



Warwickshire County Council

Warwickshire 10% Scenarios

A report for the Low Carbon Strategy Group

January 2006



Encraft
46 Northumberland Road
Leamington Spa
Warwickshire
CV32 6HB
t: 01926 312159
f: 01926 772480
w: www.encraft.co.uk

Contents

Executive summary	i
1 Introduction	1
2 National and regional policy context	2
3 Options for Warwickshire Electricity Supply	3
4 Options for Warwickshire heat supply	5
5 Options for use of Combined Heat and Power in Warwickshire	7
6 Stimulating action.....	8
7 Conclusions	9

Appendix - Warwickshire Energy Model (WEMII)

- Methodology and assumptions
- County energy needs
- Model results electricity
- Model results heat
- Model results CHP
- References
- Performance and technical data by scenario

Executive summary

Just over 210 000 Warwickshire property owners and 20 000 businesses in the county spend between £400 and £500 million each year on energy and energy services. They are directly responsible for 2.4 million tonnes of carbon dioxide emissions (excluding transport). The low carbon strategy is not about major direct investment by the county – it is rather about finding ways of influencing spending by others to optimise the county's infrastructure for the future – reducing carbon emissions at economic costs, and in a way that creates maximum long-term benefits for the local economy.

There are potentially many ways to optimise Warwickshire's energy system for the future. By modelling and comparing 13 hypothetical and distinctive scenarios in this report, each delivering 10% of either electrical or heat demand from renewable sources, we can identify major areas where energy and carbon strategy for the county should focus.

The scenarios reviewed range from large-scale wind farms through to solar systems and community combined heat and power schemes. We also model "do nothing" options of simply allowing replacement of existing heating systems with modern condensing boilers, and encouraging switching to green electricity tariffs.

The report concludes that the best ways to deliver an optimal energy system for Warwickshire in the 21st century include:

1. strengthening the role of the county and other local authorities in facilitating development of an appropriate and robust local energy system
2. using planning and selective support mechanisms to encourage economic wind, biomass and CHP schemes by preference, except where there are obvious local opportunities for other approaches (e.g., landfill gas, waste or hydro electric generation)

In the short-term, a valuable follow-up exercise for the Low Carbon Strategy Group to pursue would be to investigate in more detail a range of low cost financial and structural mechanisms that might be usefully implemented in the county. These mechanisms would provide ways for the council to influence how the £4-500 million of third party energy spend is directed locally, in line with their wider strategy.

1 INTRODUCTION

This is a brief report summarising a preliminary modelling exercise carried out for the Low Carbon Strategy Group. The purpose is to provide some objective data and scenarios to support strategy development. There is a specific focus on the comparative economics, carbon implications and supply chain consequences of pursuing alternative energy technology deployment routes across the county.

The report is accompanied by a spreadsheet model (WEMII) that is designed to be used for sensitivity analyses as necessary. There is also a short powerpoint presentation containing some key findings.

Section 2 of the report summarises the national and regional policy context within which Warwickshire's energy strategy must operate. Sections 3 to 5 review the model outputs for targets to source 10% electricity and heat from renewables. The model treats electricity, heat and combined heat and power separately for convenience. Section 6 discusses broad options for stimulating action, and section 7 sets out the overall conclusions from the study.

The assumptions and detailed outputs from the Warwickshire Energy Model (WEMII) are contained in the appendix to this report.

Important note

The economics of small-scale energy projects vary significantly around any averages generated by any modelling or statistical exercise. This is because local conditions can have a big impact on costs and performance. For example, some places are windier than others, some have more sunlight through the year, some are closer to sources of biomass or waste for fuel. Local community enthusiasm also makes a very big difference, and is worth a lot to project developers, as is the support of planning authorities. Government grants and fuel prices also change all the time.

For these reasons, this report is not intended to promote specific technologies, nor should its conclusions be taken as a blanket recommendation for Warwickshire to support any one technology at the expense of others. It is instead intended as a general guide to broad strategy and policy debates, and to stimulate action to encourage implementation of a diverse and far-sighted energy strategy for the county.

