



agenda for the evening was outlined along with the objectives for the Workshop, following which each member of the Project Team introduced themselves to attendees.

---

### 6.15pm – 7.00pm

#### **Presentation on the Keuper Gas Storage Project**

RS explained that the Stakeholder Workshop would form part of statutory consultation on the Keuper Gas Storage Project (KGSP), which follows non-statutory consultation earlier in the year. The non-statutory consultation involved a number of Information Days across Cheshire and a Stakeholder Workshop. RS then delivered a presentation on the KGSP which covered the following topics:

- Overview of INEOS and its operations in the UK
- An introduction to the KGSP and the history of brine solution mining
- The details of the proposed KGSP and associated development
- Recap of previous consultation events and feedback
- Details of where to find further information on the KGSP, how to submit feedback and methods for contacting the Project Team

RS answered several questions during the presentation, from attendees who required further clarification on aspects of the Project, or made suggestions in respect of the KGSP. These included:

- Questions about noise associated with operation of existing gas compressors
- Clarification required on the routing of traffic, particularly on Drakelow Lane
- Questions regarding light pollution from current drilling rigs and how this may be mitigated
- Suggestion of providing an out of hours contact number for someone based at the site so that issues can be resolved promptly (similar to the EON arrangement)
- Suggestion of increasing the community fund to £30k to reflect inflation when compared to the previous two gas storage projects. An increase to £30k has since been agreed by the project team.
- Question about how traffic will be marshalled at the crossroads on Yatehouse Lane – i.e. will there be temporary traffic lights?
- Question about modifications which may be made to King Street as this has been used for the previous gas storage project?
- Question about what happens if negotiations fail with the third party landowners - would INEOS use compulsory acquisition powers?
- Lack of gas supply to homes in Byley and whether this could be delivered as part of the KGSP
- Clarification on the nature of the development at Runcorn and whether permission to discharge brine exists
- Desire for the potential for underground cables to be looked into, as opposed to the use of overhead lines
- Suggestion of a speed limit on internal construction roads

Bringing the initial presentation to a close, LJ explained that attendees would have opportunities to raise further questions and make suggestions to Project Team members during the breakout session.

To make allowances for the extended amount of time given to the presentation, LJ suggested that the warm-up exercise be omitted to allow time for the breakout session discussions.

---

**7.00pm – 8.00pm****Breakout into work groups**

LJ explained that each group would remain seated while members of the Project Team rotated from one table to the next, discussing different aspects of the Project including the main development, environmental impacts and geology. A member of the Project Team was also present on each table to make notes on the discussions taking place, feedback given and any suggestions which were made. These notes are attached in the appendices to this document.

The following topics of discussion and feedback have been split into subject-specific areas:

**Ecology and Environment**

- Attendees discussed the issue of noise from existing gas compressors and it was clarified that disruption was due mainly to tonal noise.
- Those living close to drilling rigs explained the issue of lights on construction sites which are sometimes susceptible to end up facing the wrong direction. Group members explained that one way of mitigating this would be to have a contact phone number for a worker on site who was able to fix the problem, as has been the case with E.ON. Attendees expressed a view that gas storage projects were changing the nature of the local area. Attendees suggested that lighting positioning should be looked at, particularly night-time positioning.
- RM was asked what the environmental assessment covers, to which she explained that generally it is anything that may be affected by the Project such as ground conditions, impact on agricultural land, landscape and visual, ecology, traffic, water and noise.
- A question was asked about the Cheshire irrigation system and the issue over the loss of ponds. One group member suggested that farmers may fill in the ponds but this was refuted by a fellow group member and local farmer.
- Impacts caused by previous projects were raised by attendees, who noted that gates had been left open resulting in a mix up of cattle.
- RM explained that crossings over the brook had been assessed to ensure that living organisms in the water would not be affected and that additional surveys are being undertaken such as the wintering birds survey (in addition to a previous three month survey.)
- The question was asked whether Wincham Parish would be affected by the link up of underground water courses. RM explained that the Preliminary Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) had assessed the wider water courses and there was no suggestion so far from the Environment Agency or other authorities of any significant impacts.
- Stakeholders asked whether any difficulties had been met in receiving a response from the local authorities or Environment Agency. RM explained that the authorities had engaged well and that it was in their best interests to respond.
- The impact on a local farming business was raised, with the suggestion that previous projects had disrupted the business. Concern was expressed that the proposed Project would have more direct implications due to its proximity to the farm. It was suggested that the Project would interfere with the fields resulting in the farmer having to go about his business in a different way. It was explained that access routes had been discussed with INEOS and would be designed so that the impact is kept somewhat away from the farm.
- The issue of soil and water contamination was raised by one group. RM talked through the assessments and considerations which have been included in the PEIR.

