

Ashford's Future

**Ashford Sustainable
Energy Feasibility
Study**

Stakeholder Consultation

Document ref
DOC 4 (of 6)

FINAL ISSUE

Ashford's Future

**Ashford Sustainable
Energy Feasibility
Study**

Stakeholder Consultation

September 2008

This report takes into account the particular instructions and requirements of our client.

It is not intended for and should not be relied upon by any third party and no responsibility is undertaken to any third party

Contents

	Page
1 Introduction	1
2 Consultation Aims and Methods	2
3 Overview of the Workshops	2
3.1 Workshop One	2
3.2 Workshop Two	2
3.3 Workshop outputs	2
4 Summary of stakeholder feedback	3
5 Conclusions and Recommendations	5
5.1 General	1
5.2 Workshop One	1
5.3 Workshop Two	2

Appendices

Appendix A

Stakeholder Mapping

Appendix B

Workshop Agendas

Appendix C

Groups represented at Workshops

Appendix D

Summary of Workshop Outputs



1 Introduction

This report sets out the aims, approach and findings of the stakeholder consultation process for the Sustainable Energy Study. At the core of the stakeholder consultation were two workshops where the Sustainable Energy Study was presented to and discussed by planners, policy makers, building control, utility companies, development agencies, sustainable energy companies, landowners and developers. This report presents the stakeholder feedback collated through these workshops.

2 Consultation Aims and Methods

Our work on stakeholder consultation had four aims:

1. To present the range of options identified in our research to key stakeholders, including planners at local and county level.
2. To explain the key characteristics of each of the range of options and explore the implications of each
3. To collate and evaluate feedback on the range of options
4. To report stakeholder feedback on the range of options to the client group

The following consultation method was devised to achieve these aims:

- Stakeholder mapping, in terms of their influence, attitude and role in the process
- Identify stakeholder groups and their contact details and invite to join process
- Prepare and distribute pre-workshop briefing documents
- 1 day workshop with the key stakeholders: present proposed strategies to stakeholders and invite feedback.
- ½ day workshop with planners at local and county level: present proposed strategies to stakeholders and invite feedback.
- Report feedback on proposed strategies to client group

Stakeholder mapping was conducted on the 18th of April by members of the client team and Arup. The key stakeholder types identified were:

Planners	Policy makers
Utility companies	Sustainable energy companies
Developers	Building control
Landowners	Development agencies

A full explanation of the process and the outputs can be found in Appendix A.

3 Overview of the Workshops

Two workshops were held. Workshop One on the 24th of July was attended by key representatives of all stakeholder types. Workshop Two was held on the 31st of July for planners at local and county level in the Ashford area.

Prior to the workshop a set of pre-workshop briefing documents, including a copy of the Cluster Studies (Document DOC 2), was prepared and distributed to each of the attendees. The format of the workshops included presentations, Q&A, group activities and discussion.

The focus of the two workshops was devised to suit the differing needs of the two stakeholder groups as described below. The agendas of both workshops and details of groups represented can be found in Appendix B and C respectively.

3.1 Workshop One

Workshop One was attended by representatives from utility companies, planners and development agencies developers, landowners, and sustainable energy companies. As a complete cross-section of stakeholders was present it was possible to make the most of the value related to the interaction between groups of different backgrounds.

The focus was on the implementation of technologies, opportunities for collaboration between stakeholders and the economics of implementation.

Specific topics which recurred in the discussions throughout the workshop were; the sharing of costs for implementation, the practicalities of heat networks and the use of local biomass.

3.2 Workshop Two

For Workshop Two, the focus was more on understanding the relationship to national policy and issues surrounding implementation of CS10. In addition to this it was possible to include feedback from Workshop One. The workshop was attended by planners, policy makers and building control from Ashford, Kent and Dover councils.

As the stakeholders were from similar backgrounds, they shared a common vocabulary and it was possible to hold focussed discussions regarding the impact of implementation on Ashford Borough Council, Kent County Council planning and planning control.

Particular topics of interest were the need for greater training on the topics discussed, the implementation of CS10 and the 'Ashford Fund'.