Further information

If you require more detailed information about the assumptions or data used in the modelling work, or have any questions about the outcomes, please contact Matthew Rhodes at Encraft (email: matthew.rhodes@encraft.co.uk).

2 NATIONAL AND REGIONAL POLICY CONTEXT

The development of a low carbon strategy for Warwickshire takes place in the context of a major national debate on energy and climate change, including a formal consultation and review of government energy policy, due to conclude during 2006.

This makes it difficult to make definitive statements about national government policy, although the broad direction has been increasingly clear for some years. The 2003 Energy White Paper set out four goals for energy policy:

1. to put the UK on a path to cut carbon dioxide emissions by 60% by 2050.
2. to maintain reliable and secure energy supplies
3. to promote competition in energy markets
4. to ensure that every home is affordably and adequately heated.

The current review seems unlikely to change these goals, and is more concerned with the specifics of how to deliver them, probably with greater urgency and focus.

There are already firm short term national and regional targets in place as follows:

Nationally:

- for 10% of all electricity generated to come from renewable sources by 2010
- for there to be 10GW of installed combined heat and power (CHP) capacity by 2010

Regionally:

- for 5% of all electricity consumed in the region to come from renewable sources by 2010 (West Midlands Energy Strategy).

The regional target reflects the reality that there are currently few large scale power stations in the region: we are a net importer of useful energy and depend on others for our supplies.

A number of UK regions have taken up quite strong strategic positions on energy, with a view to securing longer-term advantage for their businesses and local economies. For example, London (which is a net importer like the West Midlands) has established a Climate Change Agency and is altering planning laws and seeking its own building regulations to encourage small-scale local generation and business development. The North East and North West have both invested strategically in low carbon energy technologies, and Scotland has a strong emphasis on wind power development.

3 OPTIONS FOR WARWICKSHIRE ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

There are many ways to generate electricity, from the large scale (nuclear, coal, offshore wind) through very location-specific schemes, like hydroelectric turbines, landfill gas and wave power, to the very small scale (microgeneration) such as roof-mounted wind turbines and solar photovoltaic systems. The large scale and hydro/wave systems have specific resource needs which are scarce or non-existent in Warwickshire, so evaluating these was excluded for this preliminary study.

Warwickshire already generates 3% of its electricity demand from renewables. 99.9% of this is from landfill gas schemes. This contribution is expected to fall in future as landfill resource is increasingly constrained both by site capacity and legislative controls.

For this preliminary report we have concentrated on seven potential options that are immediately accessible to the county and have a long-term future. Cogeneration or combined heat and power systems are considered separately in section 5. It is straightforward to add further technical options to the model in future if required.

Summary of model outputs

The table below shows selected results from the model; there are more details in the appendix. The table ranks technologies using total cost per tonne of carbon saved. The third column shows how many permanent jobs might be created in Warwickshire were 10% of the county's electricity demand to be sourced from this technology locally, and the fourth column shows how many installations would be required. (Installations in this context means standardised installations for modelling purposes as described in the appendix).

Option	Cost per t CO₂	Investment	Long-term jobs	Installations
1.5MW wind turbines on sites > 6.5m/s	£33	£83 million	8	83
Community 600kW wind turbines on sites > 6.5 m/s	£36	£93 million	9	208
Farm-scale 6kW wind turbines on sites > 5 m/s	£142	£347 million	52	24 800
2MW community-scale biomass generating stations	£152	£108 million	97	22
Rooftop micro-wind turbines 1.5kW on sites >4 m/s	£153	£317 million	106	211 309*
Purchase of green electricity	£201	0	0	53 074**
78 sqm 10kWp solar photovoltaic (PV) electrical installations	£672	£1723 million	173	36 815

* There are only 210 000 households in Warwickshire.

** One green electricity installation is an average Warwickshire domestic consumer switching.

Cost per tonne of CO₂ includes running costs and capital costs apportioned over a standard lifetime for the installation. Investment is initial project costs only, and long term jobs excludes jobs created to build the installations (typically between 400 and 4000 FTE years per technology). The jobs figure is employment within Warwickshire only.

