

**HENGISTBURY RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION**

**GENERAL MEETING 7 NOVEMBER 2012**

**ST. NICHOLAS CHURCH, BROADWAY, SOUTHBOURNE, BOURNEMOUTH**

**PROPOSED NAVITUS BAY WIND FARM**

**INTRODUCTION**

- Last February, the wind company Eneco carried out a public consultation, which was reported to HENRA members in March and a further update given at the June meeting. In view of its impact and the interest of members, a wind farm sub-committee was formed.
- On 3 October 2012, Challenge Navitus (CN) provided a presentation to HENRA against the scheme. This long-planned November meeting was to let our members hear the other side of the story from Navitus Bay Development Ltd. (NBDL).
- These minutes will be circulated by email to residents' associations, NBDL, CN, MPs and councillors. They include the text, an indicative map of the turbines and the voting results at the end of the meeting.

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Tony Yates, (Chair), Neil Blair (Treasurer), Bobbie Dove (Secretary), Cllr Eddie Coope, Cllr Davies, Cllr Rob Lawton and over 80 persons including members.

**Apologies:** PCSO Julia Saunders, Tobias Ellwood MP, Tony Bayliss.

**Police Report:** read out by Chair in place of police attendance:

- Halloween and Bonfire night were a success with additional ASB patrols across the Bournemouth East area, we had no reported incidents of ASB in Southbourne.
- Reports of vehicle crime in Southbourne are down, however work is still going on surrounding this.
- Speed checks have been carried out on the Broadway following recent reports of vehicles speeding between 8.30pm and the gates closing at 10pm. A number of drivers have been stopped and where appropriate have been offered the option of having points added to their licence with a fine or alternatively attending a driver's awareness scheme.

**Speakers:** Representatives of the off shore wind farm industry which included:

- Mike Unsworth (NBDL Project Director)
- Steve Freeman (PMSS Environmental Consultant)
- William Wheeler (LDA Design Seascape, Landscape and Visuals)
- Matt Bleasdale (Crown Estate. Development Manager)
- Julian Seymour (PPS Communications)
- Matthew Knight (Siemens. Wind turbine makers)
- Rachel Abbots (NBDL. Project Support)

Tony Yates stated that there was a request to postpone this meeting to coincide with the consultations in February 2013. However, given that the meeting was 6 months in the making, and the notice of postponement was only 2 weeks ago, HENRA decided that we proceed as planned. However, it was agreed that NBDL would also come along to a wind farm committee meeting in early spring 2013 to meet with Henra and provide further information.

Mikes Unsworth provided a very interesting presentation on the proposed development in Poole Bay. The presentation provided the following points:

