Bishop Burton and Walkington Liaison Committee (Crawberry Hill)

07 August 2012

Bishop Burton Village Hall

Notes of Meeting

Attendees: David Montagu-Smith (Chairman, Rathlin Energy (UK)) - DM-S
Margaret Hebb (Bishop Burton Resident) - MH
Jason Chester (Bishop Burton Resident) - JC
Peter Rolinson (Walkington Resident) - PR
John Castle (Walkington Resident) - JC
Tom Selkirk (Project Manager, Rathlin Energy (UK)) - TS
Philip Silk (Planning Manager, Moorhouse Drilling and Completions) - PS
Jonathan Foster (HSE Manager, Moorhouse Drilling and Completions) -
JF Simon Taylor (Rathlin Communications) - ST
Tony Kirby (Director, Local Transport Projects) - TK
Tom Hargreaves (Hydrogeologist, URS) - TH

Apologies: Apologies were received from: Cllr David Drew (Chair, Walkington Parish Council), Cllr David Oxtoby (Chair, Bishop Burton Parish Council) and Caroline Foster (Field Manager, Rathlin Energy (UK))

1. **Welcome and Introductions**: DM-S opened the liaison group meeting, welcomed everyone and thanked them for attending. Attendees were asked to re-introduce themselves and the organisations they represent in view of the fact that there were two guest speakers at the meeting.

   D-MS explained that TK and TH had been invited to the meeting to discuss their specialist subjects, transport and highways matters and hydrogeology so that group members would have a better understanding of the studies that Rathlin had contracted as part of these two important areas of the new planning application.

   DM-S also said that the planning application was progressing as planned and that Rathlin was expecting it to be heard at the council's full planning meeting scheduled to take place on 13 September 2012. He went on to say that the PS would give an update on the comments received so far later in the meeting.

2. **Notes from the Previous Meeting (12 June 2012):** The notes from the previous meeting were approved as an accurate record of what was discussed and agreed at the last meeting.

3. **Planning Update**

PS confirmed, as indicated by D-MS in his opening, that the planning application was progressing as anticipated. He said that a number of comments had been received from different people and organisations and that he would summarise these as follows:

Local residents have raised concerns about:

- Damage to groundwater and pollution
- Road infrastructure
- Environmental impact
- 24 hour operations

Highways requested that a speed survey be completed along Walkington Heads to allow an accurate visibility splay to be completed. This has since been submitted and approved. Highways has requested three conditions requiring the submission of a traffic management plan, maintenance of the visibility out of the site and no part of the development will be used until the access has been constructed. Tony Kirby from Local Transport Projects would talk about this work in more detail later on in the meeting.

National Air Traffic Services has no safeguarding objections to the proposals.

Trees and landscapes, East Riding of Yorkshire Council has no objections in principle, subject to the implementation of landscape works and full site restoration on completion of operations.

Civil Aviation Authority has no comments.

Natural England has no specific comments

Humber Archaeology Partnership highlighted that there are a number of archaeological records for the local area. They have recommended that further work be completed to identify any archaeology and details a planning condition to be attached to any planning permission.

Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Team has no objection to the proposal due to the short-term and temporary nature of the proposals. The comments highlight that the submitted LVIA is clear and concise and appears to draw sound and reasonable conclusions.

Walkington Parish Council objects to the application on the following grounds:

- Fracking
- Damage to the aquifer
- Gas emissions
- The storage and treatment of waste
- Technical expertise of the ERYC planning authority

Bishop Burton Parish Council recommended that the application is approved subject to the following conditions:

- No traffic along Finchcroft Lane and Dale Gate
- Impose a 40mph limit along Walkington Heads
- Gritting of roads as and when required
- Maintain existing hedge on the south side of site

MOD has no safeguarding objections to this proposal

Nature Conservation, East Riding of Yorkshire Council has no objections to the proposals. Recommended condition to ensure measures proposed by URS are implemented.

Yorkshire Water proposes two conditions to ensure the well is constructed in accordance with the details submitted with the application and any oils are stored in bunded tanks.

Public Protection, East Riding of Yorkshire Council has no objection to the application.

4**. Transport Update (by Tony Kirby, Local Transport Projects Ltd)**

TK thanked the committee for enabling him to explain his work. He opened by saying that Local Transport Projects Ltd is based in Beverley and had been commissioned by Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited to carry out a speed survey on Walkington Heads south west of Crawberry Hill.

The appraisal was required to help determine whether a viable highway access could be provided to serve the development site using an access point onto Walkington Heads in line with current local and national guidance.

The proposed development involves the installation of an exploration borehole for the purposes of mineral explorations on land to the north of Walkington Heads approximately 620 metres east of Wold Road.

He said that, an application for the proposed development has been submitted to the East riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC), the local planning and highway authority of the site.

He explained that the scope of the speed survey was to investigate the potential for vehicular access to the site from Walkington Heads. He said that he had produced a report that had been submitted to East Riding of Yorkshire Council and that his report outlined the results of a speed survey that has been carried out in order to determine the requirements and feasibility of a highway access in accordance with the appropriate design guidelines.

He confirmed that the proposed vehicular access serving the development will need to be wide enough to accommodate two-way traffic movements and the turning requirements of the heavy goods vehicles that will deliver the drilling rig equipment at the junction with Walkington Heads.

