

Roseacre Wood Community Liaison Group

Meeting: Eleventh meeting Wednesday 16th April 2015
 Venue: Boys Brigade Hall, Carr Lane, Treales, PR4 3SS
 Time: 7.00 – 9.30 pm.

Attendees:

Heather Speak (HS) Chair
 Peter Marquis (PM)
 Gordon Smith (GS)
 Barbara Richardson (BR)
 Jacqui Stapleton (JS)
 Bob Haresceugh (BH)

Sam Schofield (SS) Cuadrilla, Lancashire Communications & Public Affairs
 Manager

Eric Vaughan (EV) Cuadrilla, Well Services Director

Mark Kerr (MK) Secretariat, PPS Group

In attendance:

Paul Entwistle (PE) Woodplumpton PC
 Lynda Oldcorn (LO) Broughton PC
 Mark Smith (MS) (Arup)
 David Hiller (DH) (Arup)
 Peter Webster (PW) (Arup)

Item	Action
<p>1.0 Apologies</p> <p>Apologies were reported from: Mark Reed, Joyce Stuart, Liz Oades, Angela Livesley, Jane Barnes, Nigel Smith and Elizabeth Warner.</p> <p>MK drew attention to Mark Reed's apology and that as he was not standing for the forthcoming parish council elections, in future his position on the CLG would be filled by another representative from Elswick Parish Council, following the results of the May 2015 Elections.</p> <p>HS asked that recognition was given to the contribution Mark had made during his tenure on the CLG and that the Secretariat thanked him and wished him well in the future. These sentiments were echoed by all.</p> <p>In addition, HS welcomed LO who explained her attendance was in Joe Hamilton's stead as he had stood down from Broughton PC.</p> <p>2.0 Meeting agenda</p> <p>In light of the importance of ARUP's presentation on the Reg. 22 issues, HS proposed and it was agreed that this item would be taken first with urgent items only to be taken at the end of the meeting.</p>	<p><i>Secretariat: Thank MR for his contribution to the CLG</i></p>

3.0 ARUP discussion about Reg. 22 issues

MS and DH explained LCC's Reg 22 consultation process and the detail Cuadrilla had provided on the additional mitigation measure proposed to reduce night-time noise levels at PNR.

A copy of the presentation is appended to the meeting minutes.

During discussion the following points were raised:

Noise

3.1 PE commented that it was notoriously difficult to assess theoretical noise analysis results and DH responded by saying that internationally accepted standards and proven methodology were used.

3.2 In response to a question from GS and PE, EV explained that the site layout in the presentation showing (6 pumps not 4) was the same as in the planning application but with 2 back-up pumps, DH added that this meant that a worst case scenario had been used with a larger noise source being modelled.

3.3 MS commented that LCC would impose conditions on noise levels that could not be exceeded. However, PE considered that by modelling higher figures the limits would be easier for Cuadrilla to meet. GS added that the calculation should reflect the reality and be more accurate.

3.4 PE thought that Cuadrilla had missed a trick by not providing pictures and/or a 3D model showing the visual impact of the noise mitigation measures. It was agreed that Cuadrilla would consider this idea.

3.5 BR asked about noise sources other than drilling and fracking, e.g. flaring, adding that experience of flaring in the US was that it added considerably to noise impacts. GS added that 2 flares were proposed in the application at different locations on the site. EV responded that the type of flares proposed for RW were very different from the "candle on a stick" flares often used in the US. He added that they were akin to the flares used on land fill sites with no flame and no noise. They were c. 10m tall, with an enclosed ceramic brick cowl and the EA requirements were for the flare temperature to be above 800c so it was important to control the gas/air mix. In response to a question from GS, EV thought that Flare Products Limited and Uniflare Ltd were examples of potential suppliers.

3.6 DH commented that at Horse Hill there was much less on-site noise than he had anticipated and more mechanization including the connecting of pipes in the drilling process. EV explained that each drill string was c. 45ft long and it took c. 2.5 minutes to attach each pipe. But the speed of drilling was highly dependent on the rock structure; it could vary from 2-50 m per hour, which affected the speed and regularity of pipe connections.

3.7 DH responded to a question from GS about night-time noise levels at the closest receptor by referring to Arup's findings of 29-31dBL at Old Orchard Farm and Jacob's (LCC's noise consultants) of 27-34 dBL. DH added that BS 4142 (revised 2014) noise standards related to typical background noise not lowest background noise. GS commented that BS 4142 took a receptor's not a developers' point of view.

Cuadrilla to consider the use of pictures/3D model

3.8 BH asked how good the “fit” was with anticipated noise levels and DH responded that it was robust and that the model had been tested with results in the range of -0.5 - +0.8dBL (Table 6 of the Report).

3.9 In answer to a question from JS, DH said that actual sound recordings had not been taken at Horse Hill. PE added that examples of dBL noise levels of common sounds could be found on the internet and the example of rain being c. 70-80 dBL was given. DH reconfirmed that all noise assessments were based on a worst case scenario. EV added that LCC would impose noise conditions.

3.10 In response to PM’s view “that seeing is believing” EV said that there were no current examples of operational on-shore drilling sites in the UK, although there was the possibility of a drill site in Lincolnshire becoming operational in the future. The nearest examples were in Poland (where 1 or 2 sites were drilled per month) and in France where comparable drilling techniques were being used in geothermal energy exploration. However, EV emphasized the importance of comparing like-with-like and commented that older drilling rigs were typically taller and noisier and that the rigs proposed in the UK were quieter before the additional mitigation measures were included. He added that a Cuadrilla rig had been used at Horse Hill.

3.11 SS added that if an appropriate, comparable example of drilling activity could be found Cuadrilla would consider the logistics of organizing a site visit.

3.12 In response to a question from PM, EV stated that as had been the case with drilling at Preese Hall, there would be no vibration.

3.13 In response to comments from BR and PE, MS confirmed that Cuadrilla had made a commitment to ensure that its equipment was painted in an appropriate colour for the surroundings; this was often a shade of grey to blend in with the sky line.

3.14 In response to GS and PE, DH confirmed that a drilling noise map had not been included with the additional information as it had not been requested by LCC (as advised by Jacobs) who had asked for fracking noise contours not noise drilling contours. During discussion DH and MS commented that Cuadrilla had nothing to hide but would need to discuss with LCC whether the data was required as it could result in further delay and uncertainty if another Reg 22 consultation was required. HS added that although fracking was noisier, drilling would be continuous and take place day and night. Following further deliberation, DH added that his recollection was that the noise contours for drilling, using the same scale as in the ES, were restricted to an area very close to the site and so did not provide any significant additional information.

3.15 In response to a question from BR, DH confirmed that LCC had identified an acceptable noise level for RW and that it is lower than the norm and MS added that the noise contours were already very close to the site boundary and that the mitigation measures made them even closer.

3.16 BH asked if Arup was happy with its noise model and the noise levels anticipated. MS confirmed that the mitigation measures resulted in achieving levels well below the limits set out in National Planning Guidance and DH added that LCC would impose noise limits that must be met.

3.17 In response to PE’s observation that it was a subjective process, EV commented that noise limits of c. 42 dB had always been applied to minerals workings which were often in rural areas.

3.18 HS observed that in her view there would be a massive imposition of industrial activity in a quiet rural area and she had little faith in the mitigation being proposed. MS stated that if noise conditions were exceeded LCC would take enforcement action.

3.19 GS identified that management on-site was crucial to avoid extraneous sources of additional noise, e.g. closing the doors encasing equipment as had been observed at Horse Hill, and questioned Cuadrilla's credentials following noise issues on its site in Balcombe, West Sussex. EV responded by saying that active noise monitors on and off-site would be used with an operator on-site to ensure enforcement. In relation to Balcombe he explained operations had stopped as soon as noise levels had been breached and additional mitigation measures, e.g. sound walls put in place to ensure compliance. GS added that Phil Dent was FBC's enforcement officer.

3.20 MS commented that Arup's report had been submitted to LCC (and Jacobs the Council's specialist noise consultants) and if any issues had been missed they would say so.

3.21 BH asked about the margin of error in Arup's calculations and DH confirmed that in all cases he had erred on the side of caution.

Transport

3.22 In response to a question from GS, PW confirmed that HGV weights could be up to 44 ton, 6 axle lorries and (in terms of the stated daily movements) essentially included anything above a small van and their numbers would be controlled by conditions imposed by LCC.

3.23 PE asked about the scale of activity in relation to moving a rig, EV explained that could involve c. 70-90 lorries per mobilization/demobilization but that this would be restricted to a maximum of 25 lorries per day under LCC's conditions.

3.24 In response to a question from HS, EV said that lorries could be controlled in convoys or not but operationally convoys were not favoured.

3.25 JS asked how many traffic movement peaks there would be. EV responded by identifying 1. Site construction 2. Drill mobilization 3. Drill demobilisation 4. Fracking adding that a change to the planned timetable would not increase the number of peaks but would stretch the time periods.

3.26 JS asked what "improvements" were proposed. PW identified passing places on Dagger Road and PM commented that two lorries can pass along the route except along Dagger Lane. PW added that no passing places were proposed in Wharles

3.27 PE raised the issue of Canal Bridge commenting that only perfect driving made it usable for lorries and PM added that there were no weight restrictions on the roads concerned.

3.28 JS questioned why a route through Elswick had not been used as it was 6 miles long rather than 12 miles to which PW responded by saying that there were constraints within Roseacre village and that the route through Clifton (via DHFCS Inskip) passes through fewer residential areas. The section through Clifton is already used by HGVs.

3.29 HS observed that no route would satisfy everybody, that Clifton was heavily populated and that the rural nature of the area would be spoiled by the traffic and introduction of passing places.

3.30 In response to a question from GS, PW gave examples of typical restrictions on traffic movements for similar projects as 8.30-9.30, 14.45-15.45, 16.30- 18.00 hrs and stopping at 19.00 hrs. However, the specific hours for this site would need to be agreed with LCC and imposed through a planning condition.

3.31 In discussion Members took the view that the route needed to be driven by a suitably sized lorry to identify the pinch-points. PM offered to provide a vehicle and it was thought that a film of the journey should be provided to LCC. It was considered that the Broughton traffic light junction would not work and it was not appropriate to pass schools.

3.32 BR observed that the alternative route was on the table and those opposed needed to object to LCC, she also raised the risks HGVs posed to cyclists and horse-riders.

3.33 PM commented that lots of work had gone into the alternative route but no thought had been given to practicalities.

3.34 PE reported that the Police were dismayed by the route but their hands were tied. He considered that and that the two right-angled bends are too dangerous as was Canal Bridge, where lorries had already gone off the road. He added that the Water Trust had submitted a formal objection.

3.35 BR observed that there was no "good" route and that it boiled down to the lesser of evils.

3.36 PM asked again why the Elswick route had been dismissed and BR opined it was because of the tight bends through Roseacre Village. MS commented that the planning proposal included either route and both would be evaluated by LCC

3.37 GS asked if the transportation of the solid, noise mitigation barriers had been factored in to the traffic count, HS asked if the 45ft pipes were delivered on lorries and PE asked if there would be concrete deliveries. EV responded by confirming the traffic numbers included all deliveries, including the pipes and that the concrete would be mixed on site.

3.38 In response to questions from GS and PE, PW confirmed all drivers (including contract drivers) would receive appropriate training.

The meeting thanked MS, DH and PW for their contribution.

4.0 Minutes of previous meeting:

No comments were received.

5.0 Matters arising:

Preese Hall flow-back rates; The reason why Cuadrilla does not anticipate similar water volumes to Preese Hall are;

- a) As previously stated the successful gas plays in North America are characterized by low, average (10-40%) flow-back volumes.

- b) Preese Hall was fracked in a vertical section; the sections of the RW wells that will be fracked are horizontal and typically produce lower flow-back volumes.
- c) The stepwise approach taken at Preese Hall required swabbing and killing processes between stages leading to increased volumes. The same approach is not proposed for the new wells.

Community benefit, NS's letter to Alan Oldfield, Chief Executive, FBC; This matter was carried forward to the next meeting.

Purpose of the CLG; The CLG's Terms of Reference were circulated with the meeting papers.

6.0 Programme update:

LCC determination timetable; SS reported that Cuadrilla had submitted all the additional information required within the deadlines imposed, and was awaiting confirmation from LCC about the date of the Development Control Committee (DCC).

HS commented that she thought the committee date would be after the General Election (7 May) and PE added that a DCC was scheduled for 20th May but doubted that LCC would have analysed the Reg 22 comments in time.

MS added that procedurally LCC needed to agree an extension to the DCC with Cuadrilla and BR commented that in any event sufficient notice of the DCC date and the date of any pre-DCC presentations needed to be given to all parties participating in the process.

PE added that legal action was being considered following LCC's refusal to allow an Inskip representative to participate in the pre-DCC presentations.

Preese Hall; EV confirmed there was nothing new to report and that most of the reclamation had been done and works were on schedule.

7.0 Community update:

No additional points were raised.

8.0 Any other business:

No additional points were raised.

9.0 Date of next meeting:

The date of the next meeting was agreed:

Thursday 21st May at 7.00 pm, Boys Brigade Hall, Carr Lane, Treales, PR4

Secretariat: Carry matter forward to next meeting