

Publication stage Response form - Part B		
Please use a separate Part B form for each representation		
Name or Organisation :	Ryedale Liberals 9.2 Appendix 9	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To which part of the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan does this representation relate? 		
Paragraph No./ Site Allocation Reference No.	Policy No. M18 2 iii 3846/0970/M18/LC.U.DTC	Policies Map
2. Do you consider the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan is :		
2.(1) Legally compliant	Yes	No
2.(2) Sound		
(2a) Which Element of soundness does your representation relate to? (please only mark with an x one element of soundness per response form).		
<i>Positively Prepared</i>	No	<i>Justified</i> Yes
<i>Effective</i>	No	<i>Consistent with National Policy</i> Yes
2 (3) Complies with the Duty to co-operate	Yes	

3. Please give details below of why you consider the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

[Our original challenge still stands. In relation to the MWJP response, on what scientific basis do all the potential problems end as soon as gas extraction ceases? Any health, environmental, social or economic impacts may not materialise for decades. It is far too optimistic to assume they will be at an end at the point of restoration.](#)

Whilst we agree with the idea of using a financial guarantee, this needs to be backed up by an adequate bond. In order to be effective it will need to cover more than just site restoration. At the moment it is not possible for landowners to insure against their land being harmed or contaminated as a result of fracking development with the NFU. Also there is no financial cover for medical issues that might take a long time to emerge. Both individuals and the NHS would need to be financed to cover ill effects. Livelihoods damaged by fracking would also need access to compensation. What is more, they would need to be provable against good baseline information on a broad range of issues. Without a robust pathway where harm can be proven or otherwise, all the risk lies with the community and the environment, which does not live up to the definition of sustainable development. Sustainable development requires balancing equally the three elements of economy, environment and community.

Requiring outside risk assessors to set the bonds will help to reset the trust that seems to be

lacking between the industry and the public. It also needs to be recognised that money alone cannot mitigate against serious harm

4. Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the Matter you have identified at 3. above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to cooperate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this modification will make the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Wording for M18 iii to read: 'For unconventional hydrocarbon development, the Mineral Planning Authority will require the provision a bond, guaranteed by 3rd party, to be agreed by the MPA. These bonds to cover harm at any time.

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested modification, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. After this stage further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

5. If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

6. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

As the response does not answer our point we feel there needs to be discussion at the EIP.

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

All responses received will be considered and any information provided will be made public. My consent is hereby confirmed.

Signature:
John Clark

Date: 11 Feb 2018

Hard copy to follow for signature and to ensure yes/no in the correct place.