Visibility for the drivers of vehicles emerging from the proposed vehicular access will be restricted on both sides by adjacent boundary hedges and the horizontal alignment on Walkington Heads. This does not comply with the 4.5 x 215m requirements of the Highways Agency's 'Design Manual for Roads and Bridges' (1992) for the current 60 m.p.h. speed limit and if this development is permitted it could create potential hazards to other road users.

Therefore, a traffic speed survey was required to establish the visibility splay requirements at the access road junction with Walkington Heads and to support any proposal to reduce them.

The Speed Survey Report considered the level of existing and potential visibility for drivers of emerging vehicles based on actual vehicle speeds.

A vehicle speed survey was carried out on Thursday 20th July 2012 on Walkington Heads, south west of Bishop Burton in the vicinity of the proposed highway access which is located 60 metres east of Walkington Heads junction with Wold Road. The proposed access is located on the north side of the road. Only vehicles travelling in free-flowing traffic conditions were measured using a hand-held radar gun.

Speeds of 200 free-flowing vehicles (100 eastbound and 100 westbound) were recorded between the hours of 7.15am to 9.45am. Traffic flows were light throughout the duration of the survey. The road surface was dry throughout the survey and it was cloudy.

Mean speeds of 49.7mph westbound and 46.4mph eastbound and 85th %ile speeds of 55.0mph westbound and 51.2mph eastbound were recorded.

Legislation recommends that vehicle speeds measured in dry weather should be converted to 'wet weather' speeds for design purposes and the guidance at rates that for all-purpose single carriageways 4kph (or 2.48mph) should be deducted to obtain the wet weather 85th %ile speed.

Recorded 'wet weather 85th %ile speeds' are therefore 52.5mph westbound and 48.7mph eastbound after the adjustment is made.

The location of the speed survey was situated within a derestricted speed limit. The measured vehicle speeds were below the derestricted speed limit currently in place. The measured speeds indicate a design speed of 85kph (52.8mph) would be appropriate for the proposed access. Therefore 'y' visibility splays of 160 metres to both the left and right of the proposed access would be appropriate. A visibility splay drawing was circulated for members of the committee to review.

Conclusion

Local Transport Projects Ltd's work satisfied the Highway Officer's request for the information outlined and dealt with any concerns that had originally been expressed. The committee thanked TK for his in-depth and professional explanation and for his efforts in producing an accurate report that reflected circumstances at the proposed development site.

5. Hydrogeological Risk Assessment Presentation (by Tom Hargreaves, URS)

TH began by illustrating how onshore oil and gas exploration wells are distributed over much of England with concentrations in the Weald and Wessex basins in the south and the east midlands. The map of East Yorkshire already shows a smattering of exploration wells.

TH then gave an overview of the methods used by hydrogeologists to carry out a risk assessment. The main concept behind the method is the source-pathway-receptor model. For there to be a risk there must firstly be a source or cause for the contamination. Secondly there must be a receptor that can potentially impacted, for example a stream, spring or groundwater body. There is only a potential if there is a pathway that can link the source to the receptor. In the case of groundwater this would be cracks, fissures and routes through the ground where water moves from the source of contamination to the receptor. The sensitivity or importance of the receptor is combined in a matrix with the magnitude of impact to give an overall significance of the risk. The receptor sensitivity is classified from 'very high' for the most important down to 'low' for the least important. The magnitude of impact is given a similar classification from 'high' to 'very low'. There are guidelines as how to carry out the classifications that ensure the method is uniformly applied. Thus Principal Aquifers that are used to supply a large population are always classified as being of 'very high' importance. Similarly the loss of a potable source of abstraction is always considered as having a 'high' impact magnitude. Once the significance of the risk is found those risks that are not minor or negligible can be established and mitigation measures incorporated into the construction plan to reduced or completely eliminate the likelihood of the risk significance.

TH then went on to describe the baseline conditions of the Crawberry Hill site and how this fits into the regional hydrogeology of the East Yorkshire Chalk Wolds. The pattern of water movement under the site and the seasonal fluctuations of the water table were illustrated with a series of maps, cross sections and charts. The chalk is currently classified by the Environment Agency under the Water Framework Directive as being of poor chemical and quantitative status. This was perhaps unexpected by the audience. However it was explained as being the result of the large groundwater abstraction mainly by Yorkshire Water just north of Hull and the elevated concentrations of mainly agricultural pollutants.

The application of the risk assessment to Crawberry Hill was explained. A list of ten possible sources has been identified but only two receptors. Pathways currently exist through natural cracks and fissures in the rock, some additional pathways could be created by the construction process. The full report documents all the possible risks, in the presentation a selection of these were discussed and how, where moderate risks are identified mitigation measures are introduced to reduce the risks. JF elaborated to the meeting the details of the drilling and construction techniques to be used that will minimise the risks identified.

TH concluded by demonstrating how inconspicuous a small oilfield in a rural area might be. The oilfield selected for comparison to the Crawberry Hill site is also amid large fields and attractive villages and sited on chalk hills near to villages such as Bishop Burton and Walkington.

6**. AOB**.

No other matters were raised

7. **Date and time of the next meeting:**

The next meeting will take place at 7pm on Tuesday 25 September 2012 at Bishop Burton Village Hall.

DO is kindly asked to check and confirm the Hall's availability.