

**STAR ENERGY LIAISON COMMITTEE**  
**Minutes of a meeting held Thursday 26<sup>th</sup> February 2009**  
**6pm, in Albury Village Hall**

**Present:** Jonathan Lord, Chairman, *Blackheath Village Society*  
Patricia Allen *St Martha Parish Council*  
Tim Harrold *CPRE*  
Walter Wilcox *Save Blackheath Common*  
Nick Wenman, Chairman, Albury Parish Council  
Nick Carter, *Blackheath Village Society*  
Niall Breen, *Blackheath Village Society*  
Oliver Franks, *Albury Resident*  
Roger Pearson *Managing Director, Star Energy*  
Sophie Tucker, *Project Manager, Star Energy*  
Barrie Hedges, *Daybreak Communications*  
Joanna Cadman, *Clerk, Albury Parish Council*

1. **Apologies** were received from N Morris, Blackheath Village Society, John Brockwell, Albury Parish Council, and Paul Lister, Save Blackheath Common

2. **Minutes of meeting held 26<sup>th</sup> November 2008**

Were confirmed as a correct record of the meeting and signed by the Chairman.

3. **Matters arising**

1. *Existing well:* WW asked for confirmation that this was to be abandoned. RP replied that it would not be used, as it was not suitable for storage.
2. *Processing plant:* NB requested confirmation that this would not be sited at Albury if planning was refused at Ripley. RP gave this confirmation.

JL welcomed Sophie Tucker to her first meeting of the group. She had worked very closely with Paul Dacombe in taking forward parts of the appraisal. He also welcomed Nick Carter, who had replaced Nick Harrison as representative from the Blackheath Village Society, and Oliver Franks, who attended as a resident of Albury who lived close to the site.

JL explained that the Parish Council were to hold a separate meeting with SE, following this meeting, to address specific concerns for the village and the residents.

4. **Update on overall gas storage project: Roger Pearson**

At the last meeting in November of 2008, Paul Dacombe had made a firm commitment that the Albury I project would form part of SE's portfolio. At that time SE was also involved in competitive tendering for an interest in Southern Ireland and were successful. This gives an opportunity to develop substantial gas storage facilities in Southern Ireland, which would benefit the UK as a whole. The project was potentially between 5 and 20 times the size of Albury I, and also offered an opportunity for gas sequestration. SE had a further project in Holland.

This meant that SE had to re-look at their priorities, particularly as the Irish project should move forward rapidly. As there was currently not a lot of pooled knowledge in gas storage, SE were obliged to use all their resources on these projects, and would now delay the Albury I project until Q4 of this year.

RP assured the meeting that Albury I still formed an important part of SE's portfolio. Drilling of the appraisal well would still go forward as scheduled, and Albury I stands in its own right. Albury II depends on success of the Section 6 application under the Gas Act. The appeal against the injunction for trespass under Al Fayed's land is due to be heard in mid-March, but if there was a delay or SE were not successful, it would not be possible to keep to schedule.

If Albury II drilling is successful, SE would need to access the transmission system near Godstone, whereas Albury I would go to Ripley. SE were reviewing the possibility of combining the two projects as much as possible in order to minimise impact. The pipe laid for Albury I would be big enough to take the flow from Albury I and II. The processing plant would also be big enough to deal with both phases. However, the Scotia network would not be able to deal with the volume of gas from both.

PA asked how long the pipeline would last. RP advised that gas was non-corrosive and the pipe would last for the life of the gas storage.

TH asked how long SE would need to decide whether to move forward, if they found gas. RP advised that they would know straight away, as the decision would depend on the quality of the data.

WW asked if the appraisal well would become the production well. RP confirmed that it would be used if feasible, although this was frequently not possible.

## 5. Briefing on Temporary Appraisal Drilling Programme: Sophie Tucker

The briefing took the form of a Powerpoint presentation, which has been circulated to all members of the committee.

### *Geological overview:*

- gas would be stored in the Portland to Corallian layers, at a maximum depth of 4.8km
- ST was asked how far gas would be accessed from each well, she advised that if the rock was highly permeable less wells would be needed.
- ST was asked whether some development wells could serve both phases and replied that this was not possible, as Albury I would access the Portland layer, Albury II the Corallian layer.

