

Meeting: Eighth meeting Wednesday 19th November 2014

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

Time: 7.00 – 9.30 pm.

Attendees:

Heather Speak (HS) Chair

Joyce Stuart (JS)

Gordon Smith (GS)

Peter Marquis (PM)

Barbara Richardson (BR)

Jacqui Stapleton (JSt)

Elizabeth Warner (EW)

Bob Haresceugh (BH)

Nigel Smith (NS)

Mark Reed (MR)

Sam Schofield (SS)

Cuadrilla, Lancashire Communications & Public Affairs
Manager

James Adam (JA)

Cuadrilla's Bowland Project Delivery Manager

Leon Jennings (LJ)

Cuadrilla HSSE Director

Mark Kerr

Secretariat, PPS Group

<i>Item</i>	<i>Action</i>
<p>1.0 Apologies:</p> <p>HS reported apologies from Angela Livesley, Liz Oades, Jane Barnes and Paul Hayhurst</p> <p>2.0 Minutes of previous meeting:</p> <p>The minutes from the Seventh RW CLG meeting on 15th October were approved.</p> <p>3.0 Matters arising:</p> <p>5.0 <u>Noise</u>: In SS's absence this item was carried over from the previous meeting. In addition, it was agreed that the locations for additional noise assessments suggested to Cuadrilla by HS should be circulated to CLG members.</p> <p>Action: ARUP note circulated to members on 18/11/14</p> <p>In discussion the following points were made:</p> <p>HS identified that it was difficult to assess what for example a 50 dBL level actually sounded like and it was suggested that a rubbish bin collection was 70 dBL. BR commented that the noise levels would inevitably increase from the current pre-exploration levels and thought that noise levels would need to be monitored by residents. In addition, she called for base line monitoring to be undertaken at Stanley Mews</p>	

as it was set-back from the road and was not subjected to as much road noise but was only 500m from the site.

BR also asked if the noise assessments took into account all sources of noise from the proposed works, JA confirmed this was the case with all sound associated with drilling and fracking included.

JA added that the LCC's noise consultants response was awaited and its conclusions on Arups methodology and analysis.

LW considered that the only mitigation to drilling noise was to limit hours of operation and this was not possible because of questionable claims about the need for 24/7 drilling. JA explained that sub-surface engineering and mud solidifying were the reasons for continuous drilling.

NS emphasised the need for Cuadrilla and the residents to work together to reduce noise levels and better control/manage hours of working.

HS advocated waiting to see what conditions LCC's noise consultants thought appropriate.

It was agreed that a further discussion would take place in light when the LCC's noise consultants report

Item 4.0 Page 4, Risk management: MK reported that a response was awaited from Alan Wilton, Head of Emergency Planning, LCC.

Item 4.0 Page 4, Security: Following a detailed discussion about the use of trip wires across a public footpath, cameras on poles and alleged intimidating behavior by some security staff and the fear that this could escalate if the proposals were given permission, LJ agreed to look into all the allegations and report back at the next meeting. He emphasised the need for claims to be supported by as much detail as possible particularly in relation to dates, times and locations.

LJ commented that a number of security devices had been used to detect unlawful entry at RW during a time when the threat of illegal trespass and subsequent occupation was at its highest. All devices were security industry approved devices and all were removed once the threat had sufficiently reduced. The devices were only used within the bounds of privately owned land and would not impact on people moving around in public areas.

A passive intruder detection device was used at RW. Although commonly known as a tripwire, the wire (which is in reality a low break strain fishing line) is not used to trip or injure any person or animal passing by it is merely a method used to warn security teams of attempts at unlawful entry onto private land. It would more accurately

be described as an “intruder operated alarm system”. The devices were only used on private land and were installed to provide nothing more than an audible alert of unlawful activity within a number of vulnerable areas. The devices were removed as soon as the threat of unlawful activity was sufficiently reduced.

4.0 Community benefit discussion

HS introduced the discussion by identifying that the CLG did not have confidence that the Community Foundation for Lancashire (CFL) was the appropriate body to administer the community benefit monies.

SS commented that the onshore gas industry had committed to making community benefit payments at the exploration stage of £100k per site whilst Cuadrilla was offering £100k for well that would be hydraulically fractured so up to £400k per exploration pad. At field production stage 1% of production revenues of which two thirds would be retained locally and one third at county level.

