

Preston New Road Community Liaison Group

Meeting: Third meeting Wednesday 4th June 2014

Venue: Pipers Height Caravan Park, Peel Road, FY4 5JT

Time: 7.00 – 9.00 pm

Attendees:

Sam Schofield [SS]	Interim Chair, Cuadrilla, Lancashire Communications & Public Affairs Manager
James Adam [JA]	Cuadrilla, Bowland Project Delivery Manager
Stuart Hall [SHall]	
Susan Holliday [SH]	
Jan Gregson [JG]	
Liz Cheadle [LG]	
Andrew Wareing [AW]	
Paul Hayhurst [PH]	
Mark Kerr [MK]	Secretariat, PPS Group

In attendance:

Chief Inspector Keith Ogle [KO] Lancashire Constabulary

<i>Item</i>	<i>Action</i>
<p>1.0 Welcome and introductions</p> <p>All present introduced themselves.</p> <p>2.0 Apologies</p> <p>Apologies were received from Patricia Davies who was ill and AW explained that Liz Oades was also unable to attend.</p> <p>3.0 Security issues</p> <p>It was agreed that this item would be covered first in order to make best use of KO's time.</p> <p>SS thanked KO for attending and reminded the meeting that he had been asked to discuss members' concerns about threats from protestor activity and the steps the Police would take to address the issue.</p> <p>KO explained that this was a community policing issue and that Lancashire Constabulary (LC) had attended a number of events organized by anti-</p>	

fracking groups, had liaised with a number of District and Parish Councils and with members of the public.

In his experience the protestors he had come across were nice, genuine local people with genuinely held concerns and that the Police needed to look at the debate from all sides. He identified that local protest groups had strongly held views but undertook peaceful protests and, in his view, did not welcome involvement from more extreme groups. He commented that from meetings he had attended with local protestors they did not want to alienate local residents by the activities of the more extreme groups. He added that all meetings with protestor groups had been fully documented.

He identified that the Police Liaison Teams looked at local community issues and there was a balance to be struck between the positive duty to facilitate legal protests and to allow Cuadrilla to undertake its lawful activities.

Lessons had been learned from the policing activity by Greater Manchester Police at Barton Moss and Sussex Police at Balcombe. A key issue was liaison between the Police and protestors and the companies concerned. The aim was to have a clear understanding from both sides about their expectations and the issues involved and agreed protocols with all parties. For example, a protocol could be agreed for the timing of truck deliveries to the site.

KO confirmed that the Police response was in place with local trained officers ready to deal with any issues that arose, it would be a Lancashire response by Lancashire officers. He thought that there were now a number of fracking sites around the country in the North West, Sussex, N. Yorkshire and Nottingham and that this could take the spotlight off the Fylde.

KO responded to a number of questions:

SHall asked about traffic management and its potential impact on local businesses.

KO identified that the A583 was an arterial route so must be kept open at all times. This meant that camping on the verges would not be allowed and that if necessary deliveries to site would require a lorry stacking system from a compound located off the A583.

SHall asked if there would be a 24 hour Police presence.

KO said that policing would react as appropriate. Previous experience suggested that there would be some days when planned activity on site and agreed protocols would indicate an increased Police presence but that if peaceful legal camping was taking place 24 hour policing would not be required.

AW asked about the delays that can be experienced in getting illegal camping sites cleared.

KO said that some local landowners may give permission for camping on their land but if there was a case of trespass this can be dealt with quickly when required.

AW identified the risk of “professional protestors” becoming involved.

KO commented that most “professional protestors” had south east postcodes and tended to go where they were made most welcome by local residents. He questioned whether this would be the case in the Fylde and suggested that local protestors did not want to attract this particular group. He was confident that the local Police could cope and highlighted that early liaison with all parties was key.

PH considered that the Fylde was a very topical area regarding fracking and a potentially fertile area for generating publicity and raised concerns about the potential for Cuadrilla’s security presence to cause friction.

SS stated that any off-site issues were a matter for the Police and those on-site would be resolved by Cuadrilla’s well-trained security staff.