- The original wind company was Eneco, which last April made a 50/50 joint venture with EDF to form NBDL.
- The Crown Estates had awarded Eneco this site known as Zone 7 in January 2010.
- The importance of wind power derived from various factors: sustainable energy source which will tackle climate change; it helps the preservation of the planet; fossil fuels are declining and subject to EU emissions regulations; some conventional power stations are being forced to close through non-compliance; the government target is 15% of energy from renewables by 2020; the reserve capacity of the system is reducing from 14% to 4% so creating a real risk of the lights going out.
- The Navitus Bay wind park will support economic growth in the south of England creating £100 million of business opportunities.
- A maintenance base will be manned using 100 local, permanent, full-time jobs, i.e. mainly technicians for the 20-25 year life of the project. In addition, the construction will require about 1,000 jobs for 3-4 years.
- The scheme will power a minimum of 615,000 and maximum of 820,000 homes.
- The company is committed to community consultation; discussions are held with Natural England and Trinity House; issues of tourism, impact on views and navigation are all recognised, and much feedback has been received. This is why the next round of consultation has been postponed to February when more visuals and other information will be available.
- The Planning Act 2008 applies a new procedure to wind farms because the government wanted to make developers provide more information. NBDL will apply for a Development Consent Order (DCO) in early 2014 and expect a decision from the Planning Inspectorate after about 15 months – it will then be for the minister to take a decision on whether to allow the scheme. (A site map was shown as included with these minutes, but this is indicative only because the number of turbines, their size and location is not yet known).
- Only part of the area, defined by the Crown Estates, was included in the scheme because NBDL's role is to define the optimum site in view of the various constraints such as navigation, shipping, aggregate extraction seabed slope and the Wight-Barfleur Reef (a Special Area of Conservation).
- An agreement has been reached with the Planning Inspectorate regarding the scope for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).
- NBDL must also have approval in advance from the Planning Inspectorate of a Statement of Community Consultation.
- Fawley power station produces 1000 MW compared to Navitus producing 1,200 MW maximum. Navitus might have 133 turbines of 9 MW each at a height of 210 metres above sea level, or 333 turbines of 3.6 MW each at 155 metres, or something in between. If however a design of 900 MW maximum is used, turbine numbers would be somewhat less.
- The 1200 MW option would save the emission of 1.2 million tonnes of carbon dioxide p.a. but no decision has yet been taken on the size of the development.
- The typical procedure is to design the turbines after planning consent has been received. However, it is known that they would be in straight lines and tangential to the direction of the prevailing wind.
- The next consultation will have improved photo montages and a “fly-through” model.
- The onshore facility includes an underground 35 km cable from a point between Barton and Milford to Mannington Grid between West Moors and Three Legged Cross.
- The EIA, the critical body of work which provides the information for consent, is under way now covering many aspects, e.g. navigation, seascape, landscape, hydrology, ornithology, fisheries etc. The Environment Statement, which identifies environmental impacts and how NBDL will limit those impacts, should appear in early 2013 and consultations will form the more formal part of the progress with the Statutory Consultees.
- After the planning application (DCO) in late 2013 or very early 2014 and subsequently the approval in 2015, there will be supply chain discussions and an investment decision in 2017 (raising funds for work) which will be between £3 to £3.5 billion. That year the onshore works will start and the offshore works will be between 3 to 3.5 years from 2018.

- The EIA will assess a comprehensive range of topics, including but not limited to:
  - a. Seascape, Landscape and Visuals
  - b. Socioeconomics
  - c. Navigation
  - d. Aviation
  - e. Coastal processes (impact of a man made structure on tidal regime and the impact that will have on coast line and erosion.
  - f. Hydrology
  - g. Ecology inc. ornithology
  - h. Commercial fisheries
- Mike requested that everyone comes along to the next round of consultations and provide feedback, either positive or negative.
- Mike recognised 2 main issues raised by Henra; the economic impact assessment and tourism in particular. And therefore one of the chapters within the EIA is socio-economics driven by an external organisation Roger Timm and Partners and primarily looks at supply chains, development and opportunities, tourism, local business and local fishing. It will look at positive and negative impacts.
- Andrew Langley from CN met with Mike Unsworth in August 2012 and they explored why the visuals from the 2 organisations are very different. Both parties agreed that the methodology to produce those visuals were correct, and that the geometry of the turbines was correct. CN Used a taller turbine than NBDL, however Mike stated that the original images used by NBDL were at a wider perspective than is seen by the eye. This is a prescriptive requirement and they have to produce the visuals in that manner. He quoted Andrew Langley as saying, “CN crop the image to narrow that visual perspective so it provides the impression that the turbines appear larger compared with those of NBDL”. The 2 organisations are also working together to find a way of providing images in February which will show an accurate representation.
- Mike is confident that having surveyed migratory patterns for 2 years that any measures undertaken to mitigate the environmental impacts will be successful but they are also working closely with statutory consultees and RSPB.

Members were then invited to ask questions which were answered by the wind farm representatives.

#### Tourism

Q – *What impact would there be on tourism?*

Answer provided by Mike Unsworth – EIA will look at that issue. LDA Design will be producing visuals to help assess it. He went on to say, “Having met Challenge Navitus, there are differences. In particular, I think that CN use a narrower perspective which causes the turbines to appear bigger. However, I accept that our photomontages were too small and we are working with CN on this. There will be additional viewpoints and various turbine options will be shown. Two years bird survey work has now been done and mitigation measures will work”.

#### Cost

Q – *If the whole thing is £3.5 billion, how much does that work out for each home?*

Answer provided by Mike Unsworth – “I do not have the figures for that as it has not been asked before. I can say that photo-voltaic electricity is four times the cost of wind power. It is widely recognised that tidal technology is some 10-20 years away from being comparable to the output of offshore wind farms. The project reflects the Governments’ ambition to deliver as much renewable generation energy as possible”.