The small-scale biomass generation option has the added advantage of requiring fuel to be sourced locally. This creates an economic opportunity for farmers, and a demand for between £5 and £6 million of biomass fuel per year, needing around 15000 hectares of land.

Conclusions from table 1

Large scale wind power provides an economically-attractive way to reduce carbon dioxide emissions in Warwickshire, to an extent limited by wind resource and planning constraints (see below). Farm-scale wind, community-scale biomass schemes and rooftop wind turbines are all comparable in cost-effectiveness to many of the heat technologies discussed in subsequent sections, and should have a role to play in suitable locations and circumstances. Rooftop turbines have probably been somewhat over-sold (see comment below) but nevertheless may have a useful role to play in public engagement.

Note on resource constraints and fit to previous work

The county commissioned an evaluation of wind resources locally in 2002. This work identified land areas within the county suitable for larger wind turbines where there are sufficient wind speeds and further qualified these to sites where there are no planning constraints. This deliverable resource amounts to an area suitable for up to 178 1.5MW turbines or 445 600kW turbines. This means the target numbers of installations at each of these turbine sizes to achieve 10% renewable supply (83 and 208 turbines respectively) are both in principle deliverable for Warwickshire and well within resource capacity.

Comment on rooftop wind turbines

The relative availability of wind resource for the larger turbines is not true for the rooftop machines, which the model suggests are unlikely to contribute more than 10% of county electricity even if installed on all homes. This is because the wind speeds in urban areas and near buildings in Warwickshire are rarely likely to exceed 5 m/s on average over the year. Our view is that the model assumption of 4 m/s for these machines on average, while slightly conservative, is also realistic.

Benefits of smaller systems

The great advantage of these smaller systems, though, is one that should not be understated from a public policy perspective. Their advantage is that they are relatively attractive and accessible to individual homeowners, who are thus often willing to finance their installation and operation to a far greater extent than the bigger machines. Small rooftop systems thus potentially provide a good starting point for any strategy; they are an effective way to engage homeowners; and they may ultimately contribute perhaps 1 or 2% overall to county targets.

4 OPTIONS FOR WARWICKSHIRE HEAT SUPPLY

Heat does not feature as much in the energy debate as it should, since it accounts for well over half of the typical domestic energy bill, and also for the largest share of national non-transport energy use. Lack of heat in the winter is what kills people and drives the fuel poverty agenda.

Electricity can be used for heating but is an expensive and (usually) environmentally inefficient way to heat buildings. It is in common use because the capital costs of electrical heating are often much lower than gas systems, although the running costs are 3-4 times higher. These costs fall on residents rather than developers, however.

For the purposes of the preliminary model, therefore, we have concentrated on the more efficient gas, solar and biomass heating options (with combined heat and power community systems considered in section 5).

In table 2 and for the model the 10% target is defined as 10% of delivered heat supplied in Warwickshire. This allows the benefits of improved system efficiencies to be modelled. (For example, if a house currently uses 10000 kWh of gas a year to deliver 6000kWh of actual heat (because it has an old boiler operating at 60% efficiency) the target is to supply 600kWh of this heat from renewables – i.e., 10% of 6000kWh, not 10% of 10000kWh).

The average efficiency of domestic heating systems in the UK is currently around 70% (BRE 2003). This means that replacing all domestic heating systems with modern condensing boilers over the next 15 years will automatically reduce carbon emissions due to heating by 10-20% as new boilers operate at up to 90% efficiencies. This is being mandated through Building Regulations. This will also mean that a notional 10% Warwickshire heat target can be met simply by allowing this to happen in around 58 000 homes. However, the *relative* impact of this option on carbon emissions is poor because gas is still being burned – reflected in a poor cost per tonne of carbon dioxide saved. We show this as the “do nothing” base case in the table below.

