

## Appendix 20

### Development Control Committee Update – 28<sup>th</sup> January 2015

#### Item 3 Application LCC/2014/0096 – Preston New Road – site

**Halsall Parish Council:** Support the resolution of the Lancashire Association of Local Councils (AGM held on 14<sup>th</sup> November 2014) that L.A.L.C. and N.A.L.C. urge individual Parish and Town Councils to consider opposition to applications for fracking in their areas, in recognition that the potential damage to the environment is irreversible and no payment from fracking companies can compensate for any such damage and consequently object to the current proposals.

**Representations:** Since the 1<sup>st</sup> January 2015 and up to 26 January 2015 5520 further representations objecting to the proposal have been received. 5317 of these are in template form. The reasons for objecting reflect those already summarised in the report. It is not known whether the additional representations received have been made in respect of Regulation 22 additional further information that was submitted by the applicant and advertised in December 2014, and if so whether they are from individuals that have previously made representations, or whether they are additional representations over and above those already received. It is not therefore possible to provide at this stage an accurate figure of representations received.

On Friday 23 January 2015 presentations were received from the following groups objecting to the proposals. No substantive new points were raised over and above those set out in the report. The points raised are summarised as follows:

#### **Preston New Road Action Group**

- The proposal would affect local residents particularly the most vulnerable young and old and is dividing communities.
- There are 3332 residents within 2 miles of the proposal, 196,000 within 5 miles.
- High levels of social deprivation in the Blackpool area that would be adversely affected.
- Fox wood chase accommodates a number of vulnerable residents who would be most affected in terms of impacts on health.
- Impact on air quality would be detrimental to school children in a school 1 mile to the north of the site.
- There would be multiple impacts on air quality, noise, health, visual impact, light pollution and tourism.
- Contrary to NPPF to avoid impacts on noise, health and life and cumulative impacts from a number of proposed sites.
- Unacceptable use of chemicals.

## **Little Plumpton Awareness Group**

- Maintain there will need to be 3500 wells in 10-15 years to make it viable with up to 120 – 200 well pads accommodating 40 to 60 wells per pad all with flaring which would be visually intrusive and affect air quality.
- 33,000 wells will be required to meet the targets assured to the government by the industry.
- Current regulations are designed for off shore, not n shore and are inadequate.
- HSE rely on remote monitoring results carried out by the applicant.
- EA permitting is not stringent enough.
- The escape of methane from failed wells will be damaging in the long term.
- Accepted BGS may monitor - but no details as yet.
- Only one recommendation of the Royal Society has been implemented.
- Risks could be mitigated.
- Unacceptable risks associated with hydrogeology and should be refused.
- Applicants risk assessment not fit for purpose.
- UK geology is heavily faulted provided pathways for the migration of contamination.

## **Defend Lytham**

- Unacceptable impacts on health, economy, rural Fylde and at odds with emerging policies of the Fylde Local Plan.
- Over use of natural water supplies and no clear disposal route for waste water.
- Unacceptable levels of noise and vibration that would be felt considerable distance away.

## **Frack Free Fylde**

- Shale gas costs 30% more to produce than conventional gas plus long term unknown costs making it an economic burden for the future.
- Unknown impacts on the agricultural industry if ground is contaminated.
- Would cause damage to roads and health shouldered by the tax payer.
- No need to rely on gas if commitment to climate change and a greener energy supply.
- Need for a social licence – the applicant hasn't got one.
- A Human Rights Impact Assessment should be carried out.

## **RAFF**

- Proposals would significantly affect health. A summary assessing the impacts of shale gas will be published by Medac soon.
- LCC public health assessment is limited.
- There are gaps in the regulations and diminishing resources to administer them.
- UK government is relaxing regulations contrary to other countries.
- Reliance on hydrocarbons will not contribute to reducing global warming or climate change.
- Reject the industry until a full assessment of the industry as a whole has been carried out.
- Public health is a material consideration

## **FoE**

- Supported what had been said.
- Contrary to policy in that it would have an adverse effect on ecology and the economy and benefits would be outweighed by the impacts.
- NE has provided insufficient advice – need to undertake a HRA.
- No long term benefits.
- Local survey demonstrates that 63% of people want a ban on fracking.
- A precautionary approach should be adopted.
- The recommendation to object on noise is supported.
- Vehicles would arrive in convoy and the officer's assessment is not strong enough.
- There is no identified waste water treatment centre and conservative estimates of quantities of flow back water.
- The underground activities and risk of well failure are not adequately assessed.
- Will increase green house gasses and is not a transitional fuel to be used to address climate change.
- Beconsall and Grange Road have not been considered in assessment of cumulative impact.

