



Social Sustainability and Wind Energy Development: Experiences from the Field

Bríd Walsh Dept. of Geography, NUI Galway Supervisor: Prof. Micheál Ó Cinnéide Supported by EPA

September 29th 2010

b.walsh11@nuigalway.ie

Photo: Author







National steering

- Local authority engagement
- Structural change
- Ownership and power
- Economic returns
- Participation in planning
- Best' practice?





Photos: Author

Ireland's wind industry

Predominantly corporate ownership
 Nearly 700MW (of ~1400MW) owned by three corporate interests alone

Diverse opinions regarding local engagement

Minority undertake little or no consultations with local communities.

Minority strongly identify with the Ideology of community participation. Majority view consultations as:

Good planning practice Means of mitigating local opposition and enhancing chance of planning success

> Most common methods: Public exhibitions

Wariness of public meetings

Engagement practices are informed by:
(a) previous experiences
(b) their ideological commitment to best practice
(c) their assessment of:

-- local opposition and of the necessity to get local people on-side

-- local capacity and interest of citizens to engage in consultation mechanisms

-- the legitimacy of local knowledge and concerns(d) size and location of the project

Industry trends

- Industry up-scaling
- Repowering
- Beyond local community capacity in many cases
- Corporate players
- Alienation from grassroots
- Remedial interventions
 - New methods of local involvement in planning
 - New monetary compensation mechanisms





"It ain't what you do it's the way that you do it"

 Collaborative planning
 Wind Park Haarlemmermeer Zuid Province of Noord Holland The Netherlands

Economic returns

- Issues with monetary compensation
- Danish Promotion of Renewable Energy Act 2009



Photo: Author

Wind Park Haarlemmermeer Zuid

Municipality initiated (2006)
20MW project
Prospective investors to be decided
Collaborative approach
Still at design phase
National government support withdrawn



 Process guidelines
 ...communication is the key word of the whole project (municipal planner)

Communication objectives:

creating supportive attitudes to wind energy development in Haarlemmermeer

increasing local knowledge regarding wind energy
encouraging residents to participate in the project.

Conflict solved primarily through discussion and weighing options Establishment of a cooperative of local landowners to work in a collaborative manner to create three alternative viable project designs

Project is operationalised through:
Municipal project group
Initiative group
Kern group (lead group)
Facilitator

Stichting (Foundation)Design team

Advantages (IG perspective)

- Increased local acceptance of wind energyMeaningful influence on the process
- Process is transparent and fair
- Local citizens have a vested interest
- Realisation of renewable energy
- Bonds and ties are created

Difficulties

- Defining stakeholder roles
- Stakeholder interest and willingness to participate in a consistent manner
- Fractured Initiative Group
- Mistrust of municipality
 - There is a secret plan in a drawer somewhere
- Timeliness of municipality in providing supports
- Revisiting decisions going around in circles
- Time consuming still at planning phase

Recommendations

- Leadership for consensus building to work
- Municipal support proactive
- Skilful facilitation by trusted individual
- Clear guidelines stakeholders must have a clear understanding of their roles and expected input
- Transparency no 'secret' meetings
- Avoid complicated structures
- All stakeholders need to feel influential with equal opportunity for voice to be heard

Economic returns

- Goal reduce opposition, improve the chances of planning success
- Factors of influence identified:
- (a) project promoters want to retain as much profit as possible
- (b) project promoters display significant wariness that local people will perceive economic returns as bribes to get them on side
- (c) project promoters seek guidance regarding operationalising such schemes

Citizens' perspectives

- (a) local citizens may not have the capacity or desire to invest in a wind energy project
- (b) local people perceive economic returns accruing to only one or two stakeholders as unfair
- (d) local people feel ostracised when they are not engaged in the process in a manner in which they *feel they can get anything out of it*

Legislating for local involvement

- Promotion of Renewable Energy Act 2009 (Denmark)
- To ensure that local involvement in wind energy is not a thing of the past (Danish interviewee)

Four key provisions:

- (a) Compensation scheme for loss of value to property
- (b) Local citizens' option to purchase shares
- (c) Green fund scheme to enhance local scenic and recreational values
- (d) Guarantee fund to support preliminary investigations by local wind turbine owners' associations

Recommendations

- Meaningful engagement with impacted communities
 - It is important *for citizens to really participate* in planning and decision-making and to learn *how to do good planning that involves people* (Dutch and Danish interviewees)
 - Investment opportunities
 - Community funds
- Enhanced role of planning authorities
 - Proactive involvement in site selection and local consultations
 - Financial supports for community collaboration



Acknowledgements



- **EPA STRIVE Programme for funding**
- Prof. Micheál Ó Cinnéide
- Dr. Henrike Rau
- Prof. Ulf Strohmayer





Photo: Author



Thank you for your kind attention.

Email: b.walsh11@nuigalway.ie