

CLOUGHTON PARISH COUNCIL

Mrs J. Marley, Clerk to the Parish Council,
Annan, 41 Scalby Road, Burniston, Scarborough, YO13 0HN
Tel. 01723-870299
Email: clerk@cloughtonpc.org.uk

PARISH COUNCIL MEETING

St. Mary's Church Hall

Monday 7th April 2025 at 7.30pm

Parishioners welcome to attend

AGENDA

All declarations of interest in agenda items to be made by the member, in writing, on the form provided. If unsure - DO NOT WAIT TILL THE MEETING - please contact the Clerk on receipt of the agenda.

1. To receive apologies for absence given in advance of the meeting.
2. To consider the approval of reasons given for absence.
3. To receive member's declarations of interest in items of business on this agenda.
4. Minutes of Council meeting of 3rd March 2025 [*enclosed*] to approve and sign.
5. Public Open Forum.
6. To consider & agree action as appropriate on matters raised in the Public Open Forum.
7. Reports/updates to receive (as available) & agree action as appropriate – Police (*emailed to councillors 1/4/25*), Unitary, Parish, Clerk - not to exceed 30 minutes in total.
8. To receive updates on matters raised at previous meetings & agree action as appropriate:-
 - a) Land off Whiteway [*Minute 133/24c refers*] – Clerk to update.
9. Correspondence:-
 - a) Correspondence received after 1/4/25 requiring a response before next meeting.
10. Planning Matters:-
 - a) Applications Received – NY/2025/0030/ENV Construction of a temporary wellsite for the appraisal of gas, including drilling operation, proppant squeeze and flow testing operation and site restoration at Land East of the Mill Yard, Burniston Mill, Coastal Road, Burniston, Scarborough, YO13 0DB – to consider the enclosed report & submission tabled by Cllr. Fanthorpe and agree action as appropriate.
 - b) Decision received to note:- NYM/2024/0875 Erect one agricultural worker's dwelling with attached garage, associated access and amenity space, Hodgson's Moor Farm, Gowland Lane – **granted with conditions**;
 - c) To agree comments/note any planning matters/decisions received after 1/4/25.
11. Account to Ratify:- St. Mary's Cloughton PCC (hall hire 1/4/23-31/3/25) £240-00 (online authorisation by Cllr. Ford and Staveley, 17/3/25).
12. Accounts to Authorise for online payment:- Duchy of Lancaster (backdated charge, bus shelter rent to 24/3/26) £18-00; J Marley (1/4/24-31/3/25 contractual and year end adjustment) £234-78; HMRC (Tax/NI Jan-March) £54-20; YLCA (annual sub) £339.

J. Marley

J. Marley (Mrs)
Clerk to the Parish Council
2nd April 2025

REMINDER – the 2025 Parish Assembly is due to take place 7pm Monday 12th May followed by the Annual Meeting of the Parish Council.

**MINUTES OF ORDINARY MEETING OF CLOUGHTON PARISH COUNCIL HELD IN ST.
MARY'S CHURCH HALL ON MONDAY 3rd MARCH 2025 AT 7.30PM**

Present: Councillors P Couch, D Baker, K Fanthorpe, D Ford, S Staveley.
Mrs J Marley (Clerk to Council).

Absent: Cllr. P Bleasdale.

127/24 **APOLOGIES GIVEN IN ADVANCE OF MEETING:-** Received from Cllr. Bleasdale and North Yorkshire Cllr. Bastiman.

128/24 **APPROVAL OF REASONS FOR ABSENCE:-** Resolved the reasons of 'personal commitment' (Cllr. Bleasdale) and 'family commitment' (NY Cllr. Bastiman) be approved & accepted.

129/24 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:** None.

130/24 **MINUTES**

Having been previously circulated, the minutes of the meeting of 3rd February 2025 were **approved** as an accurate record & authorised for signature by the Chairman of the meeting.

131/24 **PUBLIC OPEN FORUM** No matters raised.

132/24 **MATTERS RAISED IN PUBLIC OPEN FORUM** None.