Option	Cost per t CO₂	Investment	Long-term jobs	Installations
Domestic woodchip-fuelled boilers (15kW)	£101	£136 million	26	28 953
Rooftop 4.2 sqm solar water heating systems	£155	£469 million	45	223 220**
Domestic condensing boilers (8kW, A-rated) – do nothing option.	£649	£75 million	46*	57 906

* already existing.

** this is more than the number of households in the county (210 000)

Conclusions from table 2

Domestic biomass boilers are theoretically-attractive (and will also create economic opportunity for local farmers). However, they will be limited in application because they involve continuous input of labour by property owners (which doesn't show in the economic analysis) and they are also not widely available as yet in sizes small enough to supply modern homes.

Like rooftop wind turbines, rooftop solar systems have a contribution to make (and are reasonably economic in saving carbon). However, to make a significant contribution to county heat demand would require more systems than there are homes, which places a physical constraint on widespread deployment. Nevertheless, there is a role to play in engaging homeowners, and the technology is so simple that any significant volume demand could quickly bring prices down. For example, in Germany solar systems can be bought for less than £100 (plus installation) while here they still typically cost more than £2000.

Overall, therefore, the initial conclusion from this table is that straightforward installation of good quality condensing boilers may well be at the core of the way forward on heating, supplemented by the more attractive solar and biomass technologies for larger properties or those with high water heating demands (for example, solar is particularly efficient providing supplementary heating for swimming pools).

However, this analysis must be qualified by the conclusions of the next section, which discusses combined heat and power. As we will see, in many circumstances CHP presents a more efficient and attractive option for both communities and households.

5 OPTIONS FOR USE OF COMBINED HEAT AND POWER IN WARWICKSHIRE

Combined heat and power (CHP) schemes can be very attractive where appropriate load conditions exist. For example, a continuous heat demand from an industrial process or swimming pool or waste heat from an incinerator can be coupled to an electrical generator to provide low cost electrical power for nearby homes. This is often more efficient than sourcing heat and electricity separately.

Warwickshire's share of the national target of 10GW (electrical) of CHP by 2010 would be 90MWe, as the county is responsible for .9% of national electricity consumption. According to Warwickshire Energy Statistics (a report by ECOTEC for WCC in 2005) there are currently 2MWe of operational capacity in the county. Much of this will be retired within the next 10 years, however. There is also a potential 115MWe scheme in Rugby registered with Ofgem, but it is not known if this is still being developed.

Assuming the Rugby scheme goes ahead, however, it does look as if the county will exceed its share of national targets relatively easily. This modelling exercise has therefore concentrated on CHP as a potential contributor to the 10% heat target, with electrical energy generated as a bonus, and table 3 below shows the results of the model for three smaller-scale CHP technologies.

The "do nothing" condensing boiler option is the same as in table 2, and is repeated for comparison, particularly with the domestic micro-chp units which are designed to compete directly in this market.

Option	Cost per t CO₂	Investment	Long-term jobs	Installations
Community biomass-fired 2MWt CHP with district heating	£150	£248 million	223	47
Domestic micro-CHP (8kWt/1.1kWe units)	£433	£174 million	69	57 906
Community gas-fired 2MWt CHP with district heating	£585	£165 million	50	47
Domestic condensing boilers (8kW, A-rated) – do nothing option.	£649	£75 million	46*	57 906

The biomass-fired CHP option has the additional benefit of creating a demand for £5 million of energy crops from local farms (around 13000 hectares of land).

Conclusions from table 3

All three CHP options shown are more economic at reducing carbon than A-rated condensing boilers. Community-scale biomass (which might also be built around a school heating system, or based in a large office building or industrial site) is particularly attractive, and offers additional economic benefits for farmers.

6 STIMULATING ACTION

Energy involves big numbers. The important thing to remember is that most of these big numbers are other people's money, ***which is already being spent on energy***, and the trick as a public policy body is to apply limited resources to influence where this money flows in the long-term interests of the county, without necessarily having to make major investments on behalf of the council itself.

