Local acceptance and wind energy – the role of the legal framework

HELLE TEGNER ANKER
UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN
HTA@IFRO.KU.DK

Outline

- How does the legal framework safeguard local concerns?
 - Public law v private law (e.g. nuisance)
 - o Public law re. "siting" of wind energy projects
 - Land use planning and environmental regulation
 - "Pro-active" policy measures
 - Compensation, co-ownership & community benefit schemes
- How does the legal framework affect local acceptance?
 - Some preliminary observations...
 - Trust and fairness in public decision-making?
 - ▼ Do the "pro-active" policy measures actually work?
- NB: Focus on onshore turbines!

Local concerns ...

- Visual interference
- Noise
- Health
- Property values
- Recreational values
- Cultural values
- Landscape values
- Nature and biodiversity



Collective v individual concerns How are such concerns safeguarded?

Public law re. "siting" of wind turbines - DK

- Land use and environmental regulation
 - Land use planning
 - Environmental assessment
 - Noise regulations etc.
 - Public participation & appeals
 - Substantive v procedural rules!
- "Pro-active" policy measures (2008 RE Act)
 - Compensation scheme
 - Co-ownership scheme
 - Community benefit scheme
 - (Guarantee scheme for local associations)

Land use planning system - DK

- Strategic planning v. project planning
 - Strategic designation of (potential) wind turbine areas
 - **▼** Balancing of general interests, e.g.
 - Wind resources, landscape, infrastructure, dwellings etc.
 - Municipal plans (prior to 2007: regional plans)
 - Expected number and size (for each area)
 - Public participation & appeals
 - Project plans for wind energy projects
 - **▼** Balancing of more specific (local) interests
 - Landscape, visual interference, noise, neighbours etc.
 - Local plans (and possibly municipal plan supplements)
 - Precise siting, number and height (min. + max.)
 - o Conditions re. flickering in local plans (or EIA permit)
 - Public participation & appeals
- Is strategic planning being undermined by ad hoc project planning?
 - What is the appropriate level of authority?

Land use planning – specific wind energy rules (DK)

- Wind turbine circular 9295/2009, e.g.
 - Safeguarding neighbours, nature, landscape, cultural heritage and agricultural interests
 - Neighbours, e.g.
 - **▼** Min. distance to dwellings: 4xtotal height
 - o Landscape, e.g.
 - ➤ Less than 28xtotal height to existing or planned turbines assess "cumulative" effect and argue that "insignificant"!
 - Max. 150 m (exemptions for test turbines (MIM))
- NB: Substantive elements!
- NB: To be replaced by statutory order!

Varde case

- Nature and Environment Appeals Board Decision of 15 September 2014 – appeals by neighbours
- Local plan (and SEA/EIA) for 10 new 150 m turbines in a designated area located 650 m and 1,7 km from existing wind parks. According to the SEA/EIA the interplay with existing turbines would be "messy" from several sites. NMKN: not justified that "insignificant" effect. EIA had not assessed potential effects on groundand surface water (lowering of groundwater level) or the potential effects on birch mouse – any damage to breeding and resting places should be avoided. The plans (and SEA/EIA) were declared invalid!
- Construction works were initiated in 2013 and a new plan + EIA/SEA is expected to be elaborated while possibly decommissioning existing turbines...!

Vardecase



Environmental assessment

Strategic environmental assessment of plans (EU SEA Directive)

- Strategic planning v project planning
- What <u>level of detail</u> in strategic planning?
- Public participation and appeals
- Procedural rules

Environmental impact assessment of projects (EU EIA Directive)

- EU: screening (Annex II) DK: mandatory (Annex I: above 80 m or more than three turbines)
- O DK: EIA report is presented by the authority!
- Fairly detailed assessment requirements
- <u>Health effects</u> or general noise standards?
- Public participation and appeals
- Procedural rules

Natura 2000, Annex IV and birds (EU Habitats & Birds Directives)

- Detailed assessment requirements
- NB: Substantive elements
 - **★** Ascertain that <u>no adverse effects</u> on the integrity of N2000 sites
 - No deterioration or destruction of breeding sites or resting places (Annex IV species)
 - ▼ NB: Mitigation measures (v. compensatory measures)



- Nature and Environment Appeals Board decision of 30 June 2014 – appeals by neighbours.
- Strategic municipal plan supplement on potential wind turbine areas. NMKN: Too short public consultation period regarding the final designation of 8 areas (as opposed to the proposed 18 areas). The SEA did not even at an overall level assess potential effects, but only included general statements re. nature and environment. Other authorities affected by the plan had not been consulted. The strategic plan was declared invalid!

