

Chelveston-cum-Caldecott Parish Council

Northamptonshire

Minutes of an Extra-Ordinary Parish Assembly

5th June 2006

Meeting Number EPA06

Minutes of an **Extra-Ordinary Parish Assembly** held at 7:30 p.m. - **Monday 5th June 2006** in the Chelveston Village Hall.

Present :- Councillors : Cllr A.R.Dale (Chairman)
 Cllr M.W.Wooding (Vice-chairman)
 Cllrs. M.L.Foulger, M.J.Izzard, A.J.Palfreeman & S.E.Stopps
 District Cllrs A.Saunston, B.Saunston & P.Whiting
 County Cllr D.Lawson

Clerk: Mr. M.H.Hunter

Public: Approx. 150 members of the public (approx. 10 visitors)

1 Introduction

Cllr Dale welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained that this was a meeting of the parish (rather than the Council). By law, he would be chairing the meeting.

2 Minutes of the 2006 APA held on 8th May 2006.

The Clerk outlined the minutes of the previous meeting. Cllr Dale proposed the adoption of the minutes and this was agreed by the meeting. Cllr Dale & the Clerk then signed the minutes.

3 Presentation by speaker for the developer.

Cllr Dale explained that the developer had consulted with his planning advisors and opted not to speak at the meeting, nor to make a statement.

4 Presentation by speakers for PRESERVE and CLOWD.

Chris Pentland spoke for PRESERVE, mainly on the bio-mass development issues and Steve Chambers spoke for CLOWD (Campaign to Limit On shore Wind farm Development), mainly on the Podington wind farm proposal and wind farm issues in general.

5 Questions from the floor.

24 members of the public raised questions or made statements. These included -

Health issues from bio-mass; health issues from pylons; the traffic to site (inc number of vehicles required to deliver concrete for the bases); the traffic routes (HGVs and cars); the impact on wildlife; the loss of grazing & visual amenity of pasture fields; the landscape will become industrialised; the lack of developer's response to questions; PPS 22 (Renewable Energy Policy) and its effect on local planning guidance; the potential for HGV accidents on the Chelveston bends (3 HGV accidents cited); what options for further weight restrictions on the B645?; the potential for vehicles to be located on the site; does any other development in the UK have both bio-mass and wind farms?; what are the alternatives if the application is rejected, given the developer's investment in the land?; are the local councils working together?; the noise levels and legislation; the light pollution caused by 24/7 operation; why are there options on the survey forms instead of YES/NO?; why do wind farms developers go for taller/bigger turbines?; will blade

Chelveston-cum-Caldecott Parish Council

Northamptonshire

flicker/glint trigger epilepsy attacks?; how far will PRESERVE go if it gets £50k - £100k?; are responses being sought from CAA, MOD and other bodies?; what happens to the bio-mass residue that is left over?; the dangers of fans and bio-mass combined; the need to refer the application responses to each other.

6 Summing up statement by PRESERVE.

Mr Pieter Mommersteeg (Chairman of PRESERVE) told the meeting that they had to weigh the disadvantages of the sites against the possible UK global warming savings. They should consider what is the logic, motive and economic benefits of locating the turbines in an area of below average wind speed. The electorate should draw its own conclusions by the developer's non-attendance at the meeting.

Regarding the bio-mass plant, if it is as safe as the developers claim, why is it not located on a Brownfield site with appropriate transport access? Why is it being proposed for a Greenfield site with very poor access?

Planning permissions, once granted, can be extended more easily and are rarely revoked. Allowing one application will eventually allow the other. Mr Mommersteeg urged the meeting to respond NO to both survey questions.

7 Response from the floor.

Mr Pentland advised that CRE was about 5 months ahead and that PRESERVE needs to get up to speed quickly. Anyone who had specialist skills was especially welcomed, but the bigger the membership of PRESERVE the more seriously it will be taken. The web-site will be up and running shortly (www.preservegroup.co.uk).

8 Summary of the meeting and explanation of the Council' opinion survey for the views of the electorate.

Cllr Dale summarised what the meeting had heard and what the planning process would be. Since the Council had a (separate) voice at the ENC planning meeting, and he was likely to be the speaker, he wanted a strong mandate from the electorate as to what the Council's view should be. As always, when the applications arrived, he urged people to write to ENC & NCC (as appropriate) with their objections, as the more the better.

The survey forms had been delivered and the Clerk or he would be available at the village hall for the next three evenings to receive the completed forms. Alternately they can be delivered/posted to the Clerk. The result would be announced at the Parish Council meeting on Monday 12th June.

The options on the survey were questioned. Cllr Dale explained he had chosen the options in response to requests from villagers.

The meeting closed at 9:20 p.m.

Issued on 7th June 2006

Pages 1103-1104 signed under seal as a true record

Adrian Dale
Chairman of the Parish Council

Mark Hunter
Clerk to the Parish Council