

Parish Council Forum Meeting Report

Monday 29 June 18:30 – 20:00

Microsoft Teams and Colne Town Hall

Attendance

Organisation	Membership
Calderdale Energy Park	Christian Egal - CEP Kevin Whitmore - Cavendish Indya Waite - Cavendish Graeme Blackett – Biggar Economics Sally Weston – Pell Frischmann Damian Kilburn – Pell Frischmann
Wadsworth Parish Council	Cllr Jon Kimber – Forum Chair Cllr Jenny Shepherd Stuart Bradshaw Apologies – Cllr J Salt
Heptonstall Parish Council	Cllr Joanne Holt Apologies – Cllr Colin Jackson
Hebden Royd Town Council	Cllr Nikki Harvey Cllr Keith Butterick
Haworth & Stanbury Village Council	Lisa Bladerstone Cllr Trudy Mahon
Keighley Town Council	Cllr Peter Kates
Trawden Forest Parish Council	Cllr Adrian Foulkes
Laneshaw Bridge Parish Council	Cllr Paul White Cllr Amanda Meachin
Briercliffe with Extwistle Parish Council	Cllr Alison Griffin Apologies - Cllr Roger Frost
Denholme Town Council	Cllr Paul Golding
Colne Town Council	Cllr Andy Bell Cllr David Cockburn-Price

Agenda

Agenda Item	Timings
1. Welcome & Approval of Previous Minutes	10 minutes
2. Discussion about project visualisations	10 minutes
3. Focus on Community Benefit Fund	20 minutes
4. Focus Transport, Traffic and Access	40 minutes
5. Topics for next meeting	10 minutes

Minutes

Welcome & Approval of Previous Minutes

The meeting commenced at **18:45**, slightly later than scheduled.

Cllr Jon Kimber (JK) opened the meeting, apologised for the delayed start and welcomed forum members to Colne. JK informed attendees that some councillors would need to leave the meeting early, including Cllr Keith Butterick (KB), JK requested that discussion of the proposed Community Benefit Fund be brought forward.

Kevin Whitmore (KW) clarified that discussions regarding a potential Community Benefit Fund did not imply support for, or approval of, the project. Rather, it was considered beneficial to discuss how such a fund could operate should the project receive consent.

Cllr Jenny Shepherd (JS) raised concerns regarding the accuracy of the previous meeting minutes, particularly relating to the discussion of peat definitions. JS stated she did not recall the discussion as recorded in the previous minutes and said it was her understanding that the English definition of peat should be used.

KW confirmed that the minutes of the last meeting would be reviewed.

JS also raised concerns relating to Natural England, habitat loss and habitat surveys. In relation to the Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment item, she requested clarification regarding how CEP intends to model the changes to Walshaw Moor's topography, in order for the draft 'direct

rainfall runoff flood model 'to estimate the flood risk impact of the proposed development on Walshaw moor – and downstream. The flood/hydrology expert said that this flood risk impact would be based on estimates of how the proposed development would change the blanket bog topography – and so, the runoff.

Forum members requested access to shapefiles relating to the proposed road infrastructure.

The project flythrough visualisation was discussed.

PW noted that the minutes did not record that the turbines shown within the flythrough were not to scale.

KW clarified that turbine heights shown were to scale, including the tip heights. CE explained that the exact rotor diameters and hub heights of wind turbines can vary between manufacturers and therefore cannot yet be accurately represented.

Focus on Community Benefit Fund (CBF)

Graeme Blackett (GB) introduced himself and outlined his experience in developing and delivering community benefit schemes associated with renewable energy projects. GB explained the documents that would be produced as part of the application process, including the PEIR, ES and Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Management Plan (OSSCMP).

He explained that it is useful to discuss these matters early as doing so helps to ensure the best possible community benefit scheme is included if the project is consented. He shared his personal experience of living near a wind farm in Scotland and helping to shape the CBF for that project.

Councillors agreed that it was best to postpone consideration of the proposed Community Benefit fund until after the DCO application – if Calderdale Energy Park gets that far.

