

Right Reverend Graham Cray

The Dovecote
Main St
Kirby Misperton
North Yorkshire
YO17 6XL

Submission to the All Party Parliamentary Group on Shale Gas Regulation & Planning -
7th September 2016

I am the Rt. Revd. Graham Cray, retired from stipendiary ministry in the Church of England, but still active as an Honorary Assistant Bishop in the Diocese of York, and a Visiting Fellow at St John's College Durham. I am a resident of Kirby Misperton, where my wife and I have had a house for 23 years, moving there permanently on our retirement in May 2014. I live half a mile from the KM8 well site, and the proposed 910 HGV movements and 504 other vehicle movements, proposed for just one frack, will pass my front door. We are promised that the noise level will be no louder than that of a nightclub, for the nearest properties! For this reason, as a concerned resident, I participate in Frack Free Ryedale. I very strongly regret that I am the only representative of a local community here today.

We have no vicar at the moment, so my wife, who is a priest, and I conduct most of the services in four village churches, and my wife, takes the local baptisms, weddings and funerals. As a consequence we know our communities well. We know of no-one in the villages surrounding KM8 who welcomes fracking. Our parish council, and all the other local parish councils, the four Ryedale town councils, the District Council, our County Councillor and our former MP all opposed Third Energy's application to frack here. We regard fracking as an imposition from Westminster. It was not even in the County minerals plan. How do you compensate for the undermining of local democracy?

The recent proposal to directly compensate households is only welcome because it is a public recognition that fracking does cause harm to local communities and households. Beyond that it is an irrelevance. We would not have fracking at any price!

The anticipation of fracking has already impacted house prices and house sales in our village. For example, a young couple my wife prepared for marriage were interested in a modern house for sale in the village. That is until the bride's father, a local farmer, warned them not to touch it as they

would never be able to sell it, except at a loss. We are informed that local solicitor's searches now include an enquiry about being in an exploration license area. Who would compensate us for the loss of value on our homes?

Our greatest concern is the sheer scale of what is planned. Our village's experience is to be multiplied many times. The latest round of exploration licenses cover more than 200 communities in the Diocese of York, as I have reported to my Archbishop. As part of an earlier license round, Third Energy told the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Committee that they aspired to no more than 19 sites each with from 10 to 50 wells, depending on size¹. In the latest round INEOS, in their advertisement for seismic survey subcontractors announced their plan for "up to 30 well sites, and up to 396 horizontal wells' within each of their 9, 10k by 10k exploration license areas. The company states that these figures are intended 'to give the community an idea of the maximum numbers of well sites they can expect to see in a license area, as well as the number of wells.'² This could mean up to 300 well-sites and 4,000 horizontal wells across their area. But these are just two of six companies with exploration licenses.

The quantity of water and of traffic alone is huge, and the impact even greater where there is no pre-existing natural gas infrastructure. How many additional roads, pipelines, storage facilities and compressor stations will be required? For a short-term alleged gain this amounts to the industrialization of much of rural North Yorkshire, profoundly threatening our long term economy, and beyond the capacity of our infrastructure: rural roads, villages in close proximity to one another, and busy main roads to the coast. In addition large quantities of flow-back fluid have to be trucked out and need decontamination, presumably at Bran Sands in Middleborough. Who will pay for the damage to roads, the congestion and inconvenience? What precisely will happen to the flow-back fluid?

The World Travel Awards have twice identified Yorkshire as Europe's best travel destination. North Yorkshire's economy is heavily dependent on tourism, agriculture and food. But, given the proposed scale, who wants to visit a gas field? How can you compensate for the resulting loss of jobs? In Queensland Australia for every 10 new gas jobs, 18 agricultural jobs were lost.³ In North Yorkshire it would be jobs lost in tourism. We see fracking as a threat to the local and regional economy. The application for KM8 was opposed by Flamingo Land, Castle Howard, Duncombe

¹ <http://www.parliamentlive.tv/Event/Index/a11cdfa1-35ff-4e18-ba29-b6aa4eaf4d3c>

² <http://frackfreeryedale.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/INEOS-online-ad-for-Seismic-Survey-Contractor-06.05.16.pdf>

³ <http://www.tai.org.au/content/sound-economics-victoria-quits-fracking-good>

Place, the Hovingham Estate and many other estates and primary tourist locations.⁴

