Minute of the meeting of the Tinker Lane CLG held at 7pm on Thursday 9th June 2016 in Lound Village Hall.

In attendance: Christie Willis, Rob Boeuf, Chick Fraser, Julia Kershaw, Tracey Taylor, Michael Grey, Liz Yates, George Fridlington, Bev Fullwood, Sharon Dyson, Helen Wilson, Rhonda Miller, Ross Glover.

1. **Welcome and Apologies**

Christie welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies were received from Peter Thompson, Maureen Holdgate, Sally Hill, Ann Fraser.

Christie welcomed Cllr Michael Gray from Bassetlaw District Council.

1. **Minute of Last Meeting**

The minute from the previous two meetings were accepted as a true record of events.

1. **Matters Arising**

Rhonda reported that a question had been asked as to whether the water companies were considered statutory consultees and she could report that they are considered such.

Rhonda informed the group that Gordon Grant would not be regularly attending the Tinker Lane CLG meetings anymore and that the primary contact would be her going forwards. His focus would be on the North West region but would still be involved when necessary.

Ross provided a full hard copy of the planning application to Christie, who informed the group that a further copy had been given to Torworth Parish Council by Notts CC Planners.

1. **Presentation by Ross Glover, IGas Planning Consultant**

Ross began by introducing himself. He has a great deal of experience in dealing with planning applications, for all types of energy including wind, biomass, solar and hydrocarbons. His expertise is not with the detailed specialist information such as ecology, but rather with the planning process and associated Environmental Impact Assessments.

Ross gave a presentation which covered all the different aspects of the Tinker Lane submission and accepted questions throughout the delivery. He noted that it is difficult to distil such a large volume of information into a presentation and urged the group to read the whole submission, rather than relying on the content of his presentation.

Rob asked why this application was different to the Springs Road one – was it because 3d seismic had not been shot? Ross explained that this was an application to drill for cores in order to explore the geology of the area and we have no plans at present to drill a horizontal well. This may change in the future but would require a further planning application.

Ross explained that the field boundaries which currently exist would remain and would be supplemented by bunds built parallel to the road. There would also be 3m high fencing around the site.

Christie asked what would happen if IGas found archaeology on the site. Ross explained that if anything was found then we would stop work and report this to the County Archaeologist. They would then decide how to proceed but generally they would ask for an archaeologist to be on site to carry out a ‘watching brief.’

Should planning permission be obtained the first structure that would be built would be the well cellar. Once the ground protection was in place the well cellar would be created and various pieces of equipment would be brought to site including mud tanks, work cabins. This is when the site is at its busiest.

Within the EIA, IGas always take the worst case scenario as their baseline, so they have allowed for the largest and loudest drill possible (which is not necessarily the same drill.) However, the drill actually used will be dependent on what is available at the time.

Rob asked if this meant that IGas did not at present know which contractor they will be using. He asked whether IGas are confident with all the possible contractors and Ross replied that this was the case and that IGas have confidence in all the available contractors.

Rob asked what would be the maximum time that IGas would wait for a drill and Ross replied that this would not be the case, the site would only be developed when there was a drill available to use immediately.

Ross explained that once drilling was complete there would be very little to see during the evaluation process. The cores would be sent away for analysis and most of the equipment on the site would be removed. Rob asked whether the site would be illuminated during this phase and Ross stated that it would not be illuminated.

Ross then went on to explain that the well would then be decommissioned (unless a further planning application was going to be submitted.) Christie asked whether the decommissioning process would be contracted out and Ross explained that this would be the case, but that there would be a site manager from IGas on site at all time, as ultimately it is the responsibility of IGas to ensure that the site specifications and conditions are met.

Julia then asked for clarification on the seismic vehicle which the planning application states will be present for a couple of hours. What was this for? Ross explained that although the 2d seismic and drilling log results will be consulted, the seismic will provide echos, which help to calibrate equipment.