GB ran through his presentation, noting that government guidance for community benefit funds is forthcoming, and in the meantime best practice from Scotland and Wales is being followed. Funds can be transformational, but only if well managed and directed to where they are

most needed. He gave examples of projects in Scotland with high returns as an indicator of what is possible.

The scale of funding is not yet confirmed and depends on the final scale of the project. CWFL will commit to what is expected — £5,000 per megawatt.

JK asked whether funding is provided over the lifetime of the scheme.

GB confirmed that community benefit arrangements are typically designed around the full operational lifespan of the development, so a 35-year lifetime for CEP.

A question was raised as to whether the funding is index-linked or based on output.

GB said this depends on policy, but the developer assumes the risk — usually CPI.

GB stressed that a good management system is critical. Communities cannot be expected to manage funds themselves without experience, and a strong understanding of local needs is required to properly manage and distribute funds. Initial discussions have taken place with The Community Foundation for Calderdale (CFFC) about fund management. Their ideas included a tiered approach with funding for flagship long-term projects, multi-year funded projects and smaller grants to be included.

CFFC is an experienced organisation that already distributes funds across local authority boundaries for other onshore wind farms as well as the public sector.

Potential uses were discussed for the CBF including: community energy, green jobs, climate education, and youth investment.

GB noted that the project will also deliver socio-economic benefits during construction and operation. The initial assessment has only looked at Calderdale, but further work will also include assessments of potential economic impacts in Bradford, Rossendale, Pendle and Burnley.

During construction, benefits are estimated at £80m and 900 job years — an unusual calculation but one that captures both longer- and shorter-term job opportunities.

GB referenced the OSSCMP (Outline Supply Skills Chain Management Plan) as the plan for jobs and invited feedback on who they should be speaking to, before opening the floor to Q&A.

There was nervousness about engaging with the process due to the community's focus on objecting to the project, and a concern that engagement might be seen as tacit approval.

GB encouraged engagement in the process - even in opposition to the project - so that if consent is granted, thinking about community benefit isn't starting from scratch.

A question was raised as to whether an amount for the fund can be committed in the application.

KW said it would be about "how" the CBF is designed and managed rather than the amount of funding, which is aligned with government guidance on the basis of £5,000 per MW.

A further question was asked about the exact number of jobs.

GB said the exact number isn't yet available but will be confirmed for application submission, with civils and construction being the key jobs during the construction process. He confirmed that the assessment is undertaken on the basis of a reasonable commuter distance from the site.

DCP asked whether attrition is factored into the analysis, accounting for potential jobs lost due to businesses closing as a result of the project.

GB confirmed the net benefit has to be considered.

NH asked whether there is a firm commitment on the use of local contractors and apprenticeships if the project goes ahead.

GB confirmed both will be looked at within the OSSCMP. In practice, delivery is usually via a main contractor with other elements following down the supply chain, and this is likely to form part of the plan, with benefits to contractors through reduced cost and transport. He added that projects like this usually inspire younger people into careers they wouldn't have considered otherwise. He referenced Clyde in South Lanarkshire, where lots of young people have now ended up working in the renewables

sector. Engineering and forestry roles are also involved, and local interest suits the contractors.

Concerns were raised about the potential traffic impact in Colne, Laneshaw Bridge and more broadly past Burnley and Nelson.

Cllr David Cockburn Price (DCP) explained that he did not think the employment opportunities presented by the project were a significant return for the level of disruption.

A discussion was then had about the merits of comparisons between renewable energy projects in Scotland and Calderdale Energy Park, with members feeling that this is not particularly helpful.

JS commented that it didn't make sense for GB to compare Calderdale Energy Park in West Yorkshire to Scottish windfarms – the difference in geology means that Scottish windfarms have onsite access to suitable aggregate, so don't have the same local diseconomies as Calderdale Energy Park, that would arise from having to import massive quantities of aggregate. Councilors agreed.

Transport and access

Sally Weston (SW) and Damian Kilburn (DK) from Pell Frischman introduced themselves to the forum and provided an overview of their credentials, which included developing wind farms in Wales and Scotland.