133/24 **REPORTS**

- a) **Police:** the report for January incidents (emailed to councillors earlier today) was **received & noted**.
- b) **Unitary:** No report to receive.
- c) **Parish:** Cllr. Ford reported the continuing use of a field off Whiteway as a base for a firm of builders (**resolved** Clerk to get update from planning enforcement). Cllr. Staveley reported there had been intermittent problems with the light in the phone box and she was monitoring contact. Cllr. Couch reported the gully outside the church rooms was now running well after the recent remedial work by Highways.
- d) **Clerk:** no matters to report.

134/24 **UPDATES ON MATTERS RAISED AT PREVIOUS MEETINGS:-**

- a) Speed enforcement [*Minute 122/24a* refers] – Cllr. Fanthorpe reported a recent High Street check by the Community Speedwatch volunteers had indicated a speed of 28mph for 85% of traffic. She is to contact the Community Speedwatch co-ordinator.
- b) Fracking [*Minute 122/24b* refers] – **noted** Cllr. Fanthorpe's written report that the 'fracking' drop-in on 24th February had been well attended and 22 questionnaire/comment sheets had been completed. The planning application had still not been submitted.

135/24 **CORRESPONDENCE**

- a) Bus shelter rent review – **noted** from 25/3/25 the Duchy wanted to increase the rent by £15/year. Following prolonged discussion Council most reluctantly **resolved** to accept the increase.
- b) Correspondence received after 26/2/25 & requiring a response before next meeting – none.

136/24 **PLANNING MATTERS**

- a) **Applications Received & Appeals Notified:-** None.
- b) **Decisions received:** – None.
- c) **Planning matters received after 26/2/25:-** None.

137/24 **FINANCE & REGULATORY MATTERS:-** None.

138/24 **ACCOUNTS TO CERTIFY** – Having been previously notified, the following was approved for payment via online banking (Cllrs. Baker & Staveley to do the online authorisation within 24 hours):-

Duchy of Lancaster	Bus shelter rent to 24/3/26	£60-00
--------------------	-----------------------------	--------

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting closed at 8.20pm.

Report to: Cloughton Parish Council

Report from: Cllr Karen Fanthorpe

Subject: Planning Application for a temporary well site for appraisal of gas
(NY/2025/0030/ENV)

Date: 2nd April, 2025

1) Purpose of report:

This covering report makes a recommendation in principle to Cloughton Parish Councillors to object to the above planning application. It sets out the various reasons leading to this conclusion and asks Councillors for their consideration, comment and ultimately their decision whether to approve this recommendation.

2) Introduction & Timeline

On 12th July, 2024, a Request for a Formal Screening Opinion was made by Europa Oil & Gas (EOG) to North Yorkshire Council. This related to a future planning application for the temporary construction and operation of a drilling rig for the exploration of subsurface hydrocarbons, a testing well and retention of equipment on a site in Burniston. The request was to establish whether an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) would be required as part of any future planning application. On 1st August, North Yorkshire Council confirmed that their opinion was that the proposed development would require an EIA. The Company made an appeal to the Secretary of State (SOS) and, on 6th November, the SoS published a decision that an EIA was not required.

On the 17th February, 2025, EOG submitted the full planning application with Parish Councils receiving notification on 12th March for an application (including Environmental Statement) for the construction of a temporary wellsite for the appraisal of gas. The application includes plans for a drilling operation, proppant squeeze and flow testing operation, followed by site restoration. The location of the site is on land east of the Mill Yard on the Coastal Road in Burniston.

Establishing a temporary wellsite would be for the purpose of assessing the potential for extracting hydrocarbons in an economically viable way. This temporary site will not produce any gas/oil for onward consumption but if it is found that oil & gas can be successfully extracted, a further planning application covering a much larger area will be forthcoming.

The planning application reference number is NY/2025/0030/ENV and has been submitted by Europa Oil & Gas Limited.

Cloughton Parish Council has requested an extension to the date originally set for submissions. Our response must be submitted by 30th April.

3) Local Activity in response to the Proposal

3.1 The formal planning application was received some months after the plans were first released in the media. During this time, many local residents in Cloughton & Burniston began to mobilise with the intention of objecting to the proposal.

