

JOINT REPLY from the following:

FROM: Turner, Mrs. Susan

Stables, Mrs. Lynne

We believe this does not comply with Soundness as it is not effective and not deliverable for the reasons stated below.

**POLICY M17 (4) (i) Policy M17 (4) (i) – justification on the 500m buffer around residential properties and other sensitive receptors**

We believe if the policy is altered so that each instance is judged on its own merits that will be unsound and undeliverable. The plan needs to give clear guidance on this issue. A 500m buffer zone is needed to protect residents from noise, air and light pollution. It is not considered large enough to protect residents from accidents at the site, chemical spills, fire etc . It should be a minimum of 1km in case a well explodes. The blast radius of a couple of wells in USA has been 1km and people should not be required to live within a blast zone whether it is a conventional or unconventional well.

**Policy M16 (a) and explanatory text – further explanation on the split between conventional and unconventional and how this has been dealt with in policy provisions**

Unconventional differs from conventional in many respects. It cannot be defined by the amount of water used as this would mean that operators could ensure that their wells were classed as conventional when all fracking wells irrespective of the amount of fluid used pose the same dangers.

We want the plan to apply to all hydraulic fracturing irrespective of the quantity of fluid used as it will be impossible to monitor and regulate the amount.