

has been delayed going up, so instead the proposals will be based on estimated data (which is the approach widely used for renewable energy projects) .

- MB: Questioned best practice and aesthetics for BESS.
 - MF: BESS at M74 West will have screening, tree and shrub planning and biodiversity enhancements.
 - MB: Requires trust from the community that Renewco are true to their word.
 - RK: Replied that it is a fair point and a fair challenge.
 - MS: Questioned why trees aren't planted earlier.
 - RK: Confirmed that early planting is being explored but is complicated where we do not yet have a planning consent or confirmation that the project will go ahead. Gauging if this may be possible for M74 West.

RK: [Slide 7: What could this look like?]

- RK: Noted that each of containers will be slightly different and will have its own fire suppression system. Added that more guidance is welcomed
 - MB: Replied that it is years away from detail specification for BESS projects.
 - RK: Confirmed that it is but trying to consent the best possible option.
 - MS: Questioned the lifespan of BESS
 - RK: Replied that this depends how it is run – if it is run as stop and start, doesn't think it will get past a 40-year consent life as they will need to be replaced much quicker.

6. Community Updates

- RK opened the floor to members to offer updates on behalf of community councils.
- GG: Confirmed that Leadhills CC have made comments in relation to the Ravengill scoping.
- MF: These will be considered alongside all other comments received as part of EIA Scoping and would look to provide an update on how these points are being addressed during the second round of consultation via a 'You said, we did' narrative. All feedback will ultimately be captured in the Pre-Application Consultation (PAC) Report.

7. Matters for Next Meeting

- MB: Requested that the next meeting focuses fully on the wider Community Benefit Discussion, including updated figures, ownership options, structures and visual materials.
 - MS: Suggested that members invite in organisations that help with the distribution of CBFs.
 - All members agreed.

- SJ: Noted that BESS sites in England/ Wales are legally required to provide a CBF, even if included in a wider energy park (solar, wind etc) – unlike Scotland.
 - RK: questioned this suggestion and believed it to be unlikely. Will check and report back.

Action: Renewco to seek clarity of CBF structure for English/Welsh BESS vs Scottish.

- MB: Over what period would BESS and turbines depreciate?
 - RK: Renewco not had to practice this yet – but all developers vary their method here.
 - MB: Noted that understanding accounting practice will help conceptualise the impact of CAPex expenditure.
 - RK: Questioned the relevance.
 - MB: Replied that the relevance is when making a return for investors and Renewco, communities are providing a part of that asset which enables this. If there is to be a reward from these activities, then it's reasonable to understand what shares are due.
 - RK: There are pie charts available to highlight expenditure.
 - MB: Noted the importance to share outcomes that are worthwhile. Advocating for communities providing the asset.
 - MB: Highlighted the importance of these dialogues.

Housekeeping

- GM: Asked if members were happy to use 'Doodle Poll' for the arrangement of the next meeting, following a suggestion from Carmichael CC.
- Members confirmed – requested that next date options were issued as early as possible.
- GM: Target would be to issue next date options alongside finalised minutes.

Appendix 14.5: CLG Meeting 4 Minutes



Renewco Power – M74 Community Liaison Group – Meeting 4

Date: 26th November 2025

Location: The Old School House, Abington

Attendees:

- Steve Johnson (SJ) - Leadhills Community Council
- Gerard Godfrey (GG) - Leadhills Community Council
- Jeremy Cooper (JC) - Crawford & Elvanfoot
- Neil Ingram (NI) - Biggar Community Council
- David McLatchie (DL) - Muirkirk Community Council
- Robert McCafferty (RM) - Wanlockhead Community Council
- Karen Morrison (KM) - Wanlockhead Community Council
- Mick Barker (MB) - Moffat & District Community Council
- David Moffat (DM) - Moffat and District Community Council
- Mike Steele (MS) - Closeburn Community Council
- David Dick (DD) - Closeburn Community Council
- Elizabeth Shelby (ES) - Thornhill Community Council
- Brian Muir (BM) - Douglas Community Council
- Tommy Cronin (TC) - Douglas Community Council
- Richard Koiak (RK) - Renewco Power
- Maeve Fryday (MF) - Renewco Power
- Nick Lopez (NL) - Renewco Power
- Salma Mahmud (SM) - Cavendish Consulting
- Grace McGovern (GM) - Cavendish Consulting
- Dario Ewing (DE) - Cavendish Consulting

Actions Agreed:

- Renewco to provide an update on shared ownership at the next CLG meeting.
- CLG members to consider and agree their preferred approach to community benefit, for discussion at the next meeting.
- Members to discuss desired approach to defining catchments for community benefit which will be discussed at the next meeting.
- Cavendish to circulate a Doodle Poll with proposed dates for the next meeting, alongside the finalised minutes, to give members options and advance notice.

