail.
- The impacts of action on renewable energy are similar/consistent across all areas - it is the response from LAs that is different. Some active/some not.
- Yes, the speakers were excellent and provided up to date advice, guidance and examples of good practice.
- Hard to hear the two afternoon speakers but good information gleaned from table discussion.
- Yes - x 4.

Has the event helped you to consider the strategic links on this agenda to corporate policy and vision for your area? Please explain your response.

- Will refer the information back to our Planning Department to see if they are willing to publish guidance on most suitable areas/types of renewables that are suitable for Hambleton.
- Local Plan for York - renewables and what is most likely to be appropriate policy to achieve renewables strategy for the authority's consideration.
- From a personal perspective yes, however my organisation's involvement in wind is limited.
- Yes, cross-meeting with local policy makers was fruitful.
- Yes - very live topic for my authority and some useful ideas discussed.
- Has given me the information to consider this further.
- To a degree - still difficult to see what difference could be made in an environment of reduced resources? However, I will feed back to colleagues in Planning Policy.
- Yes - probably already aware of opportunities. Hope to make it happen!
- Yes, there needs to be better linkage with LPA and regional view/plans. Been lost at regional level.
- Would have liked more emphasis on defending policies through EiP, especially in relation to viability.
- Reinforced belief that small household schemes more likely to be successful than large scale.
- It has highlighted some good practice, i.e. Sheffield heat network, to show real opportunities for corporate and community benefits. As a member of two Environment Forums, it is important to see what national policy actually is and how local councils could take a lead role in influencing.
- Yes - good deal of written information and case studies but lack of information on comparing all the renewable power options. However, the district heating techniques seem to offer best way to provide energy efficient, climate friendly power/heating.
- Yes - a more strategic approach and guidance from DECC would be appreciated.
- Yes, need to undertake further evidence basic work with the local authority and beyond with neighbouring authorities.
- Yes - x 5.

Has the event helped you to understand the current government policy and the role of planning in the context of renewable energy? Please explain your response.

- Yes - there isn't really one. CLG needed.

- The government should prioritise renewable development over grading and nuclear. Community benefit from turbines should be given greater priority e.g. community trust providing on-going resource.
- Yes - good to hear from DECC and their viewpoint.
- Yes - good to hear from DECC. Interesting to hear how local authorities are translating this. However, not very consistent across LAs, therefore CLG's presence should have been recognised by the department as vital to aid and move forward discussions.
- Yes - planning to provide leadership and make links to wider agenda and partner organisations - e.g. prepare Energy Plan.
- Yes - but still have suspicion that government going lukewarm on renewables.
- Yes, very good to meet and chat with Erin from DECC.
- Up to a point! Government needs to provide clearer and more consistent messages.
- Yes - and also the limitations.
- Yes - although more consistency in implementation would help.
- Shown and demonstrated how out of sorts government policy is at present, changing planning system for the sake of it. The system before, whilst not perfect, was the best system available.
- Not very knowledgeable about planning so mainly went over my head.
- Given more clarity.
- Yes - but concern about lack of acknowledgement about value of less developed technology.
- Yes, however, each planning authority interprets information in different ways. A consistent approach is required.
- Yes, it was good to have an up to date overview of current government policy.
- The hall made comments from further away hard to catch. OK when Chair repeated them.
- Yes - x 5.

Has the event raised your awareness of the potential benefits of collaboration with a range of stakeholders and the potential routes to achieve this?

- A collaborative approach between all stakeholders will deliver a consistent response.
- Shown the variety and diversity of solutions - need to be relevant to local communities.
- Question not relevant to before lunch sessions - sorry I had to leave at lunchtime.
- Yes, community benefits available useful. But no experience from LPAs of case studies in the Yorkshire area. Tend to be in Scotland/Wales, culturally different.
- Yes - real opportunities for public sector family to collaborate on this.
- Yes - pre-app discussions always best!
- Yes. Presentation gave a balanced view from some of those involved.
- Yes, raising the importance of early discussion and collaboration - on any renewable technology.
- Yes - x 9.

Please let us know if you have any other comments about today's event

- Two afternoon speakers need training on how to deliver their speech. Because they had a microphone they spoke conversationally in a monotone. It was hard to hear and understand.
- Overall, very informative. Thanks.

- Definitely inspired to encourage formation of community energy company/organisation in York. York Environment Forum (www.yorkenvironmentforum.org.uk) has already held one public meeting (at same venue) attended by over 100 people. We plan to hold a follow-up meeting now, with a proposal to start something here in York.
- Too focussed on wind energy. Would have liked more discussion about planning policies and viability. There were 2 speakers from the wind energy industry but we only needed one and could have had a different kind of renewable energy presented. Would have liked to have seen something on Code for Sust. Homes/Breeam and to know DECC's view on it.
- Well rounded debate and useful to reiterate issues around renewables.
- Excellent food for thought and need for change.
- Great venue, easily accessible and good coffee!
- As don't directly work in this area, would be useful to know good examples of the evidence base available. Good venue and lunch.
- I guess we should count our blessings - we could always have another - unnamed but mentioned during the day..... - Minister in charge!
- Hold another in a year's time and see how far we've got.
- Information/guidance of implementing Affordable Solutions would help local implementations.
- Excellent event. Very informative although strong bias to wind discussion. Hugh excellent Chair as always. Good to have opportunity to discuss and debate which some events lack. Food good too.
- Great event and good to see different organisations (public and private) coming together. However, would have been good to discuss other renewables other than wind. Felt it was a very narrow viewpoint, which doesn't reflect the views of DECC. Good sessions, informative, not too long/short. Good interaction and felt comfortable to discuss topics openly.
- Problem of preaching to the converted or implacably opposed.
- CLG needed. More regional collaboration and planning needed. More cohesive/holistic strategies and allowance for planning departments to require more from new developments (also housing so as to match their additional energy need).
- Insufficient attention paid to negative landscape impact of onshore wind installations.