

Wendy Strangeway



From: Planning
Sent: 15 September 2016 16:32
To: Planning
Subject: Comments on NYM/2016/0559/FL - Case Officer Mr M Hill - Received from David Davis at 21 Pasture Lane, Hovingham, YO62 4JT

It is interesting that the original planning permission for this development was granted for 3 years in August 2012. The effect of the 3 year period granted for the exploratory well would have been expiry and restoration in August 2015.

However in 2013 a variation in Planning Permission was sought as the applicants had not correctly assessed some element of their original proposal for which they were subsequently granted consent. This has automatically extended the 3 year period to 3 years from the date of the variation being approved which means that this site in theory (had the applicants got the original proposals correct) the site would now be restored to quiet woodland - and the public would now be able to enjoy the National Park and its special qualities in this location in the way envisaged by the Park Authority Members when they granted permission.

The applicant now want the Park Authority to allow them to basically have a 3 year period of grace to think about what else they could do with the site given a 'further assessment of the regional geology'. No explanation is given as to the nature or extent of this reassessment. Presumably this will be dependant on whether the applicants are successful with their other ventures in the locality.

Given representations made to the authority in respect of this application I would make the following comments and ask a few questions

1. There are clear and well founded concerns over the nature of the traffic management plan relating to the site to date.
2. It is clear that the self regulated nature of the traffic management is not satisfactory to local residents. Although of course the applicants say that there were no problems. That is not what the local Parish Council say.
3. There are concerns that instead of temporary appraisal works at the site that a much longer period of drilling and potentially more exploration work will ensue after the open ended reappraisal of the regional geology, probably another extension of 3 years? An initial 3 year period will then have become 10!
4. Given that the site was drilled and cored in September 2013 and samples subsequently analysed the applicant has surely had sufficient time to make a thorough analysis of the underlying geology?
5. Great concern is felt by local residents and businesses that further works may threaten local water supplies should further drilling take place, some are even asking for some form of financial bond to be made in this regard.
6. What protection does the National Park have as far as unconventional exploitation on this site as no clauses in the original permission prevent it or limit this?
7. How would the National Park be protected by the infrastructure Act in respect of existing permitted wellsites?
8. How does this proposal sit against the emerging Joint plan relating to Waste and Minerals?
9. How will the proposal enhance the qualities of the National park? Particularly with reference to item 3 above
10. It is noted with the passage of time more information from around the world (for example the State of Victoria in Australia August 2016) that show that the onshore gas industry rather than creating jobs actually costs jobs in other industries (eg agriculture), as a consequence the State of Victoria has now banned

unconventional gas extraction permanently. Link

http://onshoregas.vic.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0004/1096942/Onshore-Natural-Gas-Report-Final.pdf

11. In section 6, para 6.2 the applicant is either scaremongering or threatening – ie refuse permission and we will have to apply for another development elsewhere in the National Park with all the disturbance etc that that entails. Yet according to the submitted document the disturbance is 'minimal' they say you wouldn't know they were there? Surely they can't argue that both ways. The applicants say this disturbance is controllable yet other representations demonstrate that it is not.

I would ask members to refuse this extension

Yours Faithfully

David R Davis

Comments made by David Davis of 21 Pasture Lane, Hovingham, YO62 4JT