1. Attendance / Apologies

- Attendance as noted above
- Apologies
 - Sanquhar Community Council
 - Carmichael Community Council
 - Kirkpatrick & Juxta Community Council
 - Crawford, Elvanfoot and Daer Action Resource (CEDAR)

2. Approval of Previous Minutes

Members confirmed and approved the minutes of the previous meeting as presented.

3. Project Updates

- Overview of Renewco's wider project context shared via maps.

M74 Strategy Overview

MF: [slide: Project Updates: The M74 Strategy Context]

MF provided an update on the overall M74 strategy.

- RK: Noted that the Moffat Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) proposals being brought forward by Conrad Energy have not yet been consented [Note: application has not yet been submitted to ECU].
- DL: Queried whether the Red Moss Battery project belonged to Renewco.
 - MF: Confirmed it is a Green Switch Capital (Qair UK) project and there is a second BESS project being brought forward by BayWa nearby north of the Redshaw substation. Both of these projects are consented.
- JC: Questioned that the Elvanfoot Battery hasn't been mentioned.
 - MF / RK: Confirmed that the Elvanfoot Battery can be seen on the map.
 - RK: Confirmed that Muirhall Energy have three separate BESS proposals adjacent to each other close to the Elvanfoot substation..
- JC: Mentioned the Windtranz Ltd proposals for a storage and distribution depot (specifically to support renewable energy projects) at Elvanfoot and asked if Renewco were aware of the proposals.
 - MF: Confirmed that Renewco were aware.

- o JC: Noted that the application went to committee on Tuesday 25th November and experienced IT issues and is to resume at the next Planning Committee meeting in January 2026.

M74 West

MF: [slide M74 West Energy Park Update]

- Renewco continues working with NATS to agree mitigation and awaits guidance on a new position for Eskdalemuir.
- Renewco continuing to engage with Historic Environment Scotland (HES) who have objected to the scheme on cultural heritage grounds, and SLC who have also objected.
- RK: Offered to provide further background information or a session on Eskdalemuir at a future CLG meeting if helpful for members.

Watchman

MF: [slide Watchman Energy Park Update]

- Anticipated submission for Watchman Energy Park is December 2025.
- Public consultation by the Energy Consents Unit (ECU) is expected in January 2026 (noting ECU does not process applications over the Christmas period).
- EIA documentation remains in preparation

Ravengill

MF: [slide Ravengill Energy Park Update]

- Met Mast has been installed.
- Turbine count reduced from 32 to 21 following design refinement. Initial infrastructure layout and substation/BESS location shared.
- Second public consultation event to be in January 2026.
- Submission expected late March 2026.

Clyde South

MF: [slide Clyde South Energy Park Update]

- A Met Mast application is being submitted w/c 24th November 2025 [update: application delayed to wc 8 December].
- Current design proposes up to 9 turbines.
- MB: Queried how the Clyde South design has been specifically adapted on the basis of the Clyde Wind Farm's decommission.
 - MF: Responded that Renewco's design is based on the assumption that the Clyde Wind Farm will no longer be operational by the time Clyde South Energy Park becomes operational. As a result, potential proximity issues have not been assessed, as the working assumption is that Clyde Wind Farm will not have consent to operate those turbines at the relevant time, based on the time-limited nature of the consent held by Clyde.
 - MB: Noted that the Clyde South development was unexpected and asked whether Renewco intends to proactively consider speculative developments in areas where existing wind farms are expected to reach end of life.
 - RK: Replied that each project is considered independently. When assessing new opportunities, Renewco focuses on areas that are practically suitable, some of which may be adjacent to operational wind farms. The long lead-in times to develop projects and get a grid connection mean developers need to think quite far ahead.
- MB: Asked whether the model used at Clyde South could be repeated elsewhere.
 - RK: Stated that it technically could, though all projects remain speculative to some extent.
 - MB: Expressed concern about speculative development, future consents, and cumulative impacts.
 - MF: Noted that individual projects must be assessed on their own merits, and planning processes already account for cumulative effects.
- JC: Queried whether proposals for Clyde South replicated earlier projects (Crookedstane and Lionhill).
 - MF confirmed it did not. Those schemes involved 4 smaller turbines each and were more compact in their layouts. Clyde South is not expected to be visible from key viewpoints.
- JC: Asked for details of landownership.