*Appraisal Drilling: target dates:* these were tabled, together with photographs of the equipment used at each stage:

- Site preparation in April would involve erecting temporary offices and extending the security fence; leveling the area with stone, building 2 well cellars, 4 metres in depth; providing a 12 metre long concrete slab for the rig; erecting an acoustic fence (the generators meet noise criteria but this fence, which is 3.5" thick, and 4.5 metres high, gives extra insurance); and emptying the perimeter ditch and proving integrity, for spillage control
- Rig mobilization would depend on Schedule 6. The rig trailer is a 15.5m HGV especially designed for UK roads, and the mast folds back on top when transported, extending to 30m from ground level when in operation.
- Drilling: would last 18 weeks maximum, although planning condition allows for 22 weeks. The pipe carousel, which stores the drill pipe, is delivered in modular sections

### *Planning conditions:*

- 36 conditions in total
- 4 require notifications to SCC within 7 days of commencement of site preparation, drilling and flaring stages respectively and also once the overall restoration planting and seeding is complete.
- 7 conditions require submissions to SCC before stages in the project: bats, badgers, breeding birds, newts, traffic management (this has already been planned, NW requested a copy), protection of the water environment (managing spillages) and car park restoration (temporary permission has been given for 20 spaces).
- A restoration plan has to be submitted within one month of site preparation

### *Security:*

Security on site during the day. Rapid response in place for safety and traffic management on the access track and also on New Road. During the night, roving security in the area who visit the site twice nightly, as at present. There will be no light on site except at the drilling stage, when the site will be lit using directional lighting.

### *Route for Rig transport*

A25, A248, New Road. ST would supply details of the width of the HGV, but assured the meeting that there would be no problems with corners or with New Road, and no escort would

be required, which would be the case with a wide vehicle. The rig may be coming from Sussex, where it is being utilized at present. ST agreed that photographs would be taken of the route before the rig was brought in, in case of damage. She would also confirm the route when this was known.

#### *Flare*

There would be 26 days flaring, using a clean enclosed burner, 6m high.

#### *Noise*

A noise specialist would measure levels on a weekly basis, using three different points. These measurements would also record type of noise. A microphone would be placed within the vicinity of the well site to record noise 24/7. Acoustic fencing would be placed around the wellsite.

There had apparently been a vibration problem during the original drilling. ST advised that there should be no reason for this to happen this time.

#### *General Traffic*

All traffic to the site would use the A25, A248, New Road route.

Number of vehicles: 7 HGVs an hour during the heavy period, possibly over one or two days. It was noted that this equated to a traffic movement every 5 minutes. Despite the figures given in the presentation, 77 HGVs a day were not anticipated. There would be an employee with full time responsibility specifically for the access track and New Road.

NW advised that traffic was the parish's greatest concern, RP confirmed that this would be discussed with the contractor to ensure that all parties were satisfied that traffic was to be controlled properly.

NW pointed out that New Road is hazardous at present, and this additional burden on the road was a source of anxiety. There should be no HGV movements in the rush hour.

OF pointed out that sweeping of the road should be done on a cycle, not as and when required. The landfill site had been a constant problem because of this approach to road sweeping. SE should have a road sweeper on site at all times.

### **6. Keeping the Community Informed**

SE recognised that the wider community needed to be involved, and were committed to getting communication right.

They had already had direct contact with people who live close to the site. Steve Hill, who lives at Keepers Cottage, had no knowledge of the Albury projects and was particularly concerned about the impact the noise would have on his pheasants. The ecologist had been consulted and did not think that noise would affect nesting birds. He would discuss this with Steve Hill.

### **7. Update on Star Energy Community Fund**

BH advised that three independent sat on this panel. Decisions on grants made would be announced at the end of March.

### **8. Any Other Business**

No further matters were raised.

### **9. Date of next meeting**

JL considered it made sense to delay Albury I so that both projects could be done together. He thanked SE for their presentation, which had been interesting and very helpful. He noted that the committee's concerns seem to be taken seriously.

JL proposed that meetings continue with the Parish Council liaison group for the time being, as current plans impacted on them rather than the wider community, and this group would meet again when required.

This meeting was followed by the first meeting of the Albury Parish Council liaison group.