There are a number of generic and low cost things the council can do to direct action and these major capital flows in the public interest. These include:

- providing a clear and supportive planning regime to make it easier for the right kinds of energy project to be developed
- allowing re-investment of savings made through energy efficiency in renewables projects
- creating financial vehicles that make innovative energy projects easier, for example an energy services company, possibly in partnership with private sector organisations to secure broad expertise
- encouraging homeowners and businesses to appreciate the benefits of investment in small-scale renewables, working with the local Energy Advice Centre and Agenda21 organisations
- providing simple networks and infrastructure to enable community projects to develop (and to draw external funding from national and European bodies into the county). The CRED initiative may be one way to do this.
- providing limited funding for agencies that facilitate project inception and do the legwork around setting up supply chains (for example for biomass) that otherwise impose excessive costs on the first movers in the field. For example, London has established a Climate Change Agency with just this goal in mind
- using section 106 agreements and planning rules imaginatively on new developments, to kick start local energy schemes and create a secure long-term infrastructure for the county
- selectively sponsoring demonstration projects, like EPIC, where a little county support can leverage significant external private and public funding and create an exemplar that can be used to engage others in similar developments.

Some or all of these should be worked up and costed in more detail as part of action plans to deliver the agreed low carbon strategy in due course.

7 CONCLUSIONS

Warwickshire faces a plethora of choices in developing a secure and efficient energy infrastructure into the future. It is unwise to try to make all these decisions centrally, because optimal energy solutions generally depend on very local considerations.

Nevertheless, the UK as a whole is going through a transition from a century where very few people had to worry about energy, to one where it will again be everyone's concern. In this context local government has a responsibility and opportunity to take a lead, and to help citizens and local stakeholders make the best decisions for everyone's future.

This report is intended to inform this process. The findings point to the following preliminary conclusions.

1. Where there are no specific local resources that are easily exploitable (e.g., hydro-electric schemes) Warwickshire energy strategy should concentrate particularly on:
 - a. biomass-fired community-scale CHP
 - b. small-scale technologies to encourage homeowner and small-business engagement (particularly in energy efficiency, which is outside the scope of this report but a very important and difficult part of the challenge)
 - c. larger scale wind developments in a very small number of already-identified areas (around 30 sq km) plus attractive industrial sites, farms, and community locations where there is local support.
2. The council doesn't necessarily need to invest significantly in energy infrastructure itself (beyond what happens routinely as part of estate management). What the county should do is invest selectively to ensure that appropriate mechanisms are in place to direct private investment optimally for the county's benefit. There are a number of examples of such mechanisms available, and detailed evaluation of these should be a priority area for further work by the Low Carbon Strategy Group.

Appendix

This appendix is a printout from the Warwickshire Energy Model (WEMII) developed by Encraft for this report.

The model is also available as a spreadsheet, either from Encraft or the Carbon Management Team. The electronic version enables users to explore alternative targets and the impact of fuel price changes, among other things.

Methodology and assumptions**General notes**

All the analysis in this model uses the same base data and financial assumptions. This is to allow sensible comparisons. It means that as far as possible we avoid introducing assumptions about economies of scale, variable discount rates, population growth, changing patterns of energy use etc where these would potentially distort or confuse figures without materially altering the conclusions.

Data on energy demand and household numbers for Warwickshire is the latest available. Where different estimates exist, they have been cross-checked to ensure the figures used are broadly consistent. No attempt has been made to account for forward projections as this introduces an element of uncertainty into the analysis that is potentially spurious for the purposes of this model - such future changes are unlikely to alter the relative economics of alternative technology choices.

There is no allowance for economies of scale in any of the capital costs. They are all at current quoted market prices. This means that in many cases there may be significant scope for cost reduction with volumes of this magnitude. We have not allowed for this in the analysis so there is a clear and common baseline for evaluation purposes.

The technology performance figures are based on market averages and historical project outcomes. Local circumstances mean individual project economics may be better or worse than indicated and every project must be locally optimised.

Individual business cases will need to adjust individual project costs for: market valuation of social and carbon benefits (e.g., renewable obligation certificates - from 4-6p per kWh) plus billing, network and service costs, risk cost of capital etc. Many of these costs typically vary by site, with time, and with local political judgements. They can make a significant difference to project economics.