The conversation then turned to the public consultation period. Christie and Bev were concerned that the Parish Councils had less time than the public to comment on the application and they also felt that the closing date of 8th July was too soon to allow adequate consultation with communities, particularly given the time of year. Rhonda explained that the Council would generally accept comments up until the point where the report was ready to be written, but Christie felt that this was not enough, a formal extension should be requested. IGas commented that they would not have a problem with an extension being asked for as long as this did not impact on the 16 week overall timeline.

**Post Meeting Note. Following the meeting the CLG agreed to write to Notts County Council to request a 2 week extension. Torworth Parish Council and Liz Yates will also write letters. An extension until 22nd July was agreed by Notts CC.**

Ross then talked about noise. He explained that there are high background levels of traffic noise at the Tinker Lane site, which gives a higher base line to work from. The closest dwelling is 630m away. He explained that it is in the company’s interest to stay within noise condition limits – IGas do not want to engender complaints which may mean that work is stopped whilst investigations are carried out.

Both Bev and Christie felt that the text was misleading within the application, in that they had assumed the nose was at the site, rather than at the nearest receptor.

Bev mentioned that one of the most annoying noises is trucks reversing at night. Ross explained that the site is designed to have an in and out operation, so there will be no reversing.

He explained that the drill will be visible and it is impossible to mitigate this. However it is temporary.

Ross then spoke about air quality, explaining that whilst air quality is not polluted at present the A1 does decrease the quality somewhat. The emissions from the IGas development are minimal and so IGas are well within the limits set.

Traffic – Ross explained that IGas have a preferred route and intent to restrain themselves to those routes. These roads are designed to deal with much higher traffic flows than currently use them and so the IGas movements will not impact significantly.

He also pointed out that traffic will not move during specific periods including school arriving and leaving times.

Bev noted that it would have been useful if IGas had also excluded movements during After School Club timings.

Bev also asked how wide the widest drill would be.

**ACTION: Rhonda to provide these details.**

Chick asked whether vehicles would go left or right from Blyth and Ross answered that it would depend. There was a discussion about the preponderance of accidents on the A1 and Ross agreed that if there was an accident this may stop work at the site.

Rob suggested that contractors may not behave according to IGas wishes. Rhonda explained that they will put clauses in contracts, may install in vehicle monitoring systems and ensure that penalties are included for non compliance.

The conversation moved on to the IGas IMS system and Rob asked why IGas do not insist that contractors have ISO14001. Rhonda said that she would obtain a response to this question.

**ACTION: Rhonda to find an answer to the question about ISO14001.**

Bev asked where waste water would go and Rhonda explained that this would depend on the services needed as all waste water treatment facilities offered different services. Bev felt that this was not an adequate response.

Bev asked whether IGas would have security with dogs, as this had been the case at Daneshill. Ross replied that this would not be the case. There would be CCTV and security personnel but no dogs.

With regard to ecology Bev stated that she was surprised that there was not 1 reptile found. Tracy pointed out that this correlates with what the NWT representative said – having been intensively farmed for a long time this affects plants and habitats for animals, causing a reduction or exclusion of certain animals.

Tracey asked about opportunities for jobs, suppliers locally being utilised. Rhonda explained that IGas would use local companies where possible – indeed she had spent a part of the earlier day with North Nottinghamshire College looking at potential opportunities for joint working. She also planned to talk with the Hospitality committee of the North Notts Envoys for the same purpose.

There followed a long discussion about what constituted ‘local’.

Bev asked IGas how much water would be used. Ross explained that it was not a great quantity.

**ACTION: Rhonda to provide actual amounts.**

Rob suggested that the pressure test is very close to a frack – what is the difference? Rhonda suggested that this would be a question to ask the geologist who is attending the next meeting.

Christie asked how IGas would ensure safety of cars in relation to protest camps. Ross explained that IGas are in regular contact with the police and had discussions with Notts CC Highways division around signage to ensure that local people and protestors would be kept safe.

At this point the meeting was concluded, as Rhonda had to take Ross to his train.

1. **Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be held on Thursday 30th June at 7pm in Lound Village Hall. A member of the IGas Geological team will attend.