Organised action has been coordinated through Frack Free Coastal Communities (local group) supported by Frack Free Scarborough. Activities have included a series of leaflet drops, information drop- in sessions and a rally/march held on 22nd March. It has been reported that over 200 people attended the rally.

The two groups have provided local residents with access to a lot of information and many people have expressed their gratitude to the groups for their expertise.

3.2 Burniston Parish Council (BPC) held a public meeting in September 2024 which was very well attended.

BPC subsequently proposed to set up a Joint Working Group (JWG) with representatives from the three local councils (Burniston, Cloughton and Newby & Scalby) to gather information and share knowledge in anticipation of the planning application being submitted. This working group has been meeting on almost a weekly basis with much of the focus being on reading relevant documents, most notably, North Yorkshire Council's Mineral & Waste Joint Plan (M&WJP). The M&WJP will be the primary document to assess the planning application.

3.3 At their February meeting, Cloughton Parish councillors agreed to gather the opinions of local residents in order to be able to represent their views. A drop- in session was held on 24th February, 2025. This generated 22 written responses – of these, 1 person was in favour of the proposal, 4 people held mixed views and 17 people were strongly opposed. In percentage terms, this means that 77% were strongly opposed with 18% being ambivalent.

The written comments have already been shared with councillors. The comments were recorded exactly as written to provide councillors with a verbatim record of the views expressed by people. In summary:

- The main reason which people gave in favour of the proposal is they believe that this will secure a gas source for the country – particularly important if renewable/sustainable sources of energy are too underdeveloped to meet the need.
- The people who objected to this proposal gave a total of 20 different reasons. The three concerns which were listed most frequently were:
 1. Impact of increased number of HGVs travelling on local roads – this included impact on junctions, worsening the already known problems of busy roads, carrying waste material through residential areas and pollution arising from more vehicles (20 times)
 2. Potential damage to the heritage coast in terms of worsening cliff erosion and the negative impact on the beauty of the coastline (15 times)

3. The amount of water that will be used, questions about its source and the potential toxicity of the water that is a by-product of the drilling process (11 times)

3.4 Once the notification of the Planning Application was received by the Parish Clerk, it was circulated to all councillors. Individual councillors have therefore had access to all the documentation available via the North Yorkshire portal.

3.5 Following the release of the planning application, the Joint Working Group took the opportunity to meet with senior representatives from Europa to raise questions arising from the documentation and matters brought forward by residents. This meeting, held on 13th March, had attendance from Will Holland, Chief Executive Officer, Alastair Stuart, Chief Operating Officer and Jamie McGill, Petroleum Engineer (all from Europa). It was a cordial and informative meeting lasting almost two hours.

Questions to be covered in the meeting were shared with Europa a couple of days prior to getting together. The Company offered to provide written answers to the questions as well as verbal answers at the meeting. To date, this document has not been received.

Information received during this discussion with Europa has informed the recommendation made in this report.

3.6 A site meeting by members of the Joint Working Group was held on 1st April.

4) Proposed response to the Planning Application

4.1 Throughout the process of consultation, information has been gathered from various sources – national & regional documents, the planning application itself, residents' views, local experts and the discussion with company representatives.

4.2 It must be remembered that the planning application being considered is for a temporary undertaking.

Some of the reasons to support this type of excavation (mainly, a domestic source of energy which will offer the UK "energy security") will only come to fruition if there is a future, successful application to drill for oil & gas across the Cloughton Gas Field. This would inevitably mean drilling across a much wider area, over a lengthy period of time (minimum of ten years, possibly up to twenty years) and into the National Park.

4.3 The information which has been gathered leads to a conclusion that the Parish Council should consider strongly objecting to the planning application. The reasons for this recommendation are set out in the draft submission which is attached to this report but they can be summarised as:

- The unknown (and therefore unmitigated) seismic risks to the local area which arise from this proposal
- The inappropriate location which has been chosen.

- A lack of confidence arising from omissions & contradictions contained within the planning application

5) Recommendations for Councillors

5.1 Councillors are asked to consider and review the information that has been gathered from the various sources resulting in the draft submission to North Yorkshire Council (APPENDIX 1).

5.2 Councillors are asked to raise questions and suggest amendments to the draft submission, up to and including challenging the recommendation to object.

