

Meeting: Ninth meeting Wednesday 14<sup>th</sup> January 2015  
 Venue: Boys Brigade Hall, Carr Lane, Treales, PR4 3SS  
 Time: 7.00 – 9.30 pm.

Attendees:

Heather Speak (HS) Chair  
 Angela Livesley (AL)  
 Jane Barnes (JB)  
 Gordon Smith (GS)  
 Barbara Richardson (BR)  
 Jacqui Stapleton (JS)  
 Nigel Smith (NS)  
 Bob Haresceugh (BH)  
 Paul Hayhurst (PH)

Sam Schofield (SS) Cuadrilla, Lancashire Communications & Public Affairs  
 Manager  
 James Adam (JA) Cuadrilla, Bowland Project Delivery Manager  
 Mark Kerr Secretariat, PPS Group

<b>Item</b>	<b>Action</b>
<p><b>1.0 Apologies</b></p> <p>Apologies were reported from: Mark Reed, Elizabeth Warner, Joyce Stuart, Liz Oades and Peter Marquis</p> <p><b>2.0 Minutes of previous meeting</b></p> <p>The minutes from the fifth RW CLG meeting on July 23 were approved subject to GS requesting the following addition:</p> <p><u>ANPR/traffic management:</u> In response to a question from GS, LJ acknowledged that ANPR systems were used by the Police and in some public car parks and could be considered if LCC conditioned specific traffic routes and timing of traffic movements. LJ said that in looking at mitigation measures ANPR could be one of a number of potential solutions.</p> <p><b>3.0 Matters arising</b></p> <p><u>Emergency planning:</u> MK explained that a response was received on 8 December from Alan Wilton, Head of Emergency Planning, LCC saying that he felt it would be more appropriate to attend and brief the CLG if the proposed exploratory works were permitted and included fracking. At that point he would be happy to attend.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Secretariat would reissue the invitation at the appropriate time.</p> <p>In discussion JB raised concerns about LCC making adequate and timely budget decisions to enable funding to be available for the emergency planning work required. HS suggested that if the application was approved it may have</p>	

a condition requiring the emergency planning to be in place before any works could commence.

NS commented that he suspected LCC already had a plan in place and JA observed that from Cuadrilla's perspective an emerging plan would be drawn up and engagement with LCC would happen at the appropriate time.

Appeal process: In response to NS, JA explained that although rare, the Government could at any time call-in planning applications for determination by the Secretary of State on advice from the Planning Inspectorate. It was more common that an applicant would appeal to the Secretary of State on grounds of non-determination or if the planning application was refused.

Again in response to NS, JA confirmed that if an application was approved on appeal, applicants could apply for appeal costs from the planning authority.

Community benefit: HS had been advised by FBC legal officers that she had a prejudicial interest as a result of living so close to the RW site.

It was agreed that NS would provide a draft letter for the Secretariat to send to Alan Oldfield, Chief Executive, FBC requesting assistance in considering options for administering any community benefit payments.

NS to provide draft letter to Secretariat

Monitoring array sites: In response to the question about the reason for separate applications for the array sites, JA explained while there was no requirement to separate the applications the activities involved in the array sites was substantially different from that involved in the main applications. In addition, he added that the time lines were also different and any conditions would also be different. GS commented that nevertheless the applications were co-dependent and contained many directly comparable issues.

BR raised the concerns of two local residents about the additional mini-monitoring devices recently buried around the site and criticised the fact that there had been no communications on the matter with neighbouring residents. SS opined that it was a fine judgement as to whether minor works, the seven pieces of equipment concerned were the size of paint pots and they were buried by shovel, justified liaison with neighbours when the activity was non-invasive and minor. However, SS accepted that more information could be shared with local residents.

Following a question from GS about air monitoring it was agreed that the recent response to BR would be circulated to CLG members with the relevant references appended.

Response from BR to be circulated to CLG members

#### **4. Programme update:**

Preese Hall: JA updated the CLG that a weather window was required to complete the restoration works.

