

From: Phill Jones [phill.jones@pieuk.co.uk]
Sent: 20 December 2010 19:04
To: 'Isobelgordon@ukgateway.net'
Subject: FW: Information request

Isobel,

Further to the email correspondence below I confirm that the UKOPA committee has considered your questions. and their response to each question is as follows:

1. Who conducted the technical study on which the above recommendations were made? The technical study was undertaken by Advantica now GL Noble Denton, they are recognised experts in the field of risk assessment and the management of risk from high pressure pipelines. Further details can be found at the following link: <http://www.gl-nobledenton.com/en/index.php>
2. When was the study undertaken/published? The draft guidance was first issued in 2005 and the final version issued in 2006. The work was presented by UKOPA to the British Wind Energy Association's (BWEA) Health and Safety Steering Group in June 2006. The basis of the proposed 1.5 times the mast height separation distance was presented at this meeting and accepted by BWEA as a reasonable separation distance for high pressure pipelines and wind turbines.
3. When was the UKOPA's current requirements for siting wind turbines close to pipelines containing hazardous fluids first formulated? Between 2005 and 2006, see above.
4. What is the name of the technical study referred to in the publication and please can you send a electronic version or details where it may be obtained? The document is not a publicly available document but as explained above the findings of the study have been presented to and agreed with BWEA. Representatives of UKOPA would be happy to meet with you to explain the basis of the UKOPA separation distance if this is of interest to you. In view of the continuing number of failures of wind turbines UKOPA continue to review this work.
5. The publication mentions further works are ongoing can you again provide details of what has been done up to date and who is carrying out the work? When the study referred to above was undertaken it was believed that future work may be able to justify reducing the required separation distance if additional protective measures could be taken over the pipeline, for example placing concrete slabs over the top of the pipeline. Further work has now indicated that these measures would be ineffective as the loads would still be transferred to the pipeline and cause it to fail. Again UKOPA will continue to review this work and will modify the advice if it is considered appropriate.
6. The publication refers to mast height and illustrates by arrow on a photo, it appears from the photo the mast height includes the height of the nacelle rather than specifying the tower height, can UKOPA clarify a definition of mast height as denoted in the photo included in the recommendations publication please? The intention is that the mast height is intended to include the height of the mast up to the nacelle as shown in the photo, effectively the height of the turbine shaft above the ground.

Regards,

Phill Jones

Secretary to UKOPA

M +44 (0) 7831 450233

T +44 (0) 1455 271785
F +44 (0) 1455 271785

Disclaimer: This e-mail contains proprietary information, some or all of which may be legally privileged. It is for the intended recipient only. If an addressing or transmission error has misdirected this e-mail, please notify the author by replying to this e-mail. If you are not the intended recipient you must not use, disclose, distribute, copy, print or rely on this e-mail.

From: Phill Jones [mailto:phill.jones@pieuk.co.uk]
Sent: 16 November 2010 13:29
To: 'Isobel Gordon'
Subject: RE: Information request

Isobel,

UKOPA will respond to your questions following a meeting of the specialist committee that deals with these issues in early December.

Regards,

Phill Jones

M +44 (0) 7831 450233
T +44 (0) 1455 271785
F +44 (0) 1455 271785

Disclaimer: This e-mail contains proprietary information, some or all of which may be legally privileged. It is for the intended recipient only. If an addressing or transmission error has misdirected this e-mail, please notify the author by replying to this e-mail. If you are not the intended recipient you must not use, disclose, distribute, copy, print or rely on this e-mail.

From: Isobel Gordon [mailto:Isobelgordon@ukgateway.net]
Sent: 15 November 2010 23:43
To: Phill Jones
Subject: Re: Information request

Dear Phil,

We are landowners who have pipelines crossing our land and seek clarification on the UKOPA's requirements.

Yours sincerely,

Isobel Gordon

Hugh Gordon (A Firm)
Clochnahill
Stonehaven
Kincardineshire
AB39 2XY

----- Original Message -----

From: [Phill Jones](#)
To: ['Isobel Gordon'](#)

Sent: Monday, November 15, 2010 5:14 PM
Subject: RE: Information request

Isobel,

Will you please advise details of the source of this information request i.e. what organisation etc.

Regards,

Phill Jones

M +44 (0) 7831 450233

T +44 (0) 1455 271785

F +44 (0) 1455 271785

Disclaimer: This e-mail contains proprietary information, some or all of which may be legally privileged. It is for the intended recipient only. If an addressing or transmission error has misdirected this e-mail, please notify the author by replying to this e-mail. If you are not the intended recipient you must not use, disclose, distribute, copy, print or rely on this e-mail.

From: Isobel Gordon [mailto:Isobelgordon@ukgateway.net]

Sent: 15 November 2010 16:44

To: info@ukopa.co.uk

Subject: Information request

Dear Sir/Madam,

With regard to the UKOPA's 'Requirements for siting of wind turbines close to pipelines containing hazardous fluids' online publication, please can you clarify the following points;

Who conducted the technical study on which the above recommendations were made?

When was the study undertaken/published?

When was the UKOPA's current requirements for siting wind turbines close to pipelines containing hazardous fluids first formulated?

What is the name of the technical study referred to in the publication and please can you send a electronic version or details where it may be obtained?

The publication mentions further works are ongoing can you again provide details of what has been done up to date and who is carrying out the work?

The publication refers to mast height and illustrates by arrow on a photo, it appears from the photo the mast height includes the height of the nacelle rather than specifying the tower height, can UKOPA clarify a definition of mast height as denoted in the photo included in the recommendations publication please?

Thanking you in anticipation,

Yours sincerely,

Isobel Gordon

_____ Information from ESET Smart Security, version of virus signature database
5621 (20101115) _____

The message was checked by ESET Smart Security.