3.3 Workshop outputs

The workshop was devised and facilitated to ensure that high quality quantitative and qualitative feedback from the full range of stakeholders could be collated and used to inform our work on delivery options and recommendations for future work.

As a result of the workshop

- Questions and topics of discussion were noted
- The group activities allowed stakeholders to work together to identify key opportunities and challenges for each of the key stakeholder types
- The questionnaire gave participants an opportunity to make further comment or raise issues not covered in the discussions and activities
- Participants were invited to provide further feedback by email

The feedback received is summarised in the section below and full transcripts of the outputs can be found in Appendix D.

4 Summary of stakeholder feedback

Following the workshops, all of the feedback was collated and analysed. In this process five key themes emerged. The feedback from both workshops has been summarised below according to these themes.

1. Need for co-ordination of opportunities by facilitating wide-area district energy schemes

The importance of achieving critical mass for heat networks was seen as an important issue to all stakeholders. In particular the issues surrounding working towards economies of scale through forming larger groups by linking with neighbouring sites was seen as critical for landowners and developers.

Related to this there was concern regarding how the process could be managed to ensure that technical and operational challenges that may arise are managed optimally without impacting negatively on development.

Finally there was a definite concern that developers and landowners should not be solely responsible for bearing the cost of installing energy networks. However the notion of developers being responsible for installing the capacity to connect to heat networks that may be developed later was widely supported. Further to this there was exploration of the potential for utility companies and sustainable energy companies to become early adopters and take on some of the up front costs associated with heat networks through the creation of ESCos etc.

2. Need to create an understandable incentive and regulation structure

Planners who attended saw the chance to be involved in cutting edge planning delivery as a definite opportunity for themselves. Other stakeholders were keen to see planners provide them with a clear framework on what they are expecting to be achieved.

Generally it was thought that sustainable energy companies will benefit from the regulation driving the local market for renewable energy however, there was concern that as the market is still relatively immature sustainable energy companies may suffer from lack of brand recognition from consumers and that there may be opportunity for collaboration with utility companies to deal with this.

Building Control specialists in attendance recognised their critical role in enforcement of regulation and highlighted a need for further training in the emerging issues. An essential part of this work will need to include strategies for communication with lay people about what the policy actually means. Once this education challenge has been surmounted they felt that there was a clear opportunity for their core function to be increased and for Building Control in Ashford to become specialists beyond the Borough boundary.

Further to the educational issues for Building Control, it was felt by all types of stakeholders that education and skills need to be addressed in all sectors and that best practice and knowledge should be shared beyond the Borough boundary and that opportunities to achieve economies of scale for training programmes should be optimised.

3. Need to underwrite demand for services so as to entice investment

The work presented during the workshop showed hypothetical scenarios for the phasing of renewable energy generation on the Pilot Sites. This raised the important issue of linking the provision of renewables with demand for heat and power.

It was suggested by members of Ashford Borough Council and Kent County Council that there is an opportunity for them to underwrite the demand for services in the first instance by

leading the way with their own buildings such as schools, hospitals and council offices. This could take the form of connecting to heat networks to serve as the initial heat load. Further to this there are opportunities for Ashford Borough Council to work with Registered Social Landlords to deliver improvements in the existing stock.

4. Need to show leadership in promoting carbon abatement technology

In addition to the role for the councils in showing leadership through their own buildings as described above, several roles for Ashford's Future or similar delivery vehicle were suggested by the stakeholders:

- Championing sustainable energy and the vision for Ashford
- Leading the delivery and monitoring the outcomes
- Project management and point of contact for co-ordinating funding

5. Desire for an overarching energy strategy

It was seen as important by planners that an overarching 'energy masterplan' be developed such that they have material and guidance to back-up master planning and detailed design stages. Further to this planners were keen to find a way for such plans to have independent validation that they are fit for purpose.

5 Conclusions and Recommendations

The stakeholder consultation process for the Sustainable Energy Study enabled the work completed by Arup to be presented to 20 groups and companies who are stakeholders directly involved in the implementation of the requirements of the core strategy for carbon neutral development in Ashford. The workshops were devised and facilitated such that valuable feedback from these stakeholders could be collated.

