

Roseacre Wood Community Liaison Group

Meeting: Fourth meeting Wednesday 2 July 2014

Venue: Boys Brigade Hall, Carr Lane, Treales, PR4 3SS

Time: 7.00 – 9.00 pm.

Attendees:

Heather Speak (Chair)

Joyce Stuart

Jane Barnes

Peter Marquis

Nigel Smith

Bob Haresceugh

Mark Reed

Angela Livesley

Gordon Smith

Barbara Richardson

Paul Hayhurst (part)

Liz Oades

Sam Schofield

(Cuadrilla, Lancashire Communications & Public Affairs Manager)

James Adam

(Cuadrilla, Bowland Project Delivery Manager)

Mark Kerr

(Secretariat, PPS Group)

In attendance:

Martin York (Centrica)

Mark Smith (ARUP)

Peter Webster (ARUP)

<i>Item</i>	<i>Action</i>
<p>1.0 Welcome and introductions</p> <p>HS reported apologies from Jim Thornley.</p> <p>PH explained that he would have to leave the meeting if there was discussion about the detail of the planning application(s) because of his position as a member of LCC's planning committee.</p> <p>2.0 and 3.0 Minutes of previous meeting and matters arising</p> <p>The minutes of the 28th May 2014 meeting were approved subject to the following discussion:</p> <p>Item 2.0: The amendment proposed by GS in relation to point 4.0 was approved.</p> <p>Item 4.0: JA reconfirmed that Cuadrilla would not be re- fracking the wells but in light of concerns expressed by CLG members, JA agreed carry forward his agreement to ask LCC planners if re-fracking would be allowed without additional permissions.</p>	<p>JA</p>

<p>Item 5: Community Update – Community benefit: The amendment proposed by GS to his assessment of the value of the proposed community benefit per household was approved.</p>	
<p>Item 6.0: Insurance - Following circulation of written confirmation from Willis (Cuadrilla's insurer) in advance of the meeting, members' identified that this did not provide them with the detail of the total value of the insurance cover in place. SS/JA explained that this was a commercially sensitive issue but that in light of the concerns raised they would raise the issue again with Willis and consider whether Cuadrilla could provide an indication of the level of cover provided.</p>	SS/JA
<p>Item 5.0: Noise: In response to a question from BR about noise at Roseacre Wood, SS confirmed that Arup's response to the questions about noise posed at the last meeting would be chased up. He added that a report was being prepared in relation to noise issues in response to a similar point raised by a resident in relation to the Preston New Road site. SS agreed to explore the possibility of a comparable report being produced for some locations around the Roseacre Wood site. A number of potential locations were discussed and it was agreed that the Secretariat would liaise with HS and Arup to agree which should be considered.</p>	Secretariat/Arup
<p>GS asked if Cuadrilla had real time sound recordings of the actual noise produced by an exploration site over an extended period of time. SS committed to investigate whether such data existed.</p>	SS
<p>Item Centrica's role: In response to a question from GS, MY stated that DECC had confirmed that CLG members wishing to enquire about any licence or regulatory issues in relation to Cuadrilla/Centrica should approach Duarte Figuera at the Office of Unconventional Gas and Oil (OUGA). MY further identified that the questions in relation to the licence transfer process and Centrica's role in the licence had been covered in his email circulated to members by the Secretariat on 1 July. In response to a comment from GS, MY said he would respond in due course to the additional points GS had subsequently raised.</p>	MY
<p>Following a detailed discussion about joint and the several liability regime that applied to Cuadrilla, MY suggested clarification and explanation should be sought from DECC/OUOG.</p>	
<p>SS suggested that the members' primary interest was in tracking back to establish where liability rested and MY explained that this was encapsulated in the planning applications.</p>	
<p>Following a question from GS, MY explained that Centrica's operating principles are embedded into the planning and permitting applications and agreed to highlight how these have been incorporated.</p>	

United Utilities (UU): JB expanded on the discussion at the previous meeting by explaining that UU provided valuation certificates and condition certificates. The former applied where UU works involved demolition and the latter in relation to major works close by.

It was agreed that JB would provide the appropriate contact details for UU to the secretariat in order that SS could establish UU's criteria and the type of work which justified the issuing of a condition certificate for discussion at the next meeting.

JB/Secretarit/SS

4.0 Programme update

JA explained that the Roseacre Wood application(s) had been validated by LCC on 17 June with the public consultation period beginning on 25 June.

HS asked when Parish Councils would receive hard copies of the application because CDs were not good enough to enable careful scrutiny of the fine detail. PH explained that this was not usual practice as the application was on LCC's website and displayed in 4 local libraries, at Fylde Council and at LCC.

SS added that Arup would be delivering hard copies of the application to PC Clerks and that the application, including the Environmental Risk Assessment was also on Cuadrilla's website.