DK ran through key roads in the area, the initial traffic impact assessment, and distribution of HGVs. Construction is assumed in 2029/30, with an estimate of vehicle flows across the lifetime of the project based on a worst case scenario. The closest quarries and potential routes for construction traffic via Skipton were explained. Some traffic would come from the M65, but not all bulk material would travel through the M65 and Colne, some routing would come via the last roundabout and up to Laneshaw Bridge.

There is a significant traffic increase on Lancashire Moor Road and Two Laws Road which have the largest impact. The worst impact in Colne is on the relief road down from Skipton. More detail is contained in the transport assessment.

JS noted that the aggregate is proposed to come via a different route to site, and asked DK/SW whether assessment work had taken place along this route.

Councillors then asked the Pell Frischmann team if they were aware that limestone cannot be used on the site due to the incompatibility of limestone with peat. DK said that he was not.

POST MEETING NOTE: Project team confirm that non calcareous stone for access roads and hardstanding will be sourced and used.

JS stated that if CEP isn't bringing the aggregate in via train from the lake district, then it will be coming via road which would be an additional vehicle every 5 minutes. She then asked what consultation has been undertaken with North Yorkshire Council.

KW asked DK if the granite and aggregate routes would be confirmed for ES or if there would still be optionality.

DK said key routes have to be nailed down but not specific quarries.

DCP raised concerns that the team is consulting on things that are not correct, which opens the process to judicial review. Noting that parishes along the aggregate routes have not been consulted.

Councillors raised questions about the AIL (Abnormal Indivisible Load) routes and why the exit and entry points had been chosen.

SW stated that the AIL's have to be on the road network for as little time as possible, that's why these routes have been chosen.

DCP asked about swept path analysis, and how long the AIL convoys take and who pays for the escorts etc.

SW confirmed that for the transport of turbine blades, they travel in convoy and the roads are closed so there is no opposing traffic and they are accompanied by an escort.

DCP asked what happens when the turbine blades exit the motorway and come into Colne.

AF asked about the transport of the generator.

AM gave an example of a car accident in the village where a telegraph pole was taken out and the residents were without a phone line and internet for 6 weeks. She asked how long telegraph poles would need to be taken out.

SW confirmed that CEP will undertake survey works to understand the heights of all lines and poles and the convoy will have someone who removes and reinstates the street furniture.

AM asked how long they are removed for and how long the convoys take, assuming this is across weeks and months.

SW stated that provisions will be made to re-route or put lines underground, people will not be left without service.

AM asked how long the convoys will last.

A question was raised about how the convoys work — whether they are one per week, and whether turbines are delivered one after another.

SW confirmed that there 3 parts in a convoy and they are usually moved in the early hours of the morning.

JS noted that over 5 months, at 34 turbine deliveries per month, the figures did not add up. Based on a six-day working week, this would mean 13 AILs a night.

SW confirmed it is possible, it just depends on the availability of the required number of vehicles.

JS stated that this number of deliveries would be an issue for people living in Laneshaw Bridge alongside the AIL delivery route.

PG asked about street furniture, he asked about the timing of removal and replacement of lampposts and how quickly will this be done. He also asked whether the turbines are assembled at one time?

DK said turbines will be taken to the point where they will be assembled — it saves space on site to assemble as they go.

KW asked whether once it has been identified what street furniture needs to go, is it swapped or moved?

SW confirmed items will either be hinged or on sockets in the months ahead. A team goes ahead of the convoy to hinge or remove furniture, with

another team behind reinstating it. ALL loads cannot be on the road at the same time as normal traffic, and by law the road cannot be left without street furniture.

AF noted that the period of 5 months is a long time and will have effects on businesses within Colne Town Centre, potentially leading to closure.

DK stated that when the convoys leave they will be pushed together as one HGV and there is no leftover traffic on the local road network once the delivery has taken place.