KO added that the company’s staff would all be Security Industry Association trained and assessed and that the security industry was now very professional and concentrated on non-confrontational strategies to avoid conflict. He added that the Police had the required capability and would adopt a measured and professional approach. He observed that Cuadrilla had been very open in its approach and engaged in a number of community events in the Bowland.

KO stated that the Police would need local intelligence so local residents should contact the Police and provide information by dialing 101 or contacting

their Parish or District Councils who would liaise with the Neighbourhood Policing Teams.

He also encouraged CLG members to contact him direct on 07958 336 015.

SHall sought reassurance about any increased risk of theft.

KO commented that this had not been the case in Balcombe or Barton Moss where there had been no increase levels of crime locally so normal patrols would continue. He added that local protestors were reasonable people and were unlikely to tolerate illegal activity. The aim of protestors appeared to be more about damaging the potential investment returns for the companies concerned by slowing activity down and increasing costs.

PH reiterated the risk of traffic disruption.

KO repeated that there would be no disruption to traffic flows on the A583.

SS thanked KO for his contribution and all agreed it had been very useful.

4.0 Minutes of previous meeting

The minutes of the 16th April meeting were agreed.

5.0 Matters Arising

Additional CLG members: The following individuals would be approached by the Secretariat with a view to them joining the group:

- Harry Gardener, Moss House Farm
- Andrew Pemberton, Birks Farm, Ballam Road, Ballam
- David Hargreaves, Mere Farm, Westby
- Knights K9 Kennels, Staining Wood Cottages, Preston New Road

Chair: SS confirmed that no self-nominations had been received to date for the role of Chair.

Scoping opinion: Secretariat to circulate LCC's scoping opinion with the

Secretariat

meeting minutes.

Secretariat

Redaction of CLG members' names: SS asked, given that the meeting minutes would enter the public domain, that any members who did not want their names included should inform the Secretariat by Friday 13th June 2014. He added that a similar offer had been made to the Roseacre Wood CLG members but all were content for their names to be included.

All

In response to a question from SS, all confirmed that they had found LCC's presentation on the planning process at the extraordinary joint meeting of the two CLGs on 14th May very useful.

6.0 Programme update

JA confirmed that the Preston New Road planning application had been submitted to LCC on 29th May and that the Council's validation process was expected to be completed shortly. This would trigger the Council's 16 week determination period.

He explained the application comprised 7 volumes of documents accounting for c. 4,500 pages with the Environmental Assessment itself running to several hundred pages. The size of the application posed a challenge for LCC in uploading it onto its website but it was anticipated that this would be complete by 11th June and that the Council's statutory 21 day consultation period would begin on Friday 13th June. He added that the application would also be available on Cuadrilla's web site from 11th June.

JA added that the 21 day consultation period allowed both statutory bodies (e.g. EA, HSE etc.) and non-statutory bodies (e.g. members of the public, Parish Councils, RSPB etc.) to submit representations. He confirmed the 21 period was notional and that in practice later representations would be accepted by LCC.

He explained that there were two applications; one for the seismic monitoring array and the other for the site and access, but that the Environmental Statement covered both running to 20 chapters + appendices. He added that there were separate Planning Statements for each application along with the usual documentation (e.g. a statement of community involvement, flood risk assessment, etc.).

He confirmed that the Environmental Impact Assessment was the process that led to the Environmental Statement and that the application also included a non-technical summary that was a useful précis of the data.

JA confirmed that LCC would deposit copies of the application at County Hall and local libraries.

It was agreed that the secretariat would distribute by post CDs of the application to CLG members and PCs on 11th June.

JA added that a more user friendly brochure summarising feedback from the local community on the key issues will be posted to local residents in the next week or so.

PH commented that LCC's Planning Committee meeting on 15 October was the nearest to the end of the 16 week determination period but thought it was more likely that a special planning committee would be called by LCC to decide on the application.

On traffic routes JA explained that the application contained a revised route with a left in/left out from the site and utilizing both J3 and J4 from the motorway. He confirmed that deliveries would be closely directed and would not rely on Satnavs.