From the floor – If the load factor is taken into account, it could be £10,000 per home.

Answer from Mike Unsworth – The load factor is the % applied to the optimum generation of MW when the wind is blowing well in order to arrive at actual output in the real world of variable wind. Mike provided a quick explanation of load factor, e. g. if a wind farm capacity is 1200 MW and wind variation means a 25% - 30% load factor, actual output would be 300 MW. In arriving at 820,000

homes, load factor has already been applied. He went on to say that during the remaining 70-75% of the time, electricity can still be generated, but just not at full power.

#### Constraints-free scheme

*Q – If there were no constraints from planning, consultations, etc., what would be your ideal wind farm development, in terms of location, number and height of turbines?*

Answered by Mike Unsworth – “It is a difficult question. The entire site is about 270 square miles. Clearly, we have identified a particular site of 76 square miles as optimum reflecting all the constraints. If we didn’t have to be concerned about MOD, shipping, navigational, aggregate extractions and as developer we would be looking at areas of higher costs. For example the body of water, the seabed here is very complex on this site and in some areas we have steep slopes. So yes, we would prefer to have a bigger area, but we would avoid some areas which were not economical viable”.

“The current constraints have determined why we are where we are and have limited the capacity that we are looking to economically develop. We have a minimum target that we have signed up to with Crown Est. of 900mw. The 1200 mw is the maximum that we can develop whilst making good economic sense”.

“A larger site comes down to cost of engineering. A bigger site than the total permitted area from Crown Estates has not been considered. We would always have the water depth, seabed slope and so forth to assess and the 1200 MW is a maximum size limit laid down for us. All I can say is that given the opportunity, we would have planned something larger”.

#### Distance from a very sensitive coast

*Q – Do Crown Estates recognise that the proposed wind farm is unreasonably intrusive to this uniquely sensitive coastline including (among the list appended) Britain’s only UNESCO World Heritage Coast? And that it should fall into the Government’s own guidelines and be sited at least 14 miles from any coast indeed further in this case as per the Government’s guidelines for such cases of exceptional sensitivity? Are NBDL considering amending / restricting their proposal to beyond this 14 mile recommendation and is the 210m high turbine a real distinct possibility? (Mention was made that Crown Estates have a lot to answer for, and there was a loud, resounding murmur of agreement).*

Answered by Matthew Bleasdale who wished to provide a presentation on how the zone area was identified. Regrettably there was not enough time to do this. This is a matter for the Planning Inspector to decide in due course. It is not the crown estate’s role to decide in such matters. The Crown Estates are a property company, which is publically accountable, and which returned £240 million to the Treasury last year and has the function of developing the assets of the nation where possible. In this property management role of identifying economic sites for development, planning issues are not particularly considered. The 14 mile limit was within DECC guidance as adopted by a Strategic Environment Assessment. In essence, Crown Estates are a property company and any issue of intrusiveness is for the Planning Inspector. “We are trying to manage a national asset for the good of the nation but we are not a planning authority. We recognise that in the first 2 rounds of zoning, the areas were too small and created difficulties for many including birds. Larger areas allow developers to take account of environmental issues and to manage them”.

Mike Unsworth added that, “the feedback for shipping etc is incumbent upon us, as the developer, to react to that feedback and cater for it. Part of the planning application requires NBDL to identify the feedback and how we dealt with it”.

“The zone does not allow itself to push the development outside the 12 nm line primarily because the line is quite far to the south to the larger zone area; it pushes us down to the Wight-Barfleur Reef which is a designated strategic area of conservation. We can’t ignore certain sensitivities to deal with another sensitivity. We have to look at getting the balance right. I think that it is highly likely that we will change the design of the proposed site so significantly that all the turbines will be behind 12 nm. I don’t think that the composition of this site lends itself to this”.

Mike Unsworth then went on to say, “two weeks ago, I met the UNESCO steering group leader to talk about geology and seascape setting. There is not a wind farm issue with the Outstanding Universal Value of the Jurassic Coast but the setting will be considered. As for the boundary of the selected 76

square mile site, this is now being reviewed in terms of visual and navigation feedbacks. However, the 14 mile limit is very unlikely to be exceeded in any revised scheme”.