Analysis of the feedback from stakeholders has highlighted five key areas that need to be addressed by the delivery options explored for implementation. These factors are;

1. Need for co-ordination of opportunities by facilitating wide area district energy schemes
2. Creating an understandable incentive and regulation structure
3. Underwriting demand for services
4. Showing leadership in promoting carbon abatement technology
5. Formulation and ongoing review of an overarching energy strategy

The Delivery Options for Renewable Energy report (Document DOC 5) directly addresses these areas and suggests possible ways forward for Ashford's Future.

Appendix A

Stakeholder Mapping

A1 Explanation of stakeholder mapping.

Stakeholder mapping is the first step in the process of Stakeholder consultation. It is a process whereby stakeholders are identified and divided into groups according to their needs and their influence.

Through the process of Stakeholder mapping, 4 types of stakeholder are identified: 1) *High power, low interest*; 2) *High power, high interest*; 3) *High Interest, low Power* and 4) *Low power, low interest*. The methods of consulting and extent of consultation varies for each of these groups. Therefore, stakeholder mapping at the earliest stage possible is crucial so that consultation can be tailored to the needs of the projects team and the stakeholders.

A2 Output of stakeholder mapping for Sustainable Energy Study

Stakeholder mapping was conducted on the 18th of April by members of the client team and Arup. The following stakeholders were identified:

Power	High	Kent County Council planners	Ashford Borough Council members	Ashford's Future board SEEDA English Partnerships WEW working group	Ashford Developers and Landowners Ashford Borough Council planners
	Low		Local residents	EDF Southern Water South East Water Local pressure groups	Ashford Borough Council Policy and Development control and Building Control Sustainable Energy Providers Forestry Commission Kent Down AONB Nick Sandford SE suppliers Kent Energy Centre
		Low	Interest		High

Appendix B

Workshop Agendas

B1 Workshop One Agenda

11.00	Delegate registration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tea and Coffee • Time to see Drivers of Change display and networking
11.30	Introduction to aims of workshop <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome and introductions • Aims of workshop and how it will inform our work • 5 minute exercise – Drivers of change 1 new thing
11.45	Background to our study: CS10 and the technologies (20 mins) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation with Q&A
12.15	Options identified by our research : Cluster studies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 minute presentation on cluster studies • Group work exercise to check understanding
1.00	Lunch & Networking
1.45	Options identified by our research: Pilot studies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 minute presentation on pilot studies • Q&A
2.25	Group activity on how each of the options will affect each of the stakeholder groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role-play each stakeholder type in small groups • After a positive brainstorm draw up a list of pros and cons of the options presented
2.55	Discussion on the implications of the options discussed addressing each of the key stakeholder types <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present work completed in small groups back to large group • Short presentation by economic issues • Formal discussion chaired by JP – steer towards a first discussion of the role of the Ashford fund
3.45	Conclusions and next steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wrap-up discussion and explain next steps (Ashford Fund work <i>etc</i>) • Questionnaires
4.00	Workshop end

B2 Workshop Two Agenda

1.45	Delegate registration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tea and Coffee • Time to see Drivers of Change display and networking
2.00	Introduction to aims of workshop and background to the study <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 minute presentation covering aims of workshop and how it will inform our work on pathways to implementing CS10
2.15	Options identified by our research : Technology and Cluster studies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 minute presentation on technology and cluster studies • Q&A
2.45	Options identified by our research: Pilot studies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 minute presentation on pilot studies • group work exercise to check understanding
3.15	Feedback and Q&A <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focus on linking material to our latest understanding of what is going through planning <i>etc.</i>
3.30	Tea and Coffee
3.45	Feedback from Workshop 1: Reactions of Developers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reactions to work presented • Assumptions made about planners' reactions
4.00	Break-out session: Implications for planners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jot down individual reactions • Positive brainstorm in pairs • Then in small groups draw up a list of pros and cons
4.20	Discussion on the implications for planners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present work completed in small groups back to large group • Formal discussion chaired by workshop leader – steer towards a first discussion of the role of the Ashford fund
5.00	Conclusions and next steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wrap-up discussion and explain next steps (Ashford Fund work <i>etc</i>) • Questionnaires
5.15	Workshop close