7.0 Community update

A number of members raised the fact that local residents had put forward a number of questions some months ago at consultation events and through the community mapping site but had not received responses.

SS confirmed that where contact details were provided responses would be provided in the coming weeks. In addition, he explained that the Statement of Community Involvement included comprehensive cover of the questions raised and they were cross-referenced in the Environmental Statement.

SH highlighted the need for Cuadrilla to respond promptly to all questions from residents. And that all questions should be acknowledged as a matter of courtesy. SS recognized the need to acknowledge questions so that people knew they were being dealt with. He explained that some queries were easy

Secretariat

to respond to within the target 10 day period, but that others pertained to issues covered in the ES which had only just been published.

PH suggested that an invitation should be issued to the regulators (EA and HSE) to attend and present as soon as possible to the two CLGs to help members understand the regulators role.

It was agreed that the secretariat would approach the EA and HSE and liaise with the Roseacre Wood CLG members.

JG tabled a number of concerns:

1. Access to the site MUST be by the proposed access road from the A583.

JA confirmed this was the case with effectively a one-way system only using the motorway and the A583 with a left in/left out system. The proposed routes had been discussed with LCC who would decide the matter and that they must be complied with and enforced.

2. The access road MUST be the first priority in the construction of the site, no access to the site for construction traffic via Great Plumpton, Little Plumpton or Moss House Lane.

JA agreed. See answer to 1. above.

3. The site construction shall be in accordance with all environmental measures identified by the EA.

JA highlighted that site construction was governed by the planning consent which would include the EAs requirements.

4. Confirmation that the noise pollution would be minimal, electric drilling, but would only continue (24/7) for about 2-3 months.

JA confirmed that electric drilling would occur 24/7 for each well for c. 3 months.

SH observed that this would result in 14 months of drilling for a four well site. JA commented that drilling would be completed as quickly as possible with refreshed noise maps included in the EA. He added that drilling noise was

Secretariat

less than the noise generated by fracking, so the latter was limited to being undertaken during the daytime for c. 4 weeks in 2-3 hour periods.

SH asked if residents would be forewarned about fracking taking place. In response to a question from SS, SH thought the best way of doing this was by a leaflet/letter to local residents. SS confirmed this would happen with a broad indication of the expected timing.

5. Details required concerning the length of time that fracking/drilling will be undertaken per well – continuous/ consecutive

The order of drilling and fracking may follow an alternating process as detailed in the EA as a worst case scenario. However, this might change to a more consecutive process which has a reduced impact.

6. Confirmation that fracking would be monitored in real time from seismic stations situated around the proposed site, to enable control of the fracking pressure and thus reduce any chance of a repeat of the earth movement recorded a couple of years ago.

JA confirmed that this was the case and an integral part of the “traffic light system” required by Government.

SH asked what happened if the array indicated a problem. JA explained that in such an event the pressure is regulated and reduced and that the seismic survey work already undertaken had identified pre-stressed faults which in turn had driven site selection criteria.

SH asked if there were examples of the “traffic light system” working. SS confirmed that it had been deployed in the Netherlands and Germany and was supported by the Royal Society and the Royal Academy of Engineers.

7. Confirmation that the water used in fracking will be supplied locally and from mains supply without impact on any local supplies. All used water will be removed from site for treatment via the access road. No used water will be stored on site, unless in covered containers awaiting removal; in this instance the storage capacity will be kept to a minimum.

JA explained that United Utilities would supply the mains water required and had confirmed that there will be no adverse effect on other users. He added that not all used water would be taken off-site, with 20% recycled and reused

after minimal treatment on-site to reduce traffic movements. The 20% would be stored in steel, banded, closed, containers and the whole site was covered by an impermeable membrane so there were at least three safety barriers.

8.0 AOB

AW suggested using the Raygreen Institute as an alternative venue for future CLG meetings.

It was agreed that the secretariat would investigate this option.

9.0 Date of next meeting

It was agreed that the secretariat would circulate this when a date had been agreed with the EA and HSE.

The meeting ended at 9.15 pm.

Secretariat

Secretariat