“With regards to the height of a turbine, the larger the blade, the more wind that it captures. The way that technology is moving, the rotor diameter is getting larger, and the yield is increasing. It helps get the economics of the scheme down and the industry is under much government pressure to drive costs down and pass less costs on to the consumer. The industry is looking at increasing yield and the easiest way to do that is with larger turbines or rotor blades. We have looked at the upper end of turbine technology and identified that we will be looking at larger turbines such as the 9 MW. This has 120 metre high hubs and 180 metre diameter rotors (height to rotor tip 210 metres above the seabed). Today, the 9mw turbine does not exist and the largest turbine is 8mw with a rotor diameter of 164. I have only been involved in the job for 4 months and the feedback that I have had is that the range of options that we are looking at is too wide and it creates uncertainty. I am looking at reducing that and when I do that, I may be able to reduce the threshold of what we are looking at and the height may well come down. I can not tell you today that this may be the case but I want to narrow the range at what we are looking at within the timescales of this project”.

Matthew Knight added “The cost of the foundation structure and cabling is the same for different turbines but the larger 9 MW ones are more efficient, having less components per MW means 1/3 less weight per MW”.

#### Reliability and the environment

*Q – Cold and windless nights are common meaning no electricity from wind at times of high demand, whereas power from tides would be reliable. Why destroy the environment for the benefit of foreign companies by building these “fog machines” that are not predictable sources of power and will not come online till 2020? I hope William that you will produce fog impressions in the photos. Your slide has only showed us CO2 emissions against traditional forms of energy and not other renewable sources.*

Answer provided by Matthew Knight who said, “Siemens are involved in gas, nuclear and tidal energy and know that the costs of tidal can be very high, e.g. the Severn Barrage is currently estimated at about four times the cost of wind power for the same amount of energy. It requires 2.5 times the subsidy needed for marine turbines. The cost reduction target for wind power is from £150 per MWh now to £100 per MWh by 2020. The long term hope is to bring down the cost of renewable energy to the same as coal. However, all types of power are needed for the energy mix”.

He went on to state, “One of the best tidal areas for the country is the IOW which is site which is being looked at closely but we are some time away from that and it will be smaller”.

Matt Bleasdale added, “As the owner of seabeds, The Crown Estates are involved in the development of a number of sites including wave and tidal power, but their status is as prototypes. It is hard to get companies to take them on with a view to scaling up and reducing costs. DECC is researching the costs of electricity storage, but again these are early days. With the turbines working at approx 75% of the time, there are suggestions that the use of energy correlates with the production of energy so on average it gets paid 105% of the costs”.

#### Cost of decommissioning

*Q – Who will bear these costs at the end of the life of the wind farm: shareholders or the public?*

Answered by Mike Unsworth – The lease to NBDL will be 50 years and the life of the turbines about 25 years. A condition will be that defunct turbines will be taken down and the site restored to its previous condition. The amount of the necessary financial bond to secure this arrangement is not yet known.

#### Comparison with the Prinses Amalia wind farm

*Q – Noting that ENECO have stated on their Prinses Amalia wind farm website that its siting at over 14 miles from the Dutch coast is chosen to reduce the visual effect and noting its turbines are under 100m, will NBDL uphold these same principles on our shores? If NBDL want turbines in excess of 100m would you proportionately site such larger turbines further way from affected coasts so as not to worsen the impact beyond that at your Prinses Amalia wind farm?*

Answered by Mike Unsworth – Prinses Amalia is a very different site. Since there was no stipulated zone, Eneco had a free hand to optimise the site. Navitus is a restricted site and those restrictions have to be reflected in the design.

There followed some discussion on the objection procedure where HENRA may consult with the council and MP, and the point was made that the proposals were indeed intrusive compared to Prinses Amalia and its much smaller and more distant turbines.

Mike went on to say, “It is upon us to prove why we have to put the turbines where we are wanting to. If we can not prove that case, then the planning consent will be refused”.

#### The Chair asked

*Q – How does Henra make objections directly to the planning inspectorate for them to note our concerns and reasons for objections?*

This was answered by Steve Freeman who said, “by attending the meetings such as these and the consultations where we note the feedback and it is recorded in our planning application as part of our environmental statement. If you have any specific concerns and write to us, we have to record the objection and we are required to respond to it”.