Appendix C

**Groups represented at
Workshops**

C1 Companies and Groups represented

C1.1 Workshop One

- Ashford's Future
- Ashford Borough Council
- Kent County Council
- Ashford Landowners Group
- SEEDA
- Forestry Commission
- Kent Downs
- Henry Boot
- Atkins Global
- Churches Commission
- Berkeley Strategic
- EcoCentroGen
- South East Water
- Kti Energy
- Jarvis Homes
- Creative Environmental Networks

C1.2 Workshop Two

- Ashford's Future
- Ashford Borough Council Policy
- Ashford Borough Council Planning
- Ashford Borough Council Building Control
- Kent County Council
- Dover Council

Appendix D

**Summary of Workshop
Outputs**

D1 Output from Group Activity

At each workshop delegates were split into small groups to brainstorm the opportunities and challenges associated with implementing the plans proposed for each stakeholder. Delegates at Workshop One were asked to consider the role of; developers, landowners, planners, utility companies, sustainable energy companies and others. Delegates at Workshop Two were introduced to a summary of the outputs of Workshop One and then asked to consider the opportunities and challenges for; Ashford's Future, Ashford Borough Council, Kent County Council, Policy Makers, Planners and Building Control.

The table below records all the comments recorded by the delegates. The exact phrasing has been kept except where more than one group had made the same point.

5.1 General

	Opportunities	Challenges
General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Education ○ Opportunity to attract renewable energy companies ○ Growth of Biomass Industry ○ Benefit for rural economy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Co-operation ○ Integrated cost centre ○ Short-termist mentality ○ Knowledge and skills ○ Achieving critical mass for heat networks ○ Renewable resource availability ○ Resourcing ○ Knowledge base

5.2 Workshop One

Developers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Marketing and market development (especially if exceeding minimum reductions) ○ Access niche market ○ Cost savings to occupiers ○ Link to RSLs in leveraging money ○ Planning approval ○ New business opportunities ○ Exemplars ○ Collective approach through larger groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cost increase - limited return on sales value ○ Who bears the cost of heat networks ○ Perception of technologies as unreliable by homeowners ○ Risk of ongoing developments and handover ○ Risks to delivery ○ Future education of purchasers
Landowners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Get economies of scale and potential funding by linking with neighbouring site ○ Market for woodland products / energy crops on local land ○ Sites for power houses and turbines etc (lever to help planning application if for 3rd party) ○ Community / social responsibility ○ Community scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Depress land value: detrimental effect on land price due to aging infrastructure ○ Technical and operational challenges

	Opportunities	Challenges
Utility Companies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Growth markets to move into (ESCOs etc) – early adopters ○ Finding good sites and innovative techniques ○ PR opportunity ○ Renewable obligation ○ New customers ○ Climate change agenda ○ Make land available for renewable energy generation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Could lose customers ○ Lack of public sector influence ○ Technical and operational challenges
Sustainable Energy Companies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Guarantee energy prices ○ Regulation driving market for renewable energy ○ Access to ready market ○ Advisory services / consultancy ○ Investment - Possible up-front finance to reduce burden on developers ○ Climate change agenda 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Immature markets ○ S106 obligations ○ Want others to pay for heat networks ○ Brand confidence ○ Technical and operational challenges

5.3 Workshop Two

Planners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Opportunity to receive better info on applications ○ How to enable an achievable policy ○ PR ○ Funding ○ Delivery of sustainable communities ○ Design, controls, support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Education ○ Getting info on applications ○ Need to provide framework on what expecting to achieve ○ S106 obligations – issue consents in timely manner ○ Viability & funding ○ Competition for funds
Planners (by Planners)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Developing new skills ○ Negotiation skills ○ Help deliver national agenda ○ Involvement in cutting edge planning delivery ○ Global issue key point of this ○ Making it a place people want to live ○ Easier now than in the future ○ Opportunity to do something big ○ Meeting targets ○ Raise quality of stock 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Knowledge gap - district council ○ Knowledge gap – policy ○ Implementation ○ Resourcing ○ Independent validation ○ Back-up (technical support) in masterplanning and detailed design stages ○ Long-term enforcement ○ Unpicking CSP (Core Strategy Policy) ○ Who do you consult? How much research is there? ○ Time frames ○ Making place people want to live ○ Urban Design – PV panels on every building ○ Risk of building elsewhere ○ Not meeting growth targets
Building Control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ New skills ○ Increase in core function ○ Become specialists beyond borough boundary ○ Opportunity to sell own skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Knowledge – understanding technologies and calculations ○ Enforcement – controlling on site ○ Skill shortage ○ Communication with lay people about what the policy actually means

