

Date of Inspection: 28 January 2016
Site Name: Springs Road No 2
Site Code: 1136/M
District Council: Bassetlaw
Development: Exploratory wellsite
Operator: Island Gas limited
Present: Tim Turner - NCC

Visit to the site to review the ongoing development and to check compliance with the planning permission. Prior to visiting the site had had to make arrangements to access the site via the operators planning agent (Heaton Planning) which was done 48 hours in advance.

On arrival on site at 1330hours was allowed through the double security gates by site security staff and parked on the access road into the Jackson site. The security staff are based in a compound located just off the concrete access road within view of the access. The compound consists of a portacabin, sewage tank, generator, water tanks and various CCTV equipment. The security guard advised that they had only seen a single person the previous day taking photographs of the site when the rig arrived, but other than that nothing.

The security barriers fronting the site and the gates were positioned in such a way as to make a left turn out/right turn in very difficult. No evidence on the road of tyre tracks or road scuff heading south.

TT signed in and various personnel walked up from the rear of the site, didn't get all names but present were Chris Woolhouse (AECOM hydrogeologist), noise engineer Paul?, Chris ? (Drill Comp – drilling firm), Mr Brumby (IGas) and another person from IGas.

Walked to the main site and noted that the welfare units were located on the hardstanding of the former site to the immediate east of the red lined area proposed for the central borehole. This lies within the blue line of the site and is situated on hardstanding (rather than grass) this seems to be a sensible central location.

Prior to being allowed further onto the site went through an induction with the explosives engineer on the site and the range of ordinance that it was felt might be found on the site. The explosives engineer outlined that he was on the site permanently and was overseeing the boreholes as they progressed. He advised that it was unlikely that anything might have penetrated more than 4m into the ground. He indicated that the area of the first hole had been metal detected and there was possible noise from this. The proposal was to initially dig a pit and then check again, then drill the next section and replace the metal retaining pipe with plastic and then metal detect again and so on until an adequate depth was achieved.

After induction went onto the site and discussed the ongoing development. The rig had been working within the red line area at the rear of the site nearest to the SSSI and the initial section of piping was standing up out of the ground within a small excavated pit. Two noise monitors were position at 7m from the rig.

I was advised that the proposal was to drill the 4 deeper holes first and then knowing the geology a decision would be made on whether all the shallower boreholes were necessary dependent on the findings. Concerns were whether or not there were sand and gravel lenses in the upper formations up to the depth of the Sherwood sandstone and therefore potential pathways. It was hoped that barring any

unexpected problems that the drilling would be completed well within the proposed 8 week period.

The initial hole is excavated by hand following initial metal detecting work. The first section of borehole is then done via a percussion rig (impact) to drive the casing directly into the ground and thereby allowing the contained section to be removed. The remainder of the hole is to be formed with a rotary drill rig.

The noise consultant advised that there were two monitors on site. One would be left running constantly and the other was a back up for him to check results when on site. The noise would be sampled on a 15 minute period. He advised that the drill rig was smaller than the one proposed as part of the application and that in any event the noise levels contained within the report did not allow for any absorption. A chart of the actual measured data for the percussion rig was provided and the maximum recorded noise level on the stroke was around 85dB and well inside the permitted level. The consensus of those present was that the noise of the rotary rig was much less.

The rig was not operational at this point and the explosives engineer arrived to check the hole prior to the positioning of the rotary rig. Whilst present the explosives engineer detected something in the hole which was considered to have potential to be UXO and we were asked to retreat back to the cabins. Waited while this was reviewed by the explosives engineer but was advised that further investigation was needed.

A decision was made to move the percussion rig to the location of the second hole behind the welfare cabins. Walked to this area and a piece of land was marked out. Was advised that this had already been the subject of the initial metal detector check and had been given the all clear for the initial hole (apparently no noise from the area of this hole unlike the first one). Works were then undertaken to start the initial excavation of the pit to house the drill.

Ran through the conditions with those present

Condition 1 – development commenced 27 January 2016

Condition 2 – notification provided.

Condition 3 – works within the permitted areas and compliant to extent undertaken. NB comment on location of welfare cabins)

Condition 4 – boreholes not excavated to maximum depth at time of inspection;

Condition 5 – did not specifically request, but various copies of planning permission and other documents were pulled out and discussed by developer;

Condition 6-7 – not relevant as end date

Condition 8 – no evidence of either rotary or percussion rig exceeding 10m in height

Condition 9-10 – was advised that vehicle routeing under strict instruction and that this also stemmed to site cars (TT was asked which way he had driven in and advised via Misson as had had another visit south of there)

Condition 11 – no unexpected made ground found to date

Condition 12 – explosives engineer seen working

Condition 13 - n/a

Condition 14 – noise within permitted levels on data seen in inspection, nothing to indicate in basic assessment that this was being breached.

Condition 15 – noise levels being recorded

Condition 16 - Misson Springs Cottage not occupied

Condition 17 – no boreholes within 155m of nearest noise sensitive receptor at time of visit

Condition 18 - was advised hours are complied with and currently working well inside these

Condition 19 – site on open grass land (did not specifically check with developer that area had been cleared by an ecologist but no obvious sign of any burrows or excavations on the grassland in the area of hole 2 which might have potential to hose GCN's)

Condition 20 – currently inside permitted dates, reminder issued during discussions but hoped to be completed well inside this period.

Condition 21 – no unexpected made ground found therefore not trigger

Condition 22 - no evidence of dust, but bowser seen on site and roadways clean

Condition 23 – no artificial lighting at time of visit (NB some on security cabin)

No evidence of any issues in terms of planning permission. Need to revisit the site again in a week or so given the interest in the site.

FURTHER ACTION

Revisit in a week or so.