## **Cuadrilla**

Noted that the conclusions of the officer's assessment do not find the principle of exploration and appraisal unacceptable only a localised issue in respect of noise. They are of the view they had provided sufficient information to allay concerns over noise to meet the national guidelines and allow a condition to be imposed restricting such and which would be reflective of conditions imposed on previous developments for exploration and appraisal. They are disappointed they had not been informed of the recommendation or the opportunity to address such. They now propose additional mitigation that would incur unreasonable burden but which they would be prepared to accept. They request the application to be deferred to allow the information to be consulted on and considered and would agree to a third time extension to achieve such.

## **Item 5 Application LCC/2014/0101 – Roseacre Wood – site**

The land is classified as Grade 2 agricultural land.

**Halsall Parish Council:** Support the resolution of the Lancashire Association of Local Councils (AGM held on 14<sup>th</sup> November 2014) that L.A.L.C. and N.A.L.C. urge individual Parish and Town Councils to consider opposition to applications for fracking in their areas, in recognition that the potential damage to the environment is irreversible and no payment from fracking companies can compensate for any such damage and consequently object to the current proposals.

**Treales Roseacre & Wharles Parish Council:** Has submitted the following additional summarised comments:

Flowback Assumptions - Cuadrilla experienced 70% Flowback at Preese Hall at variance to their assumptions of 40% in their applications. Whilst flow back is not a planning matter, it cannot be shut off meaning there would be impacts on storage, transport and waste disposal capacity. The industry body, UKOOG, indicates flowback variations of 25%-75%, the EA highlights levels of 80%. Consequently there would be a requirement for increases in HGV tanker movements which have not been assessed. The situation is similar to an application in West Sussex which was refused for reason included unresolved traffic data. Predicted increase in traffic associated with such and with other development proposals in the area will lead to an unacceptable increase in HGV movements in the area.

Use of Waste Gas for Power Generation - In accord with JM&WP Policy DM4, waste should be used for power generation. There are national grid links adjacent to the exploration sites. Cuadrilla is asking to flare 30000 tons of waste gas per annum. This would generate power for 20000 households, a quarter of all the homes in Fylde & Wyre. Whilst this is a matter for the EA there is no evidence it has been considered as part of the permitting process and therefore is contrary to policy DM4.

Development in the Countryside - The application is for an activity not in accord with the Local Plan (Policy SP2 in the Fylde Borough Plan). Fylde Borough Council has concluded that the development has unacceptable impacts due to the introduction of this activity in to the countryside. The applicant's rationale for site selection does not include compliance with the spatial strategy. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that Development in the Countryside is essentially required and could not be served from Fylde Borough Council Policy SP1 areas. Evidence is provided that the applicant has (in the Netherlands) directionally drilled from industrial locations.

The parish council has provided a photograph of a HGV accessing HMS Inskip from the south which necessitates the vehicle to swing across to the wrong side of the road thereby creating a hazard to other road users.

The parish council has undertaken its own equine survey in response to that undertaken by the applicant. The parish is of the view that the survey by the applicant is inadequate and inaccurate in terms of the numbers of horses on the roads. The results of the survey show that:

- 93% of riders, who expressed a preference about when they ride, ride in the months of April – Sept. The Cuadrilla study was conducted in the winter, so is unrepresentative.
- 60% of horse owners consider the roads are safe for horses and riders in this area
- 74% of riders would not hack out if traffic volumes increased significantly. They would be disadvantaged.
- 60% would leave the area and stable elsewhere if they were unable to hack out on the roads

The parish feels that horse riders would be significantly affected by the introduction of the volumes of traffic being proposed and that the proposals do not provide safe and suitable access to the site to horse riders.

Following the publication of the report a number of residents have commented on a number of the subject areas via the parish council and raised a number of questions in respect of Appendix 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17.

**Representations:** Since the 1<sup>st</sup> January 2015 and up to 26 January 2015 a further 3570 representations objecting to the proposal have been received. The reasons for objecting reflect those already summarised in the report. It is not known whether the additional representations received have been made in respect of Regulation 22 additional further information that was submitted by the applicant and advertised in December 2014, and if so whether they are from individuals that have previously made representations, or whether they are additional representations over and above those already received. It is not therefore possible to provide at this stage an accurate figure of representations received.

Since the 1<sup>st</sup> January 2015 and up to 26 January 2015 one further letter of support has been received from the resident of Old Orchard Farm, the nearest residential property to the site which will see and hear the proposed operations, who, after consideration of all the facts, concluded the site is likely to be the most highly regulated and closely observed site in the world and that fracking can and will be conducted safely. The monitoring of air, water and noise would be acceptable as is the proposed HGV routing through MOD land. The exploration should be supported and has the potential to bring revenue into the area and house prices to rise. The decision making process should be retained at local level. The application should be approved.