	Opportunities	Challenges
Policy Makers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Link policies – embed in all aspects of sustainability ○ Influencing national policy development ○ Innovation shaping change ○ National trail blazing ○ the tariff and the Ashford fund ○ using Ashford Fund to invest in existing buildings ○ Future policy – setting targets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Interpreting national policy and translating into local environment ○ Scrutiny of policies ○ Site identification for renewables etc. ○ Understanding the whole agenda ○ How to group sites together ○ Specific enough to apply to applications and stands up to challenge ○ Not fully reconciled ○ Government thinks its in charge – market forces do (housing numbers) ○ Administration of the fund
Ashford Borough Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ cross department working ○ flagship council – lead the way ○ marketing ○ Unique selling point? ○ Fiscal incentives? ○ Leading the way with their own buildings – schools/hospitals etc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Administration of carbon fund ○ Improvements to existing stock – how to develop the Ashford Future (Corporate approach needed) RSL is to deliver ○ Staffing ○ Implementation ○ Government taking credit
Kent County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Joint working ○ Economies of scale – inc. training ○ Show best practice and knowledge amongst districts ○ Use Ashford as a 'springboard' ○ Leading the way with their own buildings – schools/hospitals etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Kent Design Guide reflects implementation ○ Corporate approach – all sectors plugged in?
Ashford's Future	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Championing ○ Delivery ○ Project management ○ PR ○ Change image of Ashford 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Implementation ○ Selling agenda vs. achieving growth ○ Challenge of co-ordinating funding ○ Monitoring the success
Other *	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Energy poverty incentive ○ Lower energy bills ○ Media tell straight story ○ Landscape ○ Biodiversity ○ Local economies ○ Enabling community and sustainability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What role of the consultant ○ Psychological barrier ○ Risk of technology ○ Media confusion ○ Default on payment ○ Making case ○ Choices of renewables ○ cost ○ understanding issues ○ time needed to explain to them
<p><i>* The suggestions of categories for 'Other' were; estate agents, valuers, consumers, the media, environmental groups, small house-builders and designers</i></p>		

D2 Output from Questionnaire

Feedback was received from 27 attendees at the workshops.

Usefulness of workshop content

Delegates at both workshops were asked to rate the usefulness of each section of the workshop. The results for both workshops are shown below:

	Very useful	Useful	Relevant	Not relevant
Context	15%	67%	14%	0%
Technologies	22%	60%	14%	0%
Cluster studies	33%	57%	10%	0%
Pilot studies	27%	73%	0%	0%
Energy economics	28%	55%	17%	0%

The following is a comprehensive list of topics that were cited as further comments and concerns on the questionnaire:

Workshop 1

- Land take of Sustainable Energy Technologies
- Issues of O&M and management
- Implementation of results by ABC
- Give the tools to make it happen
- Worked example for a real site in Ashford
- Why no micro CHP? micro v macro solutions
- Designing-in capacity for connection to future heat main
- Relationship to existing buildings
- What delivery vehicle is needed?
- Achieving critical mass for community CHP
- Implementation process
- Design specification
- Skills and awareness
- Communication and marketing

Workshop 2

- Feedback on case studies
- Problems with implementation
- Will keep a watching brief on tariff development
- Technology choices at a local level
- Spatial dimension of the study and future masterplanning
- Delivery mechanisms

Other key findings

- 100% will use the material at least once or twice
- 47% of stakeholder (Workshop One) will refer to the material frequently
- 100% of developers will refer to the material frequently.
- 64% of planners (Workshop Two) will refer to the material frequently
- 100% of attendees would like to receive a copy of final report
- All but one person surveyed is interested in being involved in further consultation
- 100% of ABC planners will refer to the material frequently.