POST MEETING NOTE: Owing to the sensitivities of the mineral soils on site and for good environment practice, construction stone for structural composition and running surfaces on tracks, compound and hard standings will require to be non-calcareous stone. This will be imported stone, and likely to be drawn from various sources and producers that can meet quality and logistics. Potential sources are identified to the south west, west, and north of the site. The volumes will be determined by final layout design, engineering design and site-specific design. Some of these parameters will be interpreted by the Contractors designers. Our quantities at this stage are considered to be worst case.

HGV Figures

SB raised concerns about the HGV figures and materials calculations, noting inconsistencies when the numbers are pushed together.

SB referenced the geological survey, highlighting the sandstone grit stratification within the rock itself. The flagstones on the left-hand side of the site are a different type of grit, meaning it cannot be dug to any depth. SB notes that due to the type of rock present on site, CEP may not be able to use as much rock from on site as envisaged.

On the figures being used, SB noted that 2 million tonnes of material is quoted, but this isn't proven as no ground investigation has been carried out. The assumption of digging and reusing material across site isn't clear in the calculations. PF has stated 616,000 tonnes and referenced the journeys from site, highlighting discrepancies in the figures.

SB referenced Chapter 22 of the PEIR that references taking 2 million tonnes, 2.7 million tonnes, and 707 journeys per day — SB flagged this as a serious issue with the calculations.

DK responded, acknowledging the significant flooding across the Calder Valley and Hebden Bridge, and the varied depth of material across the site. He noted that this is the initial piece of work and the team is open to hearing comments.

JS raised concerns about the offline route from Laneshaw Bridge, which has two different exit points onto Lancashire Moor Road, as indicated in different sections of the PEIR. Stating that one section of the PEIR says that the new offline route from the A6068 Keighley Road across upland grassland would join Lancashire Moor Road near Ratten Clough Bridge. Other sections of the PEIR say that the offline bypass wouldn't join Lancashire Moor Road at Rattan Clough, but would turn away from Lancashire Moor Road and carry on across Herders Common and join Lancashire Moor Road south of Herders Common. She went on to state that the longer offline route, across Herder's Common before coming out onto Lancashire Moor Road, has serious implications given that Herders Common is just off the SPA, an area with lots of red-listed birds.

JS then stated that no bird surveys have been carried out for this offline road, so the assumption of no impact is being made without supporting survey data.

DK thanked both JS and SB for their feedback and noted that it was helpful.

AM raised the issue of mitigation, explaining that she lives on School Lane where large wagons and HGVs join the access track. She asked how traffic required to use the access route would be prevented from using School Lane.

DK confirmed this would be addressed within contracts with suppliers.

AF noted that light vehicles are also permitted to use the access road off school lane.

DK clarified that the restriction on School Lane would apply to all vehicles associated with the Proposed Development.

PW stated that the majority of traffic comes through Laneshaw Bridge, meaning it is the community most impacted, and that he felt the PEIR is fundamentally flawed.

DK stated that the impact on Laneshaw Bridge will be looked at as part of the ongoing assessment work.

PW added that a community impact assessment should already have been carried out and confirmed an objection would be raised if one is not undertaken.

DCP asked about the properties closest to the road and whether there would be any impact on those households.

DK explained that the work undertaken with the Local Highway Authority starts with the existing baseline before assessing the highway situation and impacts, and that the developer would compensate where appropriate.

DCP followed up by asking how impacted households could make a claim.

DK noted that evidence would be gathered both before and after to support this process.

AOB

JK closed the main meeting and moved to AOB.

Cllr Bell asked about the ES / Air Quality assessment.

Cllr Mahon raised the issue of action group signs being removed from private property.

JK asked about sound, querying whether - if the project goes ahead - the community benefit fund could be used to help mitigate sound impacts for nearby residents. He noted that although only a small number of houses are affected, the impact is very significant, as sound carries in the valley.

GB responded that if an impact is identified, it would be addressed as part of the DCO rather than through the community benefit fund.

GB added that energy efficiency measures would be an appropriate use of the fund.

JK asked CE about the potential removal of Ed Miliband as Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero.

CE confirmed he could not comment.

Cllr Kimber asked about the date and agenda for the next meeting.

KW set out the timeline, noting that the next meeting should take place when a design update can be provided, likely in September.

Meeting closed.