- RM was asked if the Environment Agency will monitor the site. RM confirmed that the EA usually monitors at the beginning and end of the works and will be given a watching brief as the Project progresses.
- Attendees asked if there were any issues with the heritage sites. RM identified Drakelow Hall and listed buildings on the map, showing that provisions were in place to ensure that no form of development could take place in certain areas including at Drakelow Hall and RAF Cranage.
- Feedback was provided from attendees who felt reassured that the environmental impacts appeared to be taken care of.
- A representative from Northwich Town Council said he was able to report back that there was no significant water, air or ground impacts.
- Some attendees added that they had no outstanding environmental concerns in need of clarification and that they were much more confident having listened to the discussions.
- RM supplied [REDACTED] representative with the PEIR Non-Technical Summary and the suggestion was made that it may be of value for the Project Team to give a presentation to [REDACTED]

## Geology

- A suggestion was made to have clad lighting on drilling rigs and to ensure reputable drilling companies were used.
- Attendees were concerned that planted trees and hedges around wellheads must be maintained through their lifetime.
- A request was made for all overhead cables to be underground – however questions were asked whether farmers be affected by underground cables if they upset existing pipe/land drainage. The question was asked whether overhead cables would be better for farmers.
- Issues regarding terrorism were raised and how this would be addressed given the significant value of gas that would be stored underground.
- Attendees asked if sound proofing was possible at the gas compressor station.
- Vibration and noise issues arising from the main pipeline and from the compressor house to King Street were addressed, with the suggestion that these issues should be addressed in advance.
- It was suggested that extra insulation could be a solution to the noise from the gas compressor.
- Project Team members were asked about the consideration for existing land drains and how this will be addressed if they are located on the Project footprint.
- Group members questioned whether there are any issues with drilling into this type of salt.
- Discussions were had about how deep shale rock is in comparison to salt.
- The Project Team was asked if the British Geological Survey (BGS) had been consulted.
- Attendees were interested to know if there was any way of calculating how much brine would need to be purged – i.e. what percentage? Stakeholders added that the current information doesn't address a number in terms of brine purge.
- RC explained that the Project would look at extraction versus disposal, taking an average over the Project lifetime.

## Main Development

- Attendees were interested to discuss whether HS2 would affect the Project and if there would be some disturbance to the strata. The point was also raised whether the KGSP would have an

impact on the subsidence and impact on the HS2. DP reassured that the HS2 would not affect the development and subsidence monitoring was explained.

- The group discussed the main gas pipeline location and asked whether there would be any more pipelines installed. DP confirmed that there would not be.
- DP gave an overview of the seismic survey and explained the cavity distances.
- DP was asked about the extent of existing brine consents and whether the cavities would be on private land. DP confirmed that nine cavities would be on private land.
- Attendees also asked if INEOS had the ability to rely on compulsory acquisition, to which it was confirmed that this is the case.
- The development programme was questioned in line with Storengy, which developed eight cavities.
- Attendees asked where the best salt was.
- The locations of cavities were discussed, along with the movement and proximity of cavities to residential properties following surveys.
- A question was asked whether INEOS has the right to salt deposits on all land.
- DP was asked about burying the electricity cables. Responded that in RS's opening presentation, he suggested that the route was overhead but DP explained that the issue of above or below ground hadn't been decided and that the team would be working with Scottish Power to find an agreed solution.
- Attendees asked about how the grid system for cavity locations is determined. DP explained that a seismic survey is needed to establish salt depth (below grade) and the thickness of the salt layer, as well as ensuring no fault lines are present within a proposed location. The HSE will require established calculations to be produced and agreed in respect to how close cavities/wellheads can be located in respect to existing properties.
- DP was asked why no more cavities had been proposed further east of HS01 and HS10.
- It was suggested that there is a 21 inch drain – two metres down running across from [REDACTED] land. This has not been plotted and therefore needs checking.

