

# Sleaford Renewable Energy Plant

## Review of Exhibition held as part of Pre-Application Consultation

---

### A SUMMARY

---

This is the analysis of the questionnaires received during the public exhibition held at the Solo Club, Sleaford between 10am and 7pm on 26 July 2007.

The exhibition was attended by approximately 70 people (56 actually signed in).

The exhibition was manned by Andrew Toft and Dafydd Williams. A third representative from Eco2 was unable to attend due to travel difficulties. Despite this loss of personnel, attendance was evenly spread throughout the day and almost all who attended were able to discuss the project in person with the developers.

39 questionnaires were completed and almost all were full responses. The results of each question are reproduced below. Where respondents did not answer a question this response is not recorded in the analysis, despite the fact that this could be interpreted as a "No opinion" response. Comments are reproduced in full.

---

### B BACKGROUND

---

#### Q.1 Which of the following best represents your view of global warming and climate change?

##### *Results*

Strong Concern	Slight concern	No opinion	Slight scepticism	Strong scepticism
20	11	1	1	0
61%	33%	3%	3%	0%

##### *Commentary*

This is a good response in that it demonstrates a good core understanding of the importance of this issue.

#### Q.2 Which of the following forms of renewable energy do you think should have a major role in Lincolnshire?

##### *Results*

On-shore wind	Off-shore wind	Solar	Biomass	Landfill gas
10	24	11	15	4
On-shore hydro	Wave energy	Tidal energy		
1	11	13		

One respondent stated that he/she was "not qualified to say".

### *Commentary*

The relatively low score for biomass is concerning. Biomass should be a clear winner, given the resource available in Lincolnshire. The fact that it scores low could be due to: a lack of understanding of the term; reluctance to support the sector given opposition to this scheme; or genuine informed scepticism about its value.

This may highlight a deficiency in the exhibition in that it did not explain the term nor its value to the Lincolnshire renewable energy mix. This should get more attention in future.

---

## **C PROJECT SPECIFIC**

---

### **Q.3 Do you agree that this scheme will have significant environmental benefits?**

#### *Results*

Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6	15	10	4	2
16%	41%	27%	11%	5%

One respondent added:

- Await town planning application

#### *Commentary*

A good result with 57% convinced of the scheme's environmental credentials, as opposed to 16% who are sceptical. The team must work hard to bring the 27% with no opinion into the supportive camp.

### **Q.4 Do you agree that this scheme will have significant local economic benefits?**

#### *Answers*

Strongly agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
7	14	6	7	1
20%	40%	17%	20%	3%

Respondents added:

- I prefer to wait and see!
- Await town planning application

#### *Commentary*

More work to be done here to convince the sceptics. The message of jobs and straw contracts needs to be very clear.

### **Q.5 What do you think are positive aspects of the Sleaford Renewable Energy Plant?**

#### *Answers*

- It will be good.
- Creating extra jobs for the town
- If all straw and wood chip are purchased locally and there are jobs for the local people then there will be positive aspects.

- Using straw/wood surplus
- It should help to attract more industry to the town. In turn local service providers will benefit.
- Local employment and straw provider
- Can't think of any.
- Use of possible unwanted straw
- Useful use of otherwise now redundant by-product of food production.
- Jobs
- Cheaper energy; employment; overall stronger economy
- Appears to have been carefully planned site. Existing power lines. Plant designed to be unobtrusive
- I am still trying to think of one. It is a good intention/business opportunity which will worsen the standard of life in a small market town which is already suffering from excess traffic.
- (sic) This plant would be better sited away from a built up area where people have their homes
- None?
- None
- Locality and benefits to local economy
- Local economic benefits; local employment
- Positive aspects good
- Bring employment to Sleaford
- Employment; use of waste straw
- None
- The straw stacks should not be available for vandals to burn
- Environmentally "friendly" supportive of investment in Lincs enhancement of the economy
- Renewable Energy markets for biomass
- Carbon free
- Carbon free
- Carbon free
- Employment and economic
- Jobs; local economic benefits to town, and no coal-fired plant
- Use of waste agricultural produce since introduction of law against field burning

**Q.6 What, if any, concerns do you have about the Sleaford Renewable Energy Plant?**

*Answers*

- Jobs
- Extra lorry traffic from by-pass to the plant.
- That promises of a clean, nearly silent site will not be met and perhaps lorry movements will increase
- Traffic
- Emissions, visual impact, traffic
- Lorries on already congested roads particularly those that are not dual carriageway.
- Transport problems, loose straw; traffic in villages
- None
- The amount of articulated lorries needed to transport the straw. Air pollution. Deliveries on Sundays and bank-holidays – this is not going to happen now – but what about in the future – especially if deadlines have to be met!