5.3 Councillors are asked to agree any further actions which are necessary to reach a consensus view.

5.4 If the recommendation to object is accepted, Councillors are asked to agree, in principle, the content of the draft submission. Agreement will be on the basis that amendments will be made to the final submission in accordance with the comments received from Councillors. This will ensure the Parish Council's response can be submitted by the deadline.

Karen Fanthorpe (Cllr)

2nd April, 2025

APPENDIX 1

Cloughton Parish Council

Suggested Submission to North Yorkshire Council in respect of Planning Application by Europa Oil & Gas (NY/2025/0030/ENV), April, 2025

Introduction

Cloughton Parish Council objects strongly to the planning application for a temporary wellsite to be established in Burniston, Scarborough.

The Council has gathered information from a variety of sources before coming to this conclusion. The basis of the objection is:

- The unknown/unmitigated seismic risks to the local area which arise from this proposal.
- The factors which make Burniston an inappropriate location in which to site this type of industrial process
- The concerns which arise from the omissions & contradictions within the planning application which erode confidence in the proposal overall.

The Parish Council recognises that in considering this application, the Authority must take a positive approach to sustainable development as directed in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and must take account of the Government's view that natural gas remains an important source of secure and affordable energy for the country. This is in spite of the very real concerns held by many residents and people across the nation/world that the ongoing development and use of fossil fuels should not be furthered.

Notwithstanding the broader context, the Parish Council believes there are sufficient concerns to render this development a substantial risk for our community. There are 3 overarching reasons detailed below.

Reason 1: The Parish Council believes that the absence of any significant detail about the subsurface geological structure is sufficiently serious to substantiate our objection on its own.

The absence of any significant information about the subsurface geological structure is of huge concern. A Government statement concluded that the causes of seismicity are highly dependent on local geology and, so it follows, that the limitation of current scientific evidence means it is difficult to predict the probability and maximum magnitude of any seismic events. Proposals should always be supported by compelling evidence that induced seismicity can be managed and mitigated to an acceptable level.

The application from Europa provides a very short account of the rocks below the surface. What is required is a detailed 3D survey which would provide an explanation of the subsurface structure. This is particularly important because it would help to establish the potential problems posed by fault systems which are known to be many and often undocumented. Details and accompanying analysis should be made available for specialists to consider and determine if the risks can be managed sufficiently well.

This information would also assist the company in designing the structure of the well.

The Parish Council finds it incredible that Europa has submitted its application without showing this information and inconceivable that this detail is not available to be shared. For the Parish Council, the unknown risks of seismic events (earthquakes) on buildings and the local coastline is the single most important omission in this planning application. It is also in contravention of the Mineral & Waste Joint Plan which requires this information.

North Yorkshire Planning Authority is urged to make sure that no planning decision is reached without this information being available in advance rather than as part of the licensing process which appears to be the premise on which the company is working.

Reason 2: The Parish Council believes that the siting of this proposal in Burniston is not appropriate.

The function of the planning system is to ensure that new developments are appropriately located and that they are an acceptable use of the land.

In their Environmental Statement, Europa puts forward the view that Burniston is an appropriate location and cites a number of reasons for their statement. In the main, they assert that the site is already close to industrial units, it is not within a designated area for its beauty and it has existing infrastructure and access to the road network.

Cloughton Parish Council strongly contests this assessment for a number of reasons:

1. The Natural Environment Planning Guidance recognises that planning policy should *"recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside"*
Firstly, whilst the site and its surrounding area is not formally recognised as an Area of Outstanding Beauty, the site is located within the defined North Yorkshire and Cleveland Heritage Coast where it is acknowledged *"there is a relatively strong sense of remoteness and tranquillity overall"*.
Secondly, the Coastal SSSI (Site of Special Scientific Interest) "Iron Scar and Hundale Point to Scalby Ness) lies 640m to the east of the site.
Thirdly, the boundary of the North York Moors National Park is only about 800 m away from the north side of the site. NY's Minerals & Joint Waste Plan refers to *"development outside the National Park will not usually be permitted where it would have an unacceptable harmful effect on the setting of the designated area"*. Whilst any impact on the visual landscape close to the Park will be temporary and reversible, any future expansion will undoubtedly impinge on an area which has been designated for its landscape quality.