On Monday 26 January 2015 presentations were received from the following groups objecting to the proposals. No substantive new points were raised over and above those set out in the report. The points raised are summarised as follows:

### **Ribble Estuary Against Fracking**

- No long term financial benefit to be gained by the proposal.
- House price reductions will affect affordability for care for the elderly.
- There will be a big economic effect of leaking wells.
- The road network will be damaged.
- The economic case has not been demonstrated.
- A request to West Sussex County Council to defer a shale gas application was declined.
- Peer reviewed studies show impacts on health.
- The teachings of Jesus imply a duty of stewardship.
- Do the public have enough information to provide informed consent?

### **RAFF**

- Geological faults can provide a pathway for fracking fluid to migrate to shallow and surface waters.
- Acrylamide is a hazardous chemical used in fracking that can reach the surface in the same concentrations as it is at depth.
- Other European countries have put in place a moratorium on shale gas.
- Shale gas production will see large scale industrialisation of the Fylde.
- There are major health risks from shale gas.
- Population densities in the Fylde are much greater than parts of the USA where shale gas is produced, so the impacts will be greater.

### **FoE**

- There are calls for a national moratorium on fracking.
- Shale gas is not needed for energy security.
- By the time shale gas comes on stream it will replace renewable energy not coal.
- Noise limits of 30dB are needed for a 'good nights sleep'.
- The impacts should be considered together rather than separately.
- Landscape impacts are significant and should be a reason for refusal.
- The noise exceedences over background are big.
- The traffic impacts are large and should not be a reason for deferral.
- Shale gas is not a bridging fuel, and would be needed on a very large scale to have any effect on UK energy demand. This would have repeated local impacts.

## **Roseacre Awareness Group**

- The application does not comply with policy.
- The location is unsuitable.
- The community is strong and vibrant, with good social amenity.
- Wildlife, landscape and agriculture will be damaged.
- The proposal is not temporary.
- Local roads are unsuitable for HGVs.
- Noise and light pollution will affect health.
- Scientific studies prove health risks.
- The proximity of the MoD site is hazardous.
- Too much water is used
- There are a high number of objections to the proposal.

## **Residents of Roseacre**

- Ecology and bird impacts, together with impacts on other protected species (e.g. great crested newts).
- Particulate matter less than 2.5 microns (PM2.5) estimated at 9.25 tonnes per year. PM2.5 poses a significant health risk.
- Estimates of waste water arising is a significant underestimate. The underestimate will have significant impacts.
- Lighting pollution will have a large adverse impact
- Noise impacts and traffic impacts will be substantial.

## **Treales, Roseacre & Wharles PC**

- Identifies additional reasons for refusal
- The proposals are in the wrong location. Shale gas development can be located in less sensitive areas using horizontal drilling.
- 184 monitoring boreholes will create an enduring principle of development.
- Light, noise and dust pollution will be significant.
- The wrong noise standards are used.
- Impulsive noise is unacceptable and is not addressed.
- Roads unsuitable for HGVs.
- Waste methane should be used
- Safety recommendations of HIA, RS, PHE not implemented.

## **Cuadrilla**

- Most of the issues raised in the presentations by objectors are addressed by the Environment Agency in the 'minded to' permit issued for Roseacre Wood. The EA consider the risks to be low.
- The LCC planning officer's report does not support most of the issues raised by objectors in the presentations.
- Further noise mitigation is proposed (beyond that in the Committee report) to reduce night time noise levels to 37dB at the nearest property.
- Inbound traffic will conduct a left turn manoeuvre at Broughton from the A6 onto the B5269. Outbound traffic will be via Dagger Road.
- A maximum of 25 vehicles inbound utilising the inbound route via Broughton and the same 25 vehicles outbound utilising Dagger Road during a peak period of no more than 6-7 weeks throughout the 6 year duration of this application.
- A request was made to the Committee for a deferral of the determination of the application to allow for public consultation and further assessment of the new information.

### **Item 4 Application LCC/2014/0097 – Preston New Road – monitoring array**

### **Item 6 Application LCC/2014/0102 – Roseacre Wood – monitoring array**

**Treales Roseacre & Wharles Parish Council:** Has submitted the following additional summarised comments:

**Monitoring Works** - the Monitoring Works are contrary to Policy SP2 of the Fylde Local Plan in that they would create unacceptable impacts of industrialisation of the countryside. The applicant has advised that they are able to monitor seismic activity without such developments through the installation of shallow buried seismic sensors.

Conditions would need 'policing' by the community. Baseline surveys can be done without the proposed array. Conditions are generic and do not apply to each of the sites. The development should be phased. The application is premature. Protected species have not been properly considered.