#### Nature of Crown Estates

*Q – What is the Crown Estates? Is it the Queen, or a quango? How is it accountable? Does it represent Buckingham Palace? Who is the individual that we contact? How do communicate to an individual to hear our voice and to make YOU, the crown estate accountable, for your decision in this democratic country.* There was applause and loud agreement after the question was asked.

This was answered By Matthew Bleasdale – Crown Estates derives from history and the fact that the monarch owned all the land. In 1761, King George III gave income rights, i.e. revenue, to the state in return for a pension now known as the Civil List. Technically, the Queen owns the land whilst profits go to the Treasury. When the government decided to promote offshore wind power, it fell to the Crown Estates to create allocations of seabed sites for the purpose. However, any increased income will always go to the Treasury, not the Queen. Since it became clear that the development values were high, large allocations were made for Round 3 offshore wind farms. The site boundaries were fixed with the aid of an elegant computer model which took account of many things including shipping lanes and the acceptable water depth of up to 50 metres. “We are not part of government, we are an independent money making company, owned by the queen, accountable to the treasury to whom we return the profits. We work with the government to deliver their policies such as opening up the sea beds in order to provide and increase renewable energy”.

“One means of lodging your upset is by writing to your MP”.

#### Jobs

*Q – What jobs could be expected from the scheme? If people come for the view and the aspect etc. they do not come to look at these windmills. Have you taken in to account the number jobs lost in tourism?*

This was answered by Mike Unsworth – A number will arise in construction, operation and maintenance. There will be the formation of a tourist liaison group considering what tourist jobs might be affected in which concerns and real fears can be taken into consideration and fed in to the report. Roger Timm and partners will look at these aspects in the soci-economic chapter of the EIA.

#### Accountability for social and economic effects.

*Q – Who is accountable for such effects as may arise from the proposals?*

This was answered by Steve Freeman – The EIA will include considerable information from research into a number of different impacts. The research will be by bodies not of the developer’s choice but rather acceptable to various interested statutory authorities.

From the floor – “I disagree – you’re wrong. The EIA needs to be independent and not paid for by the wind company. Migrating birds are known to be killed elsewhere at the rate of 1,000 per turbine p.a.”

Matt Bleasdale responded by saying “The statutory bodies have to look at this aspect and be satisfied with it”.

From the floor – That is not right, mistakes have been made in the past. In Spain for example. The same is occurring in the North Sea where some 180,000 birds are lost, it is just not sustainable. You can choose any company you wish, and you know that you can just highlight those birds which are least affected. There have been instances in the past where the EIA were flawed

Steve Freeman replied “The safeguard here is that the RSPB have to sign off the proposals as satisfactory. We have to follow due process and our surveys followed recommended guidelines. I don’t understand the Spanish example. In the Netherlands where there were 80 turbines, researchers went back a couple of years later and found that birds flew around the farm by a few KM and the few birds that did fly through the farm, most flew around the turbines. The Baltics studies show that birds fly either around the farm or if they fly through and miss the turbines. Birds operate differently on shore and offshore and you can not carry these surveys on shore”.

From B Dove – to date the RSPB have been critical of your work with in the preliminary EIA and have confirmed that it simply did not meet the basic criteria required to form a preliminary EIA. It did not come up to scratch and they sent it back for many areas which required reworking.

Steve Freeman said “we were asked to look at night migrations and it is hard to monitor night flights. So we have come up with a model to address this. But the preliminary EIA was just a baseline study and we worked within guidelines to produce it”.

From the floor – There is greater than expected mortality, showing that the bird surveys done by wind developers are flawed. I know about all this because I regularly have to deal with swans breaking their backs when they fly into the pylons in the Avon valley. At one onshore turbine near a school, staff have to attend early every morning to pick up the dead birds so that the children arriving at school are not upset.

In addition to this, a point was made that as funding to the RSPB for bird research has increased, their objections to wind farms have decreased.