- - MF and RK confirmed the scheme involves three private landowners. GG: Noted that unlike planning applications, Section 36 applications do not legally require landownership disclosure.
 - NL: Confirmed the above.
- JC: Noted that CEDAR's Facebook stated that Clyde South events were taking place on Thursday 27th November and Monday 1st December.
- GM: Confirmed that the only event for Clyde South is taking place on Monday 1st December at the Crawford Hall between 3-7pm.
- ES: Highlighted the need for a coordinated masterplan for renewable developments across the area.
 - RK: Expressed support in principle, acknowledging wider government and grid-related reforms that are underway.
 - MF: Emphasised that information on grid capacity planning and regional generation is changing as part of grid reform and this should assist in making the governments priorities for renewable energy generation clearer.
- MB: Raised concerns about cumulative impacts and a perceived lack of strategic context.
 - RK: Asked whether CLG members would find it useful to invite other developers to future meetings; however, attendance could not be guaranteed.

4. Community Benefits and Shared Ownership

NL: [slide Wind Farm Economics]

- NL: Confirmed that community benefit contributions average around 2% of project costs/income, while overall project profit averages approximately 6%. He added that community benefits need to be considered within the context of wider project costs, with substantial increases having the potential to affect overall project viability .
 - RK: Clarified that the 6% profit figure includes operating costs such as salaries, emphasising that this is not pure profit.

- MB: Commented that, while Biggar has strong expertise in economics and wind energy, his experience of their involvement in public inquiries has raised concerns, as he finds the figures presented in Biggar Economic Report to be highly questionable.
 - MB: Challenged the income model presented, expressing doubts about the veracity of the investor returns quoted.
 - RK: Acknowledged MB's concerns but noted these are figures from a third party and line with his experience from Scottish Power Renewables.
 - MB: Stated that the current model appeared unsustainable and that communities required clearer, upfront commitments.
 - BM: Raised a question regarding landowner payments.
 - RK: Noted that payments are typically made per MW, not per acre as is the case for Solar developments and vary significantly between sites.
-

4.2 Overview of Community Benefits

NL: [slide Overview of Community Benefits]

- NL: Provided a general overview of community benefit structures.
 - RK: Criticised industry practices where some developers overpromise benefits. He argued that developers should commit to community benefit levels pre-application, ideally binding through legal instruments.
 - MB: Supported the idea of creating a clearly structured, community-led benefit scheme with developer commitments as early as possible.
-

4.3 Community Benefit – Benefits and Challenges

NL: [slide Community Benefit: Benefits and Challenges]

- BM: Queried whether eligibility would be determined by proximity (e.g., kilometre-based).
 - RK: Confirmed the host Community Council would receive a degree of prioritisation, but we are open to options regarding governance and allocation.
- RM: Asked whether all 21 Community Councils or only the 12 represented in the CLG would be eligible.

- RK: Explained eligibility to receive community benefits would vary by project and would take into account proximity to infrastructure, and we are conscious that bodies for some of the host communities are not in attendance (CEDAR and Duneaton CC). Nevertheless we are open to input on eligibility from the group.
 - MB: Emphasised that governance structures must be agreed first.
 - SJ: Reiterated that Leadhills CC should be considered as equivalent to a host community given its proximity to Ravengill.
 - RK: Highlighted potential SLC involvement which could provide oversight and the ability to disburse funds over a wider area where local community bodies are restricted. RK further explained councils can act as a "counterparty of last resort" if community groups dissolve.
 - MB: Stated decision-making must sit with communities, with councils only in a non-executive or oversight role.
-

4.4 Community Benefit

NL: [slide Community Benefit - Discussion Points]

- MB: Reported speaking to another development trust that had been banking a lot of the community benefit monies and expressed concern that communities must see tangible benefits from the outset.
 - NL: Emphasised Renewco's desire for communities to benefit from the funds and put in place mechanisms in Community Benefit Agreements to ensure this is the case
- SJ: Queried the role of BESS in community benefit. RK stated that all of the BESSs within the M74 Corridor wind-led projects will sit behind the meter, will not generate energy and will not have a separate income stream. Therefore, they have not been considered within the community benefit offers. However, we are open to discussing standalone batteries like Milton Farm.
- DM: Acknowledged that construction can be straightforward however maintenance is harder. He stated that if developers could take ownership over 30 to 40 years this would ensure sustainability.
- DM: Suggested that longer-term ownership involvement could deliver significant value to communities.
- RK: Expressed enthusiasm for exploring new and innovative models.

- MB: Proposed establishing a working group to progress the establishment of a community body across the M74 corridor that could use the community benefit. Renewco indicated willingness to engage.
-

5. Community Updates

- None provided.
-

6. Matters for Next Meeting

- NL invited feedback on the community benefit discussion points at the next meeting and is supportive of members coming together to shaping a collective position on community benefits..
- Next meeting to be centred around shared ownership and community benefit discussion points.
- Date TBC – February 2026.