- Blot on the landscape. Adds greatly to heavy vehicles on quiet roads. Too close to residential areas.
- Additional traffic at K L jct, Sleaf Sth Jct
- Noise; insufficient tree screening on all sides (particularly from walking along the River Sleaf); possibility of deposits from the air; need to manage run off from A17 into KL Thorpe
- Pollution
- None
- Traffic at Kirkby
- Atmospheric pollution. Daily (except Sunday) heavy vehicles converging on Sleaford. Noise pollution from vehicles and the power station. The chimney does not look very high. Is this really enough?
- Pollution, noise, traffic
- Noise, gas, pollution, traffic, congestion
- Traffic congestion noise pollution
- Landscaping
- Proximity of plant to housing and amount of traffic
- Visual impact
- Pollution to atmosphere
- Ensuring the traffic flow plan is rigidly enforced
- None
- Traffic control
- Emissions of ash or smells from the plant

*Commentary*

These comments roughly break down into (in order of the most to least frequent):

Traffic

Emissions

Noise

Screening

We should be able to deal with emissions once the data is available. Similarly, noise.

Noise should also be soluble. However, it was hard to give comprehensive and convincing answers without this noise report.

Screening was a relatively weak objection. Most attendees were actually pleasantly surprised by the look of it.

Traffic could not have been discussed any better and ultimately it is impossible to persuade anyone minded to be concerned that 1 truck every 15 minutes is not significant.

**Q.7 Which of the following best describes your opinion of the Sleaford Renewable Energy Plant?**

*Answers*

Strongly in favour	In favour	No opinion	Against	Strongly against
9	12	8	4	4
24%	32%	22%	11%	11%

One respondent added "I do feel that it will intrude on the countryside."

*Commentary*

A really strong result: 56% supportive vs 22% against.

---

## **D THE EXHIBITION**

---

### **Q.8 Do you feel more informed about the project having attended this exhibition?**

*Answers*

Yes	No
33	5
87%	13%

- Your staff were very patient and answered our queries in full.
- Could you provide contact details for the Ely Liaison group to talk to.
- A153 not A513
- Did nothing to reassure me or inspire any confidence in the project.
- But it does not mention extra electric pylons and cables. Will these be near private or public buildings?
- Very informative
- Thank you

*Commentary*

Clearly the exhibition was well received. It is hard to understand anybody responding negatively as to attend almost guaranteed a personal discussion on the project with the developer. I suspect that a negative response is actually due to opposition to the project rather than the quality of the exhibition.

---

## **E OTHER COMMENTS**

---

*Comments*

The following comments were made in the space available on the rear of the questionnaire.

- When the plant is being built and after when lorries are going and coming they will use their reversing lights and “bleepers” attached to the reversing lights. If these bleepers are in use constantly the noise will cause distress to local people. I understand “bleepers” can be muted and in some vehicles a light system can be used. Please consider this concern when the time comes to build the plant.
- I am a member of the Sleaford Town Council and in an individual capacity (not on behalf of the Council) would like to speak to someone in Ely who has experience the operation of a comparable project.
- My concern is lorries using our village (South Kyme) as a shortcut to the A17. We have too many large articulated vehicles supplying Adams Port Pie Factory and Padleys (Moy Park) at Anwick and Ruskington using our village now. What reassurances can you give us that lorries will only use the “A” class roads?
- It was explained to me that the lorries, if coming from Boston area would deliver the straw to site on the Boston Road then get back to the A17 at Kirkby-La-Thorpe and head to Holdingham Roundabout and back onto the A17 back towards Boston or wherever they come from. I cannot see lorry drivers adhering to this.

Apparently this idea would give the residents of Kirkby-La-Thorpe a break from the lorries.

- A wonderful opportunity for the town.
- Has the height and design of the chimney really been assess in a scientific way? It looks a paltry thing compared with the tall chimney on old industrial plants. It should be high enough to avoid any risk of smoke and fumes affecting people in Sleaford and Kirkby La Thorpe; Are the fumes to be ejected from the chimney harmful to the lungs of any people unfortunate enough to breathe them? The power station should be sited away from a residential area and cannot be said to improve the amenities of a small town; Re above, I have since been told that what comes out of the chimney is steam. Burning straw produces other things, what happens to them; How noisy will the power station be in additiona to the sound of the lorries bringing the straw? Is removing the ash noisy? Will the noise from the power station be audible in the area of, say, Sleaford Police Station?
- Living very near this proposed energy plant we are naturally concerned, 30 extra jobs seems very little, to say it will improve things for Sleaford. Yes the idea seems good, but I guess it's the site that is worrying. The chimney looks quite low in the plan, yet admittedly being low, it won't be so visible – will the “vapour” be properly dispersed?
- Locate it further north away from towns and villages
- This would be much better for the residents of Kirkby La Thorpe if it was located further away.
- Concerns: traffic, smell and noise
- I would be interested in talking to someone with regard to the landscaping

*Address left for response?*

- 17 left some details
- 22 left no details

Compiled by Andrew Toft, July 2007