### **Economic Benefits**

- Group members asked whether there was the possibility of gas supply in Byley.
- The economic benefits of the Project were discussed such as employment opportunities and apprenticeships. DP said there would be up to 300 construction jobs and potentially 30 permanent roles to fill once in operation.
- When asked would apprenticeships be awarded DP stated that the participant should make the suggestion as feedback.
- A suggestion was made that local suppliers and/or local farmers could be used for moving hedges/trees as touched on by RS during the presentation. In addition, it was suggested that semi-mature trees should be planted on soil mounds.

### **Security of gas supply**

- Attendees were interested to learn about the motivation for the Project – is it brine or gas storage? DP answered that it is both but that the primary driver for the project was brine (the business is completely dependent upon it) and that gas storage was secondary.
- The question was asked whether demand for brine had increased recently. DP said this was not the case but that INEOS has an ongoing, long-term demand for brine.

- Discussions were had around the depth of the cavities and the distance from properties, with DP explaining that the sizes of the cavities are mined specifically to allow for gas storage. It was mentioned that cavities stored 30 – 120 bar, with NTS running at 70 bar.
- Other questions included how much of the national shortage of gas storage will this Project fulfill and will there be any extension of existing infrastructure?

### Transport

- Attendees asked how many traffic movements would be made per day on Drakelow Lane and requested details about the size of lorries and the average number of vehicles.
- Traffic management was discussed with the suggestion of implementing a temporary speed restriction. RM explained that the traffic management plan was based on peak traffic movements. RM also explained that INEOS would need to seek permission from the local authority in order to enforce any such speed restrictions.
- Attendees highlighted the issue of tight bends on the roads and the need to let road users know that development and project work is taking place, in order to avoid any potential collisions.
- Attendees asked the question of how contractors will be stopped from turning left down Yatehouse Lane, with suggestions of using CCTV or number plate recognition.
- The suggestion of a speed restriction on internal roads including Yatehouse Lane was raised.
- Attendees asked whether consideration for emergency services access to the site had been taken into account, regarding the road structure and RVPs etc.
- Attendees were keen to discuss whether traffic increases would be drastic. It was stated that there would be on average 30 HGVs in and out per day.
- Attendees also asked about road infrastructure and traffic movements particularly on Drakelow Lane. It was suggested that restrictions on construction traffic should exclude smaller vehicles.
- Participants asked about traffic wrongly travelling though Byley village instead of using the King Street entrance. It was stated that a 'three strikes and out' rule would be invoked.
- Residents stated that they were grateful for no traffic through Byley.

### Health and Safety

- Attendees asked the question whether the Health and Safety Executive had responded to the Project.

### General Feedback

- Attendees highlighted that the public relations aspect and stakeholder engagement as part of consultation on the Project had been good.

---

### 8.00 - 8.20pm

#### Feedback from work groups

VL, JW and LN provided a quick overview of the key points and suggestions which had been raised and noted during the breakout session. This ensured that all areas of interest had been explored and

provided attendees the opportunity to raise any further questions which they felt had not been discussed.

No additional points were raised during this final discussion.

---

### **Workshop summary**

LJ provided a summary of the key findings from the Workshop and informed attendees that a meeting report would be compiled. LJ added that the feedback and suggestions had been particularly useful and would be addressed by the Project Team as part of the Consultation Report. Participants were thanked for their contributions and reminded that further information could be found on the KGSP website where online feedback forms and contact details were available.

The Workshop closed at 8.30pm.