

**West Newton Community Liaison Committee**  
**7pm on 09 February 2022**  
**Densholme Care Farm, Great Hatfield**  
**Notes of Meeting**

**Attendees**

Tom Selkirk (Project Manager, Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited) - TS (via videolink)  
Caroline Foster (Operations Engineer, Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited) - CF  
Nick Mace (Field Development Manager, Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited) - NM  
Harry Clark (Resident Representative, Ellerby) - HC  
Annita Howell (Representing Ellerby Parish Council) - AH  
Annette Ford (Resident Representative, Sproatley) - AF  
Christine Tomlinson (Representing Sproatley Parish Council) - CT  
Geoff North (Representing Aldborough Parish Council) – GN  
Vanessa Nolan (Resident Representative, Humbleton) - VN  
Ron Jagger (Resident Representative Marton) - RJ  
Deborah Stabler (Representing Burton Constable Parish Council) - DS  
Tom Copeland (Resident Representative, Withernwick) - TC  
Simon Taylor (Communications, Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited) - ST  
Andrew Acum (Communications, Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited) - AA

**Apologies received**

Stephen Croft (Site Technician and Local Liaison, Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited) - SC  
Lisa Brazier (Representing Humbleton Parish Council) - LB  
Matthew Grove (Representing Withernwick Parish Council) - MG

**Resignation and retirement**

Sarah Blanchard (Resident Representative, Aldbrough Parish