#### Risks to birds

*Q – With all that we have heard, there is obviously a problem – what steps, if any, have you taken to limit the problems caused to birds?*

Matthew Knight replied, “we need proper evidence and a lot of the data is subjective. When it comes to birds we can do studies and now know more about birds in the past 2 years than ever before because of all the research that has been carried out for the offshore wind farm industry. There are still a lot of things that we do not know, but the numbers that have been quoted by the gentleman at the back, are not numbers that I recognise in any of the studies or data that is widely available to view and use. We are not talking thousands of birds, we are talking of tens of birds. From the evidence that I have seen, that birds are not stupid they fly around farms. For those few that do fly into farms, radar evidence shows that birds fly exactly down the middle line and appear to be well aware of where the turbines are, whether the blades are moving or not. With regards to the numbers that were quoted, I do recognise them at all”.

#### Excessive noise and risk to human health

*Q – There are a number of cases of serious health problems arising from the low frequency noise and infra sound of wind farms. They include tinnitus, stress, depression, sleep deprivation and raised blood pressure. In some instances people have had to abandon where they live. I have looked into this area carefully and I can not see if there are any plans for a proper assessment to be undertaken with regards to noise, and health impact and in particular, in America there are questions about sound travel over water etc. If the wind farm is built, would there be excessive noise, in any frequency or nature that would pose a risk to health? If no, where is the data please? Can NBDL provide a written guarantee that there would be no excessive noise or adverse impact to human health?*

Answer was provided by Steve Freeman, “NBDL are currently undertaking an in-air noise study with a model being built. Looking at other offshore wind farms, they are not picking up any significant noise

upon shore. We have to look at the envelope and then factor the turbines used etc. There is not believed to be an issue with this. However, there is no data as of yet. We will consider covering this aspect in the EIA”.

Mike Unsworth added, “The way that it will be dealt with is within the EIA and any mitigation that has to be imposed to deal with any issues that are identified. It is not standard practise for the developer to provide a written guarantee in that respect. It is really up to the statutory bodies, that we have understood the issues, we have impact assessed it and put sufficient mitigation in place. Noise is a large chapter in the EIA and it looks are the human impact as well as seabed issues such as fish or mammary animals”.

From the floor- “I have not seen any information about assessing noise arising during the operation of the wind farm. So to confirm, you are saying that you will be looking at that. Thank you”.

#### Proposals for the members

*John Lambon then stood and went on to say the following: NBDL openly states, that the public consultation is to solicit responses and that they are or will be reacting to these – hence their delay to the next stage. As such it is important that opinions are gathered today so that NBDL have a clear view to assist this due process. Many things have been discussed here tonight and it is just a flavour of the opinions held by residents. I have taken the liberty to copy out proposals and as such would like to put them to the members.*

John Lambon next put forward the following four proposals which were read out and explained in detail. They are as set out at the end of these minutes. The proposals were seconded. Members were able to vote for more than one proposal. Copies were distributed to the members.

There are four main proposals:

- |       |                                   |
|-------|-----------------------------------|
| ONE   | To recognise the issues;          |
| TWO   | To reject the wind farm outright; |
| THREE | To consider modified proposals;   |
| FOUR  | Accept the wind farm as proposed. |

#### Voting

*Tony Yates as Chairman took the votes of the members:*

44 were in favour of proposal ONE, which was to recognise the issues.  
There were no abstentions.

34 people were in favour of proposal TWO, which was to vote against the farm completely.  
There were 4 abstentions.

39 people were in favour of proposal THREE, which was to accept a reduced scheme with turbine heights and distances creating a similar visual impact to the Prinses Amalia Site. There were 2 people voting against this proposal and there were 4 abstentions.

There was not a single vote in favour of proposal FOUR, which was to accept the building of the wind farm in Poole Bay within the information currently available. There were no abstentions.

The guests were thanked for their time in attending and speaking with us. Mike Unsworth also thanked the HENRA members for their time. He acknowledged that the residents represented a good depth of knowledge and understanding of the issues involved.

#### **A.O.B.**

Nothing was raised.

**Date of next meeting; 5<sup>th</sup> December 2012.**



**WAY FORWARD PROPOSALS  
TABLED AT HENRA MEETING WITH NBDL AND ITS REPRESENTATIVES  
7 NOVEMBER 2012**

NBDL openly states, that the public consultation is to solicit responses and that they are or will be reacting to these – hence their delay to the next stage. As such it is important that opinions are gathered today so that NBDL have a clear view to assist this due process.