PH added that LCC would liaise with PCs on matters of detail and, in response to a question from HS, opined that there was a very high probability that LCC members would undertake a site visit in advance of determination. This view was strongly supported by LO who also agreed that it was unreasonable to expect people to go on-line to view the planning application. PH suggested that PC Clerks should raise any issues with Stuart Perigo (LCC).

GS asked that the public should be given more time to provide sensible comments on what was a complex application and PH commented that LCC had already said that it would accept comments up to the committee date. However, he advocated submitting comments as soon as possible in order that they could be included in officers' report and the Order Paper for the committee meeting or the update sheet on the day if received later.

In response to questions LO said there was no date yet for the determination committee and PH thought it likely that a special meeting would be called but could not comment on the likelihood of both the Preston New Road and Roseacre Wood applications being considered at the same committee.

BH asked if a risk management plan was in place in the event of a problem such as the well head blowing.

In a wide ranging discussion JA confirmed that the Environmental Statement (volume 2, Appendix E) provides an outline structure of the Environmental

Operating Standards (EOS). The EOS will be completed once all planning and permitting conditions have been agreed and will seek to follow the format as set out in Appendix E. Table 1 shows how the EOS complies with the HSSE Risk Management Framework. LO stated that the emergency response mechanism was a function of LCC in joint working with the emergency services and was a legal requirement. She added that simulated exercises were undertaken by LCC Major Disaster Emergency Team from time to time to test the required responses.

JA/SS explained that the EOS will provide information on risk management and if this information is not considered sufficient then any further details for Risk Management could be sought through conditions placed on any planning permission which would have to be discharged before any work could start.

SS summarised the discussion by suggesting that members wanted to know exactly where in the planning application the emergency response plan could be found and in plain English how it would be put in place if required.

It was agreed that these points would be made available at the next meeting.

MS(Arup)

5.0 Community update

Telephone survey: BR reported receiving complaints from residents about Cuadrilla's recent telephone survey and asked who had been surveyed and if Cuadrilla would share the results of the research. She was also concerned that the questions showed a bias towards the industry and complained that the CLG should have been informed before the event.

SS explained that pollsters had undertaken opinion surveys on Cuadrilla's behalf over a period of time in the Fylde, Blackpool and West Lancashire to better understand the public's wider concerns about shale gas. He did not commit to sharing the results of the survey because it only formed one element of Cuadrilla's information gathering, which included the CLG's discussions and those with residents, both of which were taken more seriously. The pollsters had limited the survey area to the 3d seismic survey area (c. 100km²) with a representative sample of 500 people but had been given no guidance as to whom to phone.

Transport route: JS asked if a decision had yet been taken on the transport route. JA said that a letter of comfort had been received from the MOD which was included in the planning application which could facilitate the Inskip route. He identified that this was good progress but was not yet concluded

NS paid tribute to Cuadrilla for its efforts to secure this alternative route but GS disputed this suggesting it was all due to Mark Menzies, MP. NS did not share this view but thought it would be a good result in any event.

BR identified that the EA included the fact that for operational reasons the

MOD could stop the Inskip route being used and this would result in HGV traffic through Wharles which would necessitate the claimed traffic improvements to Wharles. She was strongly supported by members in her assertion that the proposed traffic mitigation measures for Wharles were strongly opposed by local residents.

GS asked why all traffic, not just HGVs, couldn't use the INSKIP route by utilising Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) cameras. JA supported by PW suggested that differentiating all Cuadrilla traffic (HGVs and cars/vans) would be difficult even with ANPR, and that in any event car traffic volumes were low.

[PH left the meeting.]

SS confirmed in response to a question from BR that Arup's paper on traffic management in Wharles (previously circulated to members) was in the public domain.

6. Environment Statement

MS and PW gave a presentation about the Environment Statement submitted as part of the planning application(s).

[A copy of the presentation is attached to these minutes.]

The following points were raised:

Informing BGS – MS responded to GS' question that BGS will be informed on an intention to drill.

3d data – SS/JA agreed to provide details of when Cuadrilla had supplied the 3d data to the BGS.

Public Highways works – In response to GS/BR, PW explained that public highways works will be agreed and delivered through condition or legal agreement with LCC and that the planning application's Transport Assessment included details of the transport works.

Consultation outcomes – In response to HS, MS explained that the changes to the proposals in response to issues raised during the consultation were featured in the brochure recently circulated to residents.

