

David Cragg-James on behalf of Stonegrave Village Meeting

Having on behalf of Stonegrave Village Meeting submitted evidence on Dec. 15th. 2016 to the MWJP Consultation, (individual number for submission 0878), and attended the Hydrocarbons First Day of the EIP, I should like to make the following submission in respect of the Inspector's 4 questions:

INSPECTOR'S Q2 (Policy M16 (a) and explanatory text)

While many of the regulatory provisions of the draft plan apply to both conventional and unconventional minerals, it is, we believe, important to maintain the distinction.

To blur the distinction deprives the regulations of much of their force. The term 'conventional' sits easier in the public awareness, encourages acquiescence to commercial proposals, takes us "off our guard", gives rise to arguments such as - 'we have been here exploiting gas for X years with nary a problem'. It is therefore mendacious. The public reaction to a 'conventional gas' proposal is unlikely to be negative, at least in the short term - 10 or so years. The risks (climate, global warming, emissions, spillages, health, contamination, industrialisation, tourism, land degradation and value, property value, visual, public order, etc.) inherent in one are far more significant than those inherent in the other, and need separate, clear regulation. The drift of the MWJP concerning hydrocarbons is to seek to protect from known and unknown potential consequences deriving from the forced recovery of minerals from impermeable or semi permeable strata at whatever depth using hydraulic fracturing or acidisation followed thereby.

INSPECTOR'S Q1 (Justification on the 500m buffer)

The size of the proposed buffer is clearly to some extent arbitrary, the figure of 500m apparently seeking to acquire for residents and sensitive receptors as much protection from the possible and certain effects of unconventional production as the authorities (NYCC, the NYMNP, and the City of York) consider it possible to achieve, given the government's intention to promote the industry, (therefore compliance), and industry's bullish determination to maximise its profits at the expense of public safety and of democracy.

Topography is unlikely to afford much protection to human health, endangered for example by emissions, sound and light pollution, traffic movements, etc.) Nor in the event of a catastrophic incident at the well site

would a distance of less than 500m offer anything remotely resembling adequate protection for residents and sensitive receptors.

I should be most grateful if you would be so kind as to make these comments available to Ms. Ord.

Might I at the same time indicate my intention to be present at the EIP hearing on April 13th.

David Cragg-James