Noise regulations - DK

Statutory Order 1284/2011

- Noise standards
 - Outdoor areas at dwellings (max. 15 m)
 - o Max. 44 dB at 8 m/s
 - o Max. 42 dB at 6 m/s
 - "Noise sensitive areas"
 - o Max. 39 dB at 8 m/s
 - o Max. 37 dB at 6 m/s
 - Indoor areas (dwellings and noise sensitive areas)
 - Max 20 dB low frequency noise
- Notification of new turbines and supervision
- EIA permit
 - Individual noise limits or conditions?
 - E.g. "compliance with current noise standards at any time.."?

Public participation and appeals

- 1998 Aarhus Convention (and EU Directives)!
- Public participation ("the public concerned") art. 6
 - Adequate, timely and effective information and participation (projects with potential significant impact)
 - O DK: Land use planning, SEA and EIA
- Access to justice ("sufficient interest") art. 9
 - o access to .. a court of law and/or another independent and impartial body ... to challenge the substantive and procedural legality of any decision, act or omission subject to the provisions of article 6
 - access to administrative or judicial procedures to challenge acts and omissions by private persons and public authorities which contravene provisions of its national law relating to the environment
 - shall provide adequate and effective remedies, including injunctive relief as appropriate, and be <u>fair</u>, <u>equitable</u>, <u>timely and not</u> <u>prohibitively expensive!</u>
 - DK: Administrative appeal bodies (NMKN + EKN)

Pro-active policy measures - DK

- 2008 Renewable Energy Act "local acceptance schemes"
 - Compensation scheme
 - Co-ownership scheme
 - Community benefit scheme
 - (Guarantee scheme for local associations)

Compensation scheme

- Developers shall compensate the financial loss of property owners when more than 1 % decrease of property value (dwellings)
- Procedure:
 - Public meeting (developer) during planning/EIA process
 - **▼** Information letter to residents within 6xtotal height
 - Submission of claims by neighbours
 - ▼ No fee (up to 6xtotal height) otherwise refundable fee
 - Agreement with developer or decision by "Valuation Authority"
 - Average compensation 2010-12: EUR 13,500
 - **▼** No appeals of decision, but ...
 - Ocivil law suits between developer and neighbour(s) is an option!
 - ▼ 9 reported district court cases three appealed to the High Court
 - ▼ 4 of 9 court cases resulted in higher compensation!

Co-ownership scheme

- Developers shall offer min. 20 % shares to local citizens
- Tender procedure
 - After final approval before grid connection
 - Permanent residents within 4,5 km (priority right to 50 shares) or the municipality
 - Near-shore: residents in municipalities with a shoreline within
 16 km

Community benefit scheme – "green scheme"

- A fixed amount "allocated" to the relevant municipalities
 - o approx. EUR 12,000/MW (grid connected)
- The municipalities may apply Energinet.dk for funding to:
 - Construction work to enhance scenic or recreational values
 - Cultural and information activities
 - Eg. bicycle paths, nature restoration projects, renovating sport facilities, renewables in public buildings
 - Municipal and local association activities only
- Limited use so far?
 - Available funding (30 Sept. 2014) : EUR 13,2 mio (22 mio)
 - Expenditure (30 Sept. 2014) : EUR 2,3 mio (5,8 mio)
 - Local variations!

Some preliminary observations..

Trust and fairness in public decision-making

- Is the system, e.g. planning/EIA, comprehensible?
- Is there a clear distinction between authority and developer?
- Are the substantive rules adequate, e.g. noise?
- Appropriate participation procedures
- Appeals difficult to avoid!
 - Substantive v procedural rules
 - Extensive public regulation (and procedural rights) provides ample opportunities for appeals
 - Important that the authorities get it all right!

Pro-active policy measures

- O Do the schemes actually promote local acceptance?
- O Positive or negative signals ...?
- O DK compensation scheme contested!
- Counterproductive legislation?