There are four main proposals:

- |       |                                   |
|-------|-----------------------------------|
| ONE   | To recognise the issues;          |
| TWO   | To reject the wind farm outright; |
| THREE | To consider modified proposals;   |
| FOUR  | Accept the wind farm as proposed. |
- .....

**PROPOSAL ONE**

The meeting RECOGNISES that the proposed Navitus Bay wind farm is:

1. Proposed to be sited inappropriately in one of the most strategic and sensitive stretches of coastlines around the whole of the UK in part recognised as a World Heritage Site by UNESCO [*See Appendix 1 for full extent of impacted coastline, towns and communities*];
2. That by nature of this coastline, primarily a bay, the impact of the unreasonably close and truly massive proposal is intrusive, overwhelming and unacceptable;
3. That by specific reference to Government policy, namely DECC OESEA guidelines, such wind farms should normally be sited at a distance of at least 22km (14 miles) from coastlines indeed further in sensitive locations;
4. That if there is any location around our coasts that should be deemed sensitive, this has to be one of the most foremost candidates imaginable;
5. That the siting particularly impacts, with associated risks, key north/south bird migratory routes and potentially navigational safety;
6. That noting the unprecedented scale, the microclimate, noise and consequential impacts including biodiversity and health respectively, are undetermined;
7. That the tourism industry of all these coastal areas and centred around Bournemouth has grown on the back of its uniquely beautiful setting and consequential to the proposed wind farm there is a serious downside risk to the local economy and employment in this prime local industry, one recognised by the Government as of paramount importance to the UK economy as a whole.

**PROPOSAL TWO**

The meeting proposes that the Navitus Bay wind farm is

Abandoned as wholly inappropriate in this location.

**PROPOSAL THREE**

Noting that ENECO claim the size and location of their Prinses Amalia \* wind park off of their Dutch coast, is "*Chosen to reduce the visual effect from the coast as well as impact on migrating birds.*" [*\* See Appendix 2*]

The meeting proposes that the Navitus Bay wind farm upholds these same principles and is:

1. Sited a minimum of 23km (over 14 miles) from any coastline for turbines not exceeding 100m in total height, or
2. Is sited a minimum of 36km from any coastline for turbines up to 155m, or
3. Is sited a minimum of 46km from any coastline for turbines up to 210m, and pro rata for even larger sizes, and

4. In all cases does not prescribe an angle at any point on any affected coastline greater than 10 degrees.

#### PROPOSAL FOUR

The meeting proposes:

To accept the wind farm at the undetermined size and potential location now proposed by NBDL with turbines potentially up to 210m in height.

#### APPENDIX 1

With particular reference to unreasonable proximity to England's only natural UNESCO World Heritage Site, two Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and a National Park, the proposed location is wholly inappropriate.

The impact of the proposed Navitus Bay wind farm on the affected coastlines (clockwise) stretches from:

- a. The famous UNESCO World Heritage Jurassic coast of Dorset;
- b. Durlston Head (the gateway to the Jurassic coast);
- c. The resort town of Swanage;
- d. The Isle of Purbeck;
- e. Sandbanks;
- f. Brownsea Island nature reserve;
- g. Poole;
- h. Canford Cliffs;
- i. The resort town of Bournemouth;
- j. Boscombe;
- k. Hengistbury Head and its nature reserve;
- l. Stanpit nature reserve;
- m. The historic town of Christchurch, and the coastal communities:
- n. Mundeford;
- o. Highcliffe;
- p. Barton on Sea;
- q. Milford on Sea;
- r. Lymington; and
- s. Hurst castle;
- t. The West Solent to the Isle of Wight including:
- u. The famous Needles;
- v. West High and Tennyson Downs;
- w. Freshwater Bay and the
- x. Isle of Wight's beautiful South West coast.

Over 80 miles of Britain's most scenic coastline and prime resorts impacted.

#### APPENDIX 2

The Prinses Amalia wind farm by the Dutch company ENECO located off their Dutch coast at IJmuiden comprises 60 turbines under 100m high and covering 14 sq. km., being sited 23km from any shore, prescribing an angle not greater than 10 degrees at any point on the coast, and is claimed by ENECO to be duly sited to reduce visual impact from the coast and impact on migrating birds.

