

Report on the Consultation by Minster School (Southwell) on Catchment Areas

Presented by: Cllr Allan

Closing date of Consultation: 30th January 2023

Cllr Allan outlined the current position regarding school catchment areas for reception, infant and junior children in the Parish and the misalignment of catchment areas for their progression to senior school.

The current catchment senior school for children from the Parish is Suthers School in Fernwood.

The Minster School, Southwell is consulting on a proposal to change its catchment area to include Averham and Kelham which would result in children attending their catchment junior schools to progress to senior school along with their year cohort rather than go on their own to Fernwood. It would also avoid the inevitable road congestion caused by flooding and the forthcoming works on the upgrade to the A46.

Cllr Allan stressed the need for residents to respond with their opinion.

Minute ref AKS-22-99

Report on the Local Liaison Committee Meeting with RWE and Residents

Presented by: Cllrs Emeny & Cobley

Date of Meeting 24th January 2023

RWE presented the results of the late 2022 noise survey, this included for the first time a monitoring point towards Behay Gardens Staythorpe, making 4 in all, either at the agreed locations, or at an interim point between the power station and recording point, then figures extrapolated as per standard technology accepted calculations.

All readings were below the planning restricted maximum of 38 Dba, generally around 35 / 36 Dba.

Cllr Emeny questioned the origin of the original planning limits in force, these were set by the Government and environment agencies in 1998. As an aside, national noise planning limit is 45 Dba for new builds.

Once the station is operational, output level has no real effect so no increase in noise when working to capacity, the start-up noise that has been mentioned by local residents, is steam escaping. This has also been measured and is within limits, it was suggested that as it's a different noise to "normal running", it's more noticeable.

The next survey will be late 2023, time of year has no measurable effect on results, however atmospheric pressure does, this is why they have to do the surveys at time of high pressure (more transmissible) for noise.

RWE do not have any plans for their own battery storage system on the Staythorpe site, though this could not be ruled out, Dave Dyson who is in charge of the site felt it would be many years as they are primarily a generator not storage.

The Carbon Capture project that was mentioned only in passing at the last meeting (RWE Npower Green aspirations and government direction), is related to a scheme currently in design phase in which they aim to recover 95% CO₂ from the flue gases of the turbines. This is dependent on winning one of 4 CCUS (Carbon Capture Utilise Scheme) licenses from the government, if successful, they should know by the end of 2023 / early 2024. This would mean quite a large on-site construction project, with up to 200 engineers on site at its peak, 8 -12 permanent positions afterwards. The site for this is where the current oil storage tanks are sited, adjacent to the current turbine sheds. Viking CCS Ltd have the contract to build a connecting pipe network between the 4 sites chosen and Hull, this is to transport the recovered CO₂ to be stored in re-purposed redundant oil and gas wells in the North Sea.

DD was asked about the long-term future of the power station, without the CCUS 10 - 15 years dependent on the progress of the UK government's Green Commitment, however with CCUS, it would be classed as a "green site", so would extend life to 30+ years.

With regard to the BESS project (obviously not connected to RWE or the site), they have no concerns with installation or fire risks etc., as it is a minimum 800mtrs from the site so would not pose any threat to their operation.

When questioned Andy Mosely, Chief Environmental Officer at RWE, stated trees have NO EFFECT on masking noise, just may introduce a masking noise, leaves rustling for example. To have any effect a woven matting would have to be installed through them apparently similar to what some road schemes have done.

Minute ref AKS-22-110

Working Group/ECAP Meeting 're The Community Benefit Scheme

Meeting Held 23rd January 2023 at Kelham Hall

Attendees:

Elena Sarieva (ES), John Hetherton (JH), Tom Cooper(TC) - ECAP Renewables
John Cobley (JC), John Allan (JA), Andy Fereday (AF), Debs Storey (DS), Chris Hall (CH) - Working Group

AF gave the introduction and emphasized that the purpose of today's meeting was an information gathering exercise and not a meeting of the Parish Council (PC) and should not be referred to as such at any time in the future.

ES stated that ECAP had come up with the current idea of the community fund offering following the public consultation. They wanted to explore how they could best communicate their proposals across the whole community and how residents could sign up most easily and efficiently to the proposal.

AF pointed out that the PC council would need to take out specialist legal advice before agreeing any form of proposal as they do not have the necessary skills in house.

CH asked if it was proposed that the fund be payable directly to residents or would they propose to make one payment to the PC who would then distribute it to residents?

JC queried the number of households that have been taken into account in the current proposal especially as it appeared that some of those included would not be directly affected by the proposed development.

AF stated that, currently, the PC could not legally administer such a scheme as they were not in possession of "The General Power of Competence" as defined under the current legislation.

JA asked if ECAP had any experience in relation to similar community benefit schemes. ES replied that this type of proposal was new to them so there was nothing similar to compare it with at the moment. However it was agreed that ECAP would go away to come up with proposals as to how such a scheme could function and be implemented.

TC stated that his experience of community benefit schemes were those that were normally associated with solar farms and usually involved a "one off" payment to the community. He also said that the situation was slightly different when it came to wind farms as community benefit payments were normally ongoing throughout the lifecycle of the project. It was also stated that any payment or benefit to residents would not be dependent upon their original viewpoint and whether they were in favour or objected to the proposal.

CH queried how the 2 MW figure quoted was calculated and was the proposed benefit based on current energy prices? ECAP agreed to provide a backup post meeting as to how the proposed benefit was calculated.

Working Group/ECAP Meeting cont'd.

JA queried how the community benefit could be continued/guaranteed should the scheme be sold on in the future to new owners?

JC queried who would cover any legal costs incurred by the PC in agreeing the terms and conditions of the community benefit scheme. JH stated that as part of the project, ECAP would cover all third party legal costs incurred by the PC in agreeing contracts terms and conditions. ECAP also stated that all legal costs would be covered should the project not go ahead for any reason. JC asked if this commitment to cover all legal costs incurred by the PC could be put in writing by ECAP.

All agreed that the ongoing workload of such a scheme would be costly and a challenge administratively.

DS queried whether payments would be fixed for the life of the project or would they be variable over time. ECAP stated that payments would be linked to the energy costs prevailing at the time and that their current calculations were based on the average household bill as quoted by the government. The comment was made that the government average household bill was not a reflection of average household bills within the parish.

JC queried why all households within all three parishes were included and not just those in Staythorpe that were directly affected by the project. He also asked that if the number of households were reduced would the capital simply be split between a lesser number or would it be prorata.

JA queried the issue of land ownership. JH replied that they would simply be leasing the land for the duration of the project, it would then be returned to its original owners.

Section 106 agreements were mentioned in relation to the community benefit scheme however it was felt that these would need to be dealt with as totally separate issues.

It was agreed that ECAP would respond with the information requested by Friday 10th February 2023 in order for the Working Group to review and report to the PC Meeting on 20th February 2023.

The meeting was closed and ECAP left. The working group agreed to meet again to review any developments arising on Monday the 13th of February at 13:00 hrs, venue to be Kelham Hall.