Definition of terms used in the model**Base cost per kWh**

This is the undiscounted cost per kWh (heat or electrical energy) including capital, operating and maintenance and fuel costs over the lifetime of the installation. It includes empirically-supported capacity factors for each technology in normal operating environments.

Table of fuel parameters

Fuel	t CO ₂ /kWh	£/kWh	£/tonne	kWh/tonne	Notes
Gas	0.000194	0.025	-	-	
Electricity	0.000422	0.081	-	-	Grid average emissions, allowing for existing renewables
Green electricity	0	0.085	-	-	
Biomass	0	0.006	30	5278	19GJ per tonne (JL) is 5278 kWh per tonne
Solar	0	0	-	-	
Wind	0	0	-	-	

Sources

SAP 2005

Consumer and industrial prices for electricity and gas Jan 2006, sample online quotations.

Other model parameters

Total cost of employment	50000 £ p.a.	includes all overheads, admin and management costs etc for one individual
Average efficiency of existing installed heating	70 %	Source: BRE 2003
Price of Renewable Obligation Certificates	4.2 p/kWh	Source: Platts 2005
Recoverable value of ROCs after admin	88 %	Source: Carbon Trust (industry-reported average)
Duration of ROC market	10 years	Model variable
Discount rate	6 %	Not used yet.
Biomass crop intensity	12 odt (tonnes) per hectare	
Average farm size	81 hectares	

Warwickshire County Energy Needs

The model uses the following base data, from sources as indicated.

Base data point	units	average per user	source	comment
Domestic sector				
Number of domestic households	210898 households		Census 2001.	
Total domestic energy demand	4973 GWh	23580 kWh	WES 2003	This is prorated by ECOTEC from national statistics
Total domestic electricity demand	1148 GWh	5443 kWh	DTI 2003	
Total domestic heat demand	4227 GWh	20043 kWh	BRE 2003	85% of domestic energy is used for heating (incl hot water)
Actual delivered heat energy	2959 GWh	14030 kWh	BRE 2003	Domestic heating systems are 70% efficient on average
Industrial and commercial (I&C) sector				
Number of I&C gas users	4000 sites		DTI 2003	
Number of I&C electricity users	20000 meter points		DTI 2003	
Total I&C energy demand	5149 GWh	257450 kWh	WES 2003	Derived from national statistics
Total I&C electricity demand	1580 GWh	79000 kWh	DTI 2003	Excludes very large users with direct connection to the transmission grid
Total I&C heat demand	2454 GWh	122700 kWh	WES 2003	Use gas demand as proxy.
Actual delivered heat energy	1963 GWh	98150 kWh		I&C heating systems assumed to be 80% efficient on average

Warwickshire model results - combined heat and power

% heat from chp 10 % by changing the figure to the left, you can see the budget costs and benefits of meeting different targets

The technical challenge is:

to supply 492 GWh per year of heating energy
to 210898 households
and 20000 industrial and commercial sites

This is a heat driven model. CHP units are assumed to be designed to deliver a required heat load and use excess heat for power generation, not vice versa.

The table below shows how many standardised mini or micro-renewables installations this would require, assuming for clarity the entire target were met from a single technology in a standardised configuration. The columns show the relative economic, environmental and social benefits of each hypothetical case, using common assumptions.