For the Parish Council, any suggestion that this is an industrial area rather than a rural one of great beauty and charm is wholly challenged.

2. Heritage Coasts are protected through development control within the planning system

The M&WJP states that “permission will only be granted where it would not lead to an unacceptable impact on the undeveloped character of the Heritage Coast, unless the need for, or benefits of the development, outweigh the harm caused”.

The NPPF states that *“Major development within a Heritage Coast is unlikely to be appropriate unless it is compatible with its special character”*

In its Environmental Statement, Europa recognises that the placement of a 38m drilling rig (which will need to be lit at night), will be an intrusion on the heritage coast visual landscape. The mitigation is that the rig will only be in place for a matter of weeks so the impact will be temporary and reversible. This mitigation was accepted by the Secretary of State when s/he concluded that an Environmental Impact Assessment was not required

For the Parish Council and local residents, concerns about the visual impact are dwarfed by concerns about potential damage to an already fragile coastal area. Such damage would be neither temporary or reversible.

On the matter of coastal damage, the Environmental Statement is completely silent but it is a matter of public record that the area surrounding this site is criss-crossed by geological faults. Both those which are known (primarily the Peak Fault) and those which lie undetected. In recent months, there have been two large landslips – one near to Scalby Mills and one at Ravenscar. Over the years, the Coastal path has been moved further inland because of cliff instability. The potential for damage to the cliffs is a huge concern to the people who live nearby.

Europa has not submitted any geophysical assessment of the sub surface structures which means the potential consequences of drilling on the coast are completely unknown. The site visit by the Joint Working Group members showed very clearly how close the site is to the coastline.

3. The proximity of the site to an established residential area renders this proposal to be wholly unacceptable. At its closest point, the site is only 350m from a group of dwellings. Residents have voiced their fears about the impact of noise, dust, vibration, emissions and light pollution. Europa’s Environmental Statement covers many of these concerns and concludes that, individually, they are insignificant because they will be temporary and reversible in nature. The cumulative effect of these factors and the overall damage to people’s mental health by destroying the pleasure of living in their home is not recognised. Clearly, if a long term project goes ahead, there is a severe risk of negative impacts on the health of people living in this community.

In addition to the impact on people, there is also concern about the effect on the village environment. There is a total of 12 listed buildings lying within 1 km of the site, all but one within the Burniston Conservation Area. It is well known that many of these older properties will have poor foundations and may be particularly affected by movement underground.

For the Parish Council, it is the cumulative effect of all these individual forms of pollution which render the proximity of the site to the village to be totally unacceptable.

4. The site is located close to important tourist facilities. The beauty of the area and its tourist attractions are an essential part of our local economy, supporting many local businesses. To repeat a comment heard from residents “who will want to come to visit an industrialized area?”

The Cleveland Way and recently upgraded Cinder Track lie close to the site – the Cleveland Way lies 730m away and the Cinder Track is 200m at its closest point. Visitors to these two amenities are attracted by the unspoilt views and landscape.

The view of the Parish Council is that there is only one chance to make a first impression to tourists and visitors alike and safeguarding our local tourism amenities is essential.

5. Europa asserts that the local road network is suitable to support the additional Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) numbers that will be generated by the operations on site. The Secretary of State accepted that the increases did not warrant an EIA. The company has submitted detailed information to argue its case and to describe the mitigating actions it would take to reduce negative impacts (e.g. scheduling deliveries outside of peak times).

This does not counter the very real concerns of local residents that this road network is unsuitable for this development and that an increase in heavy traffic will lead to an unwelcome increase in exhaust fumes, dust and noise. The fear of local residents is fact and cannot be easily ignored or diminished.

Whilst the roads which serve the site are classed as A roads, they are single carriageway and all of them pass through villages and built up areas. In fact, by choosing the Burniston location, there is no option that would not pass through residential areas.