Then there is the threat to public health. Because large scale fracking only began in the United States in the mid 2000s, most research on its impacts is recent. More than 80% of all peer-reviewed research concerning fracking and public and environmental health has been published since 2012.⁵ Much of this research raises public health concerns sufficiently serious to require a moratorium on fracking until further studies are done. Particular concerns include substantial increases in cardiology related hospital admissions⁶, problems during pregnancy and with premature births⁷, and the vulnerability of the health of children close to fracking locations⁸. The choice is either: follow the precautionary principle until further research can confirm or deny the initial findings, or our villages provide the involuntary guinea pigs in a dangerous public health experiment. There is no adequate compensation for such harm: only a complete ban is acceptable.

When Flamingo Land, in our village, objected to the KM8 application, at the advice of their Director of Conservation, a senior lecturer at York University, they did so out of concern for their staff and visitors, but also for their animals. Submitting six scientific papers in support.⁹ Flamingo Land participates in a number of international breeding programs for endangered species. Ryedale is also a national centre for the breeding and training of race horses. Air, water and environmental pollution, which have accompanied fracking wherever it has begun, are equally bad news for

⁴ E.G. <http://www.yorkshirepost.co.uk/news/opinion/yp-letters-the-five-great-perils-of-fracking-in-ryedale-1-7633374>

⁵ <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0154164>

⁶ <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0131093>

⁷ <http://www.jhsph.edu/news/news-releases/2015/study-fracking-industry-wells-associated-with-premature-birth.html>

⁸ http://www.psehealthyenergy.org/data/SS_Vulnerable_Pop_3.7_.pdf

⁹Scientific research papers submitted by Flamingo Land
<https://investigatingbalcombeandcadrilla.files.wordpress.com/2016/05/link-to-study2.pdf>
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10934529.2015.992655?scroll=top&neededAccess=true>
<https://investigatingbalcombeandcadrilla.files.wordpress.com/2016/05/link-to-study-3.pdf>
<https://investigatingbalcombeandcadrilla.files.wordpress.com/2016/05/link-to-study-4.pdf>
<https://investigatingbalcombeandcadrilla.files.wordpress.com/2016/05/link-to-study-5.pdf>
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10934529.2015.992666?scroll=top&neededAccess=true>

people and for animals.

The question of fugitive methane emissions, raised in the Lord's this week, and central to the Climate Change Committee's recommendations, is of vital importance both in terms of air quality in our communities and as a greenhouse gas. My colleague Professor Nick Cowern was one of the scientists who submitted evidence to the CCC.¹⁰

Local farmers have also been concerned to discover that they cannot get insurance for harm done to their land and livestock, as a consequence of fracking on a neighbour's land.

To quote the United Nations Environment Program Alert on Gas Fracking, issued in 2012¹¹, 'Unconventional Gas exploitation and production may have unavoidable environmental impacts. Some risks result if the technology is not used adequately, but others will occur despite proper use of technology.' Please note 'will occur'.

So who pays, and who cleans up when things go wrong? Fracking demands too high a price from local communities. The national 'gain' is short term. The local risks are beyond any reasonable scale of compensation. We do not want it in our communities, and if it is imposed upon us against our will, there should be a substantial financial bond posted in advance, for each and every affected community.

Finally there is no trust between our communities and either the companies granted exploration licenses, or with national government. The information issued to us locally has been misleading, and often late. When we object about the potential local impact we are accused of being NIMBYs. Government tells us to read the science and we will have our minds put to rest. When we read the science, most of which has been published since this policy was established, and find clear evidence for concern, we are told overseas research is not relevant because we have the best regulation. As this was also the message given in the US and Australia we are not reassured. We fear the blind are leading the blind. Compensation is not the issue. We are committed to a frack free Ryedale and North Yorkshire.

+Graham Cray – September 2016

¹⁰http://www.theecologist.org/News/news_analysis/2987783/fracking_is_twice_as_bad_for_climate_as_coal_will_the_climate_change_committee_ban_it.html
http://www.theecologist.org/News/news_analysis/2987805/uk_fracking_policy_founded_on_scientific_fraud_misrepresentation_and_prevarication.html

¹¹ http://www.unep.org/pdf/UNEP-GEAS_NOV_2012.pdf