Technology option	What does each (notional) installation look like	How many installations required	What is the base cost per kWh of this solution	By how much are CO2 emissions reduced	What are the supply chain implications?							
					Capital investment £	Annual operating and maintenance (O&M) costs £ p.a.	Fuel costs £ p.a. Flowing ex-county	Spent in county	Capital jobs supported (person years)	O&M jobs created or retained	Farms needing to grow 10% biomass	Income per farm per year
Domestic condensing boilers (Do nothing option)	8kW wall or floor-mounted modern gas condensing boiler, A-rated and 91% efficient.	57,906	4.2p heat, 8.1p electricity	31848 t.p.a	£ 75 million	£ 2.3 million	£ 13.5 million	0	903	46		
Domestic (micro) CHP	8kWt/1.1kWe wall or floor-mounted micro-chp units in individual family homes.	57,906	5.4p	71224 t.p.a	£ 174 million	£ 3.5 million	£ 15.9 million	0	1737	69		
Community biomass CHP (district heating)	2MWt biomass-fired CHP plant in small industrial unit delivering heat and power to around 500 homes	47	4.6p	188336 t.p.a	£ 248 million	£ 11.1 million	0	£ 4.6 million	990	223	1582	£2,917
Community gas-fired CHP (district heating)	2MWt gas-fired CHP plant in small industrial unit delivering heat and power to around 500 homes	47	5.3p	55716 t.p.a	£ 165 million	£ 2.5 million	£ 19.2 million	0	660	50		

Warwickshire model results - heat

% supplied by renewables 10 % by changing the figure to the left, you can see the budget costs and benefits of meeting different targets

The technical challenge is:

to deliver 492 GWh per year of heating energy
to 210898 households
and 20000 industrial and commercial sites

The table below shows how many standardised mini or micro-renewables installations this would require, assuming for clarity the entire target were met from a single technology in a standardised configuration. The columns show the relative economic, environmental and social benefits of each hypothetical case, using common assumptions.

Technology option	What does each (notional) installation look like	How many would we need	What is the base cost per kWh of this solution	By how much do we reduce CO2 emissions	What are the supply chain implications?							
					Capital investment £	Annual operating and maintenance (O&M) costs £ p.a.	Fuel costs £ p.a. Flowing ex-county	£ p.a. Spent in county	Capital jobs supported (person years)	O&M jobs created or retained	Farms needing to grow 10% biomass	Income per farm per year
Domestic condensing boilers (Do nothing option)	8kW wall or floor-mounted modern gas condensing boiler, A-rated and 91% efficient.	57,906	4.2p	31848 t.p.a	£ 75 million	£ 2.3 million	£ 13.5 million	0	903	46		
Rooftop solar hot water systems	4.2 sqm flat plate solar water heating systems on individual family homes with 4 occupants	223220	4.3p	136164 t.p.a	£ 469 million	£ 2.3 million	0	0	1496	45		
Domestic wood-fuelled boilers	15kW wood chip boilers providing heating and hot water to family homes	28953	2.8p	136368 t.p.a	£ 136 million	£ 1.4 million	0	£ 3.3 million	1170	26	1122	£2,916

Warwickshire model results - electricity

% supplied by renewables 10 % by changing the figure to the left, you can see the budget costs and benefits of meeting different targets

The technical challenge is:
 to supply 273 GWh per year of electrical energy (the above target, using 2003 estimated consumption as the base)
 to 210898 households
 and 20000 industrial and commercial meter points

The table below shows how many standardised mini or micro-renewables installations this would require, assuming for clarity the entire target were met from a single technology in a standardised configuration. The columns show the relative economic, environmental and social benefits of each hypothetical case, using common assumptions.

Technology option	What does each (notional) installation look like	How many would we need	What is the base cost per kWh of this solution	By how much do we reduce CO2 emissions	What are the supply chain implications?							
					Capital investment £	Annual operating and maintenance (O&M) costs £ p.a.	Annual fuel costs Flowing ex-county	Spent in county	Capital jobs supported (person years)	Permanent jobs created to operate and maintain	Farms needed to grow 10% Biomass	Income per farm per year
Solar PV (electrical) installations	78 sqm of solar modules on a community or commercial building - 10kWp systems	36,815	28.4p	115231 t.p.a	£ 1723 million	£ 8.6 million	0	0	4,134	173		
Community biomass electrical generation	2MW combustion/gas-fired generating plants in small industrial units.	22	6.4p	115122 t.p.a	£ 108 million	£ 4.9 million	0	£ 5.5 million	433	97	1871	£2,916
Micro-wind turbines	Rooftop mounted 1.5kW turbines (Swift or Windsave) with rotor diameters 1-2m	211,309	6.4p	114107 t.p.a	£ 317 million	£ 4.8 million	0	0	2155	106		
Farmyard wind turbines	6kW small turbines (4-6m diameter) on 11m masts (similar to telegraph poles).	24,800	6p	115072 t.p.a	£ 347 million	£ 2.6 million	0	0	1944	52		
Community wind turbines	Small industrial scale turbines (600kW) on 50m tall masts, with rotor diameters 45m	208	1.5p	115122 t.p.a	£ 93 million	£ 0.5 million	0	0	635	9		
Industrial wind turbines	1.5MW wind turbines, on 100m tall masts	83	1.4p	115122 t.p.a	£ 83 million	£ 0.4 million	0	0	565	8		
Purchase of green electricity	Individual homes switching to green suppliers	53,074	8.5p	115171 t.p.a	£ 0 million	£ 0 million	£ 23.2 million	0	0	0		