Europa have sought to reassure that the volume of additional traffic will be insignificant. The anticipated HGV movements have been analysed for each phase of the project with the maximum average number per day being 18 during the drilling phase. The Company has clarified that this figure relates to the number of “jobs” and, for the purpose of the impact on local roads, this number needs to be doubled to account for return journeys. The 18 additional HGVs represent an approximate 4.7% increase in daily HGV volumes during the tourist season when roads are at their busiest. Presumably, this figure doubles when counting return journeys and so represents a substantial increase.

For the Parish Council and residents, the additional volume of traffic on roads which are already very busy and through residential areas is very unwelcome.

6. As part of any planning consideration, the close proximity of supporting infrastructure is essential. The M&WJP states that “where off-site management or disposal of waste is required, proposals should demonstrate that adequate arrangements can be made for this”

Authorised waste disposal facilities will be a significant part of the operational process but there are no known sites anywhere near this area and, when asked, Europa have been unable or unwilling to confirm which facilities they would use (and therefore which routes would be taken by the HGVs)

The Company has intimated that one option may be to move some of its waste by tanker to their unit at Crosby Warren in North Lincolnshire. In reality, this is a two hour journey on single carriageways/B class roads and can hardly be described as “local infrastructure”.

For the Parish Council, the absence of supporting infrastructure is unsurprising given that this is not an industrialised part of the country. It does, however, add to the tally of reasons why this site is not an appropriate location for the development being proposed.

7. Cloughton residents have expressed their concerns about the potential for water contamination/pollution. Some of the farmland in the immediate area and beyond is fed from a historic well. During the process of proppant squeeze, we know that water, propellants and chemicals will be forced into the ground thousands of meters below the site and the area beyond. What is the risk that this source of water could be contaminated, with a devastating effect on the surrounding farmland?

For the Parish Council, any contamination of local water sources is of concern as it will be neither temporary or reversible.

8. The planning application states that no changes will be made to the site entrance off the coastal road. “No works are proposed to the road junction and established access onto the A165”.

For local residents, this stretch of road is known to be busy with vehicles moving at speed (immediately prior to the entrance, the speed limit drops from 60mph to 30mph). The site entrance is also used by the Coastguard & Rescue Service – no mention of this has been made in the Planning Application but emergency access (24/7) would definitely be compromised if other vehicles & equipment were in the way.

A site visit has taken place. The potential problems are obvious. Firstly, the entrance to the site is in the 60mph zone which explains why this section carries fast moving vehicles. Conflict with slow moving HGVs is a major concern. Secondly, the layout of the road means that HGVs will be leaving the site into a blind bend. Crossing the

carriageway to reach the road which will give them access to Scalby Road, turning into fast moving traffic when they cannot be seen due to the bend and mixing slow vehicles with fast traffic (especially motorbikes) could be a recipe for disaster.

It is notable that in the Cloughton Planning Statement document, the section which relates to site construction includes the phrase “with an additional vehicle access point south of the existing main entrance”. This indicates that the company is not confident that the existing entrance is adequate which is a contradiction to their frequently stated position.

It also raises the question whether the company considers that including this statement in their planning application (albeit buried in the narrative and with no further detail or supporting assessment) constitutes a proposal for planning approval.

The view of the Parish Council is that this assessment by Europa is contrary to local understanding of the area and means this location is a safety risk for all forms of traffic.

Reason 3: The Parish Council considers that the planning application contains a number of omissions and contradictions which erode confidence when considering an already contentious issue.

1. The absence of any geological surveys into the subsurface is completely unacceptable. In comparison to other concerns which have been argued to be temporary/reversible (e.g. noise, light and dust), any damage to buildings or the heritage coast will be permanent and irreversible. If this damage occurs, it will be too late to lament the lack of knowledge or forward planning which resulted in such a situation.
Councillors implore NYC to ensure a proper geological assessment is undertaken and analysed in depth before any final permissions are given.
2. In its submission, Europa has completed the NYPA 15 form instead of the NYPA17 form – the latter relates to applications for development relating to the onshore extraction of oil & gas whereas the former one relates to surface mining. Completion of NYPA17 requires a full and comprehensive Geological Assessment.
It is a matter of concern that the Company appears to have made this mistake. By doing so, they have missed the opportunity to provide this essential data.
3. There are some issues where conflicting information has been given by the company – whether as a genuine mistake or to purposely underplay concerns is difficult to determine but they erode the confidence in the planning documentation and the plans.
 - Originally, the drilling rig was described as being 30m tall. In the planning application it is described as being up to 38m in height
 - In the description of the site construction, there is no reference to the range of buildings which will be on site. However, further on in the same document, the Site Layout Plan shows five separate accommodation units, a crew canteen, a

changing & laundry unit, a toilet block, a tool house, a control cabin and a workshop. Even if these buildings are of temporary construction, a proper planning decision is surely required?