UU works at PNR: JA confirmed that the works at PNR were being undertaken by UU under permitted rights and related to the laying of a new water main and were not Cuadrilla "jumping the gun".

New sites: JA explained that LCC was processing the RW application on the extended timetable to 18 November and that no further extension had been requested to date. SS added that there had been considerable correspondence on this including a request to UU for clarification from MPs and it was disappointing, but in light of nothing to the contrary from UU, that

the rumour mill had assumed the works related to Cuadrilla.

Inskip route: In response to an update requested by BH, JA explained that written confirmation from the Secretary of State to “in principle” approval had been provided by the MOD to LCC. BR asked if terms of engagement had been agreed with the MOD on 24/7 operation and all HGVs using the route and highlighted that residents’ needed to know what was happening. JA reiterated that although the agreement would be 24/7 there were likely to be conditions and notice periods to cover emergency situations. GS commented that in that event traffic would go through Wharles and BR added that if production stage was reached much more traffic would be generated.

JS observed that whatever the Inskip outcome all traffic would go through Clifton in both directions and logic suggested that there should be a round route and that Elswick had been unfairly avoided. BR commented that it was up to LCC to decide the most suitable route and approve any traffic management plan.

In a more detailed discussion a number of points were made:

- Residents wanted all traffic, not just HGVs to use Inskip
- Inskip route was designed to take all traffic
- Previous discussions with HS suggested Inskip would take all traffic
- Ultimately it was Cuadrilla’s decision how and where to route site traffic

JA commented that the current thing was that HGVs would use Inskip as the EIA had assessed that non-HGV site traffic would be satisfactorily accommodated on the existing road network.

JS was critical of the fact that it appeared a done deal that all traffic would go through Clifton to add to the existing heavy traffic levels through the village. GS commented that Arup had looked at eleven traffic routes and decided on the route that affected the least number of people. He added that the option of crossing the fields off the A584 had not been pursued.

## **5. Community Update:**

Flow-back rates: In response to a question from GS asking what assumptions had been made to justify the 40% flow-back rate, JA confirmed he had already been sent a detailed response. GS then asked what the flow-back rate had been at Preese Hall and JA confirmed he would provide a response to both questions at the next meeting.

Community benefit: In response to a question from GS asking what engagement process had been undertaken to determine the level of community benefit on offer, SS said that this had been undertaken by UKOOG. BR questioned the legal basis behind the process and observed that the 1% level payable at production stage was not representative of comparable contributions from other industries. SS observed that any addition to the 1% should come from the industry’s contribution to the Government in tax take. In the US BR thought the figure was upwards of 5% and BH commented that any monies must go to local communities and this would require the support of local MPs and LCC.

PH opined that this “lobbying” should be started immediately and that MPs had already said that 1% was not enough. BR asked that PH and LO (as County Councilors) should make representations to LCC and MPs and PH thought

---

that after determination the cause should be led by a Notice of Motion to LCC.

SS commented that Cuadrilla was happy for any and all politicians to be involved but it was for the local community and the operator to discuss the best way forward.

Following a discussion SS identified that the development of the method of deciding how any community benefit monies were administered and distributed needed to be an interactive process, rather than being proposed by Cuadrilla. The company was minded to assist by funding any legal advice required but would not be imposing decisions.

BH asked how "local community" would be defined and SS said his personal opinion was that it should be the Parish area or less. GS thought that Clifton, Wharles and Roseacre were the most affected areas but NS thought it was not all about traffic impacts. He also observed that the community benefit was going round in circles with neighbours pitched against each other.

It was agreed that the Secretariat would circulate the UKOOG Shale gas community charter and that in light of the result of the planning determination community benefit would be discussed at the next meeting.

**6. AOB:**

No points were raised under any other business.

**7. Date of next meeting:**

7.00 pm on Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> February 2015

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

---

Secretariat to circulate the  
UKOOG Shale gas  
community charter