Performance and technical data by technology option

Technology	Size	Units	Parameters per installation											Capital ratio (capital as % of installed cost)	Fuel displaced	CO2 emissions (t p.a)	CO2 emissions displaced (t p.a.)	Preliminary cost per kWh excl ROCs (p)
			Power rating (kWe)	Power rating (kWt)	Price installed (£)	O&M costs per year (£)	Fuel costs per year (£)	ROC income available (£ p.a.)	Annual average output (kWh)	Annual average output (kWhe)	Annual average output (kWht)	Operating life (years)	Fuel displaced					
Solar PV (electrical) installations	78	sqm	10	0	46800	234	0	274	7410	7410	0	25	88	Electricity	0	3.13	28.4	
Micro-wind turbines	1	2m turbine	1.5	0	1500	22.5	0	48	1291	1291	0	25	66	Electricity	0	0.54	6.4	
Farmyard wind turbines	1	11m turbine	6	0	14000	105	0	407	11000	11000	0	25	72	Electricity	0	4.64	6	
Community wind turbines	1	45m turbine	600	0	450000	2250	0	48565	1314000	1314000	0	25	66	Electricity	0	554.51	1.5	
Industrial wind turbines	1	100m turbine	1500	0	1000000	5000	0	121414	3285000	3285000	0	25	66	Electricity	0	1386.27	1.4	
Community biomass electrical generation	1	Generator	2000	0	4862000	218790	245280	453277	12264000	12264000	0	15	80	Electricity	0	5175.41	6.4	
Rooftop solar hot water systems	4.2	sqm	0	2	2100	10.5	0	0	2205	0	2205	25	84	Gas	0	0.61	4.3	
Domestic wood-fuelled boilers	1	boiler	0	15	4700	47	113	0	17000	0	17000	15	57	Gas	0	4.71	2.8	
Community biomass CHP (district heating)	1	system	500	2000	5286000	237870	98550	97131	13140000	2628000	10512000	20	80	Gas	0	4022.33	4.6	
Domestic (micro) CHP	1	unit	1.1	8	3000	60	274	50	9860	1360	8500	15	50	Gas	2.13	3.36	5.4	
Community gas-fired CHP (district heating)	1	system	500	2000	3524000	52860	410625	97131	13140000	2628000	10512000	15	80	Gas	2832.4	4022.33	5.3	
Domestic condensing boilers (Do nothing optic	1	unit	0	8	1300	39	234	0	8500	0	8500	15	40	Gas	1.81	2.36	4.2	
Purchase of green electricity	5140	kWh	1	0	0	0	436.9	0	5140	5140	0	25	0	Electricity	0	2.17	8.5	

References

Census 2001 National census 2001
WES 2003 Warwickshire Energy Statistics, ECOTEC, 2003
DTI 2003 DTI Regional Energy Statistics, 2003
BRE 2003 Domestic Energy fact File, BRE, 2003
DTI 2002 Energy White Paper 2003
EST CE102 New and renewable energy technologies for existing housing, EST Sept 2005
Carbon Trust Biomass Sector Review, October 2005