- Such extensive construction, as listed above, is also difficult to equate to a plan for a temporary undertaking. Having visited the site, it is obvious that there will be a lot of work required to flatten the site and lay the ground structures.
- The company repeatedly state that no modification will be needed to the site entrance and yet their document refers to an additional vehicle access point south of the existing main entrance
- In a televised interview with North Yorkshire Headline News (20th March), Will Holland (CEO) told the viewers that HGV increases represented less than 1% extra traffic. This is only correct as a percentage of all daily traffic volumes rather than the HGV proportion which is what matters to people.
- Within the Planning Application, a “Preliminary Ecological Appraisal” has been submitted. This is based on one site visit which took place in June 2024 and a desktop exercise. Even with such limited assessment, the appraisal acknowledges the existence of many different forms of wildlife in the area of the proposed site.

An independent ornithological report commissioned locally notes that the standard assessment would be for 6 visits to be made to undertake a robust breeding bird survey. Whilst Europa may be committed to correct any disturbance to wildlife, by that point it is too late. It is likely to take a long time, if at all, to rectify.

- In some of the early material published by the company, one of the benefits listed for the local community was employment opportunities. In more recent conversation, this has been modified to be input from some trades (e.g. electricians) and business for local food outlets/accommodation venues.
- The Planning application states there is no landfill site within 1km. This is incorrect as there is the historic landfill site on which Burniston Tip sits – this is about 550m away. There is also the Old Scalby tip which is about 1.25 km away. How can the effect of drilling under these locations be properly assessed if they are not even considered? Furthermore, the sewage unit is also located close to the site.

4. The planning application includes reference to the decommissioning of the well and the site restoration. However, in their presentation to potential investors on 13th June, 2024, there is reference to “suspend well for future re-entry and production”. This is significant as it would counter the mitigation offered repeatedly by the Company in terms of the temporary nature of this application.

As the costs of decommissioning will be significant (especially given the amount of construction that is being planned), North Yorkshire Council is asked to ensure that a financial bond is in place to cover the costs in the event that the company is not able to carry out its plans.

Conclusion

This is a contentious application with well-founded concerns about the risks (both known and unknown) for our community.

In preparing for this application, Cloughton Parish Council has taken measures to ensure it reaches a balanced and well thought through decision. This has included a resident drop-in session, site visits and the meeting with the Company alongside many individual conversations.

At the time of writing this report, 784 representations have already been made to the application (and this is only part way through the consultation period). We suspect this is an unprecedented response rate. It is possible that some people may be in favour but from discussions with our local residents we know that the vast majority will be objections.

Our objection to this application is, therefore, wholly reflective of the residents we represent.

Whilst this is an application for a temporary development, the Company has been clear that its long term intentions will be to drill for oil/gas over a much larger area and for many, many years. If the extraction of gas is shown to be economically viable, EOG will want to open up to a much wider area as shown in the submitted map, "Potential Area of Hydrocarbon".

None of this plan has been hidden but does it have any bearing on the temporary nature of the proposal in front of us and should it be part of the decision making process for this application?

Calculations (including those from Europa itself), estimate the amount of gas that could be extracted equates to between 0.4% and 1% of the UK's usage. This is likely to be a favourable/optimistic forecast. In considering this application, NYC must be mindful that the disruption which could be facing these communities is disproportionate to the contribution to the nation's energy security.

This proposal is for a site in the wrong place and with a level of unknown risks that puts the health & wellbeing of our community in unacceptable jeopardy.

It is hoped that this document will assist North Yorkshire Council in considering this complex and contentious application.