Site size – In response to HS, JA confirmed that the red line for the site had

JA/SS

<p>increased to accommodate the proposed grid connection and works required to accommodate the Inskip traffic route. In response to JB, JA explained it was necessary to remove five small trees and a hedgerow to accommodate the grid connection. In light of the increase in the size of the site, JB sought details on the drainage mitigation measures which MS agreed to provide.</p>	MS(Arup)
<p><u>Works west of Elswick</u> – BR asked about works being undertaken west of Elswick at the seismic monitoring locations, SS agreed to look into this commenting that it was unlikely this was happening without the necessary planning permission. SS suggested that BR provided grid references of the sites or arranged to visit the site with SS so that this could be investigated.</p>	BR/SS
<p><u>Seismic array monitoring sites</u> – HS commented that the location of the monitoring sites had split the community and NS confirmed that there were no sites on his land.</p>	
<p><u>Site selection</u> – GS asked how LCC’s scoping opinion requiring other sites to be considered had been met and MS confirmed the details were included in the planning statement and ES section on Alternatives.</p>	
<p><u>National Grid gas connection</u> – In response to questions JA confirmed that the required works for National Grid’s compound would be below ground. JA agreed to respond to GS’ question about whether there would be lighting on the compound’s security fence.</p>	JA
<p><u>Number of wells</u> – In response to BR, SS confirmed that the planning permission was for up to four wells but that it may not be necessary to drill all the wells depending on the results found.</p>	
<p><u>The role of Arup</u> – In response to a general discussion JA confirmed that Arup’s appointment as consultants to Cuadrilla was currently limited to work on the planning application for the exploration works.</p>	
<p><u>Monitoring of works</u> – SS confirmed that LCC was responsible for monitoring and enforcing any planning permission and associated conditions.</p>	
<p><u>Noise</u> – GS identified that the ERA did not include noise as a risk and MS explained that in planning terms it was an impact not a risk.</p>	
<p><u>Transport routes</u> – PW asked for responses from CLG members to the Arup’s note “Wharles Traffic Management” dated 30 June 2014 (circulated in advance</p>	ALL

of the meeting).

A number of contributions highlighted that members were very unhappy about the detail of Arup's proposed traffic management plan for Wharles and its impact on the rural character of the village; the consensus was that it was the wrong solution.

PW commented that the management plan was an initial proposal which been discussed with LCC Highways Officers (Glen Robinson), and that detailed comments were welcomed from CLG members.

LO I asked who would fund repairs to the road network. PW confirmed that Cuadrilla would meet costs of repairs required as a result of its activities where appropriate.

GS asked about consideration given to temporary access across the fields from the Fleetwood Road (A585) citing the example of Network Rail. SS commented that the environmental impact of this route was likely to be disproportionate in view of the temporary exploration activity planned for the site.

BR identified that transport routes was the most important issue and a better solution needed to be found by Arup/Cuadrilla and LCC. In light of this GS advocated that there should be a pause to the application process and SS commented that representations on the issue should be made to LCC for consideration.

In relation to the MOD/Inskip proposals, there was some recognition from members that the impacts would be reduced by this alternative route. However, BR identified that that it would not be available all of the time and would be subject to the MOD's operational requirements; therefore there would still be a requirement for a Wharles traffic management plan. BH asked for quantitative data on the MOD's requirements in order to assess whether the Inskip route would be available 98% of the time or considerably less. SS said he would consider this but stated that the details of the MOD's operational restrictions were not yet known and would emerge from the on-going discussions with the MOD.

SS/MS(Arup)

Public rights of way – HS raised the issue of new signs around the site referring to private access and seemingly limiting public access to rights of way. SS agreed to look into to this and report back to CLG members.

SS

PC Polling results – SS asked if the PC’s polling results about community benefit would be made public. GS/BR would not be drawn on this.

6. Community Benefit

GS asked if the community benefit was limited to UKOOG’s proposals of £100k per fracking site and 1% of production revenues. BR added that UKOOG’s Community Engagement Charter for Unconventional Reservoirs stated that production was the stage at which equipment such as pipelines and gas processing facilities were required. She considered that as the planning application stated the site would be connected to the gas mains that this would trigger the 1% of any revenues being included in any community benefit considerations.

SS confirmed that UKOOG’s proposals would deliver a defined pot on money in financial terms but a process for utilising the money for the benefit of the local community needed to be developed by the local community. He added that in addition, there would be a wider benefit from the growth in economic activity in the area.

LO highlighted that any monies should be retained in the local community and not go to Blackpool, Preston or the wider E. Lancashire area and that the Community Foundation for Lancashire (CFL) was not a local organisation. SS commented that it was not envisaged that the CFL would be making payments but would be facilitating the recruitment and organisation of a group of local people created for this purpose.

Owing to the lack of time, HS identified that community benefit was an important issue and should be discussed in greater detail at the next meeting which should be organised as a matter of urgency, ideally in the next 2-3 weeks.

7. Any other business

Cuadrilla donations – JB requested data on donations made by Cuadrilla. SS agreed to consider the request.

Leaflet distribution – JB requested a geographical breakdown of the distribution of the 9,000 leaflets sent out by Cuadrilla. SS agreed to provide this but explained that this exact distribution area for Cuadrilla’s communications with residents had changed over time.

Secretariat

SS

Secretariat

8. Date of next meeting

To be confirmed by the Secretariat.

--