**Minute of the Tinker Lane CLG, held at Lound Village Hall on Thursday 24th March at 7pm.**

**In attendance:** Rob Boeuf, Chick Fraser, Anne Fraser, George Fridlington, Tracey Taylor, Julia Kershaw, Tony Roberts, Christie Willis, Jayne Watson, David Boyne, Maureen Holgate, Bev Fullwood, Gordon Grant, Janice Bradley, Bob Edmonds (SLR Environmental Consultant)

**Welcome and Apologies**

Christie welcomed everyone to the meeting, particularly Janice Bradley, Head of Conservation, Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. Apologies were received from Liz Yates, Peter Thompson, Sheila Place, Sharon Dyson, Bob Kendall and Rhonda Miller.

1. **Presentation by Nottingham Wildlife Trust**

Janice explained that as a Trust they deal with all mineral and waste applications in the County as consultees and set the context against how they deal with energy minerals more generally and fracking as part of that.

Janice stated that we are a very carbon fuel based society and we know that global warming threatens wildlife. From a wildlife perspective the Trust would like everyone to produce less carbon dioxide, to try and reduce energy usage and use more renewable energy to replace fossil fuels.

Janice also said we have to be realistic as we have a fossil fuel based economy in the UK although it is moving in a slightly better direction. As a trust where minerals have to be extracted they would like to see as little environmental damage as possible. In Notts we still have coal, oil, gas, coal mine methane, coal bed methane and shale. Coal will run out in the next two to three years but we are a big on-land producer of oil at a decent scale since the 1940’s. Virtually all of the county sits on the Bowland shale.

Janice went on to detail the Trusts main concerns with fracking. She stated that a fracking site has a fairly small footprint which doesn’t require extensive habitat loss in the same way a quarry or coal mine and the impact on wildlife and habitat is expected to be relatively small. However the Trust expects to have significant concerns on the indirect impacts, noise, lighting, vibration and water extraction, use and pollution.

They has been working with the minerals and waste planners for many years, who involve them in nearly all pre-submission discussions and will follow their recommendations through to whatever stage is necessary, including appeals and enquiries.

All fracking developments require an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). The basics they expect to see include a data trawl for all protected sites and species within a 2.5km radius, phase 1 survey with target notes, more detailed phase 2 survey, daytime visual inspections and other bat surveys, badger surveys to at least 250 meters, amphibian surveys on any waterbodies within 250 meters. It was noted that the Habitat Suitability Index does not apply in Notts and proper surveys should be undertaken. Other surveys should include reptiles, birds, water voles and invertebrates.

The Trust would expect to see how effects can be avoided, mitigated and finally compensated if no mitigation can be implemented. Ecological compensation is a complex area and involves a lot of discussion.

The Trust reads all technical reports contained in a submission to ensure habitats and species are protected. They will look to achieve as much ecological gain as possible.

Their position on fracking is that it is included in the same category as any mineral extraction in that it has the potential to cause direct or indirect impact on the environment and wildlife. All energy minerals applications should be subject to an EIA, all impacts should be first avoided then mitigated or finally compensated for. If this can’t be achieved the application should be refused.

Rob asked about continuous monitoring. Janice explained that they would expect monitoring to be in place for as long as necessary which is standard practice. Particularly for methane, noise and dust.

Tony mentioned that everywhere has wildlife of some sort and Janice confirmed that they are talking about valuable wildlife protected by law that would be looked at in the EIA. Janice also explained that the need for an EIA is set in National Planning Guidance and is usually needed for any mineral or waste application including fracking applications.

Rob asked if the Trust had a position when it gets to the production phase and Janice replied that all principles remain the same at every stage. Bob explained that if the site was to progress to production there would be another round of surveying at every stage of the planning process.

Christie asked if the application at Tinker Lane is granted does the Trust’s responsibility end. Janice explained that it would depend on the consent, sometimes they get involved in ongoing monitoring and restoration but not involved in the enforcement of the consent.

Bob asked about The trust’s view on proportionality which she explained that with small footprint fracking sites the biggest impacts are indirect impacts.

Tracy asked whether they had an equal voice with Natural England. Janice said that Natural England were statutory consultees where the Trust is non-statutory consultees but as the Trust focuses on local wildlife the Local Authority usually always takes account their views and sometimes NE will formally hand the baton over where they feel it more appropriate.

Janice mentioned that she would send a copy of the presentation to the Group.

The Chair thanked Janice for coming along to the Group and talking with them.

Christie asked Bob why the phase 1 survey wasn’t included in the scoping request. It was explained that it is normal practice and all details will be included as part of the final application which will go out to consultation. All the ecological surveys were conducted by trained ecologists from SLR Consulting. Tracey advised that once the consultation is complete the Group should read through the responses as they are usually very informative.

1. **Minute of last Meeting**

The minutes were accepted as accurate.

1. **Matters arising**

Open sessions

Sutton remain keen to hold an independent session for the community where regulators and other interested parties can attend. IGas would be invited as one of the contributors. Gordon mentioned the importance of not just communicating until the planning application is determined but to keep the two way dialogue going. IGas committed to providing the CLG with space on their community leaflet to highlight what the CLG are planning. Rob will look at establishing a Facebook page for Tinker Lane.

It was agreed that a CLG event will be held on Saturday 7 May at Sutton Village Hall between 11am and 4pm.

Doe Green Visit

Confirmed as April 25th. Gordon advised that only 6 people have confirmed attendance so far. Parish Councils will chase their own councillors and confirm back final numbers.

Future meeting presentations

Gordon explained that the CLG had asked him to provide a schedule of speakers and topics for the upcoming meetings. It was advised that the proposed schedule of IGas experts would be from the following disciplines; Siesmic, geology, drilling, water and transport. In addition, once the application has been submitted, a land and planning expert would come and talk about the application specifically. Christie has asked that a representative from the BGS and Legal is added to the schedule.

1. **Any Other Business**

Gordon mentioned, following a previous request, he had spoken with the Partners in the licence and they are happy to attend any future meetings at the CLG’s request.

1. **Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be held in Lound Village Hall on Thursday 7thApril at 7pm with Kris Bone, Asset Manager IGas Energy, providing a technical presentation