He added that there was no set procedure as to how the monies would be administered and that the CFL had been approached as a pilot but that the views of the CLG would be taken into consideration, including its strong view that the monies should go to those individuals closest to the sites and it was not for Cuadrilla to dictate any particular solution.

HS explained that she had discussed potential solutions with Fylde BC officers but no comparable examples had been forthcoming but that if a PC took on the role of distributing the funds legal advice was required to ensure an appropriate and legal process.

MR questioned how many PCs would need to be involved and GS asked about the criteria for “local” citing the fact that Cuadrilla distributed information to c. 9,000 people.

Following a wide ranging discussion it was agreed that HS would seek advice from Fylde Borough Solicitor on the most appropriate place to secure legal advice on the matter and SS would consider the extent to which Cuadrilla might be prepared to fund legal advice.

5.0 Newton with Clifton PC representation

HS raised this matter but suggesting that the effects of the proposals on Clifton warranted a second representative for the community.

Following a discussion it was PM who had a house in Clifton would act as a community representative in addition to his contributions as a representative of local business.

6. Programme update:

LCC’s planning determination process: JA explained that a further

HS to seek advice from Fylde Borough Solicitor on the most appropriate place to secure legal advice

SS to consider the extent to which Cuadrilla might be prepared to fund legal advice

extension to the determination period to 31 January 2015 had been requested by LCC and agreed by Cuadrilla. This was to allow LCC a further 21 day public consultation (known as Regulation 22) on some new environmental information. The exact timings were not known.

JA confirmed that LCC had not decided the date of the Development Control Committee meeting at which the application would be determined but it would be after the Reg. 22 consultation had concluded.

He also confirmed that responses to the application were still awaited from LCC's noise consultants and the highways but that most other internal LCC responses had been submitted together with Fylde Borough Councils representations.

Preese Hall: Plug and abandonment activity at Preese Hall had been completed and restoration works would begin shortly with completion anticipated before Xmas 2014.

EA permits: JA anticipated that the second stage ("minded to consent") EA consultation on the permits for RW would start in the next couple of weeks. He confirmed that the EA's four week consultation on the PNR permits had already begun.

MOD/Inskip: In response to a question from JS, JA confirmed that detailed discussions were on-going with the MOD with a view of resolving the legalities and practicalities of using the Inskip route. HS and GS reaffirmed the view that all works traffic, not just HGVs, should use the Inskip route.

7. Community Update:

Monitoring Array sites: MR asked about rumours circulating and media coverage suggesting that that the monitoring sites would ultimately become additional well sites. JA explained that this was not the case and confirmed that although the red line site boundaries were 20m x 20m this was only to accommodate the construction area needed to enable the monitoring equipment to be housed and that once the works had been concluded the finished site would be 2m x 2m. He added that no additional activity (other than the monitoring applied for) could be undertaken without the agreement of the landowners and the necessary planning permissions and permits.

Following a discussion about the need for and role of such a large number of monitoring sites located close together it was agreed that JA would provide further information to the CLG including, in response to a question from GS, why the monitoring sites constituted a separate planning application.

Following a point raised by EW the question of whether, if permitted, the monitoring sites could constitute a precedent for further

JA to provide further information to the CLG, including on monitoring sites

development on the sites in question. SS stated that the monitoring sites would not provide a relevant precedent in planning terms and that Cuadrilla would not seek to develop exploration sites on monitoring locations.

Named properties in LCC's Health Impact Assessment: In response to a question from NS, HS suggested that any concerns about the need to secure homeowners permission to name specific properties should be taken up with LCC.

8. AOB:

Scope of Court injunction: Following a discussion JA confirmed that the injunction was for a two year period and it was agreed that Cuadrilla would provide clarification on the geographical area covered by the injunction and specifically whether it covered the land and gardens of Rose Cottage, New Cottage and Smithy House.

Court costs: NS asked if Cuadrilla was pressing for costs against Tina Rothery and SS confirmed that the Court had awarded costs against a named defendant.

9. Date of next meeting:

7.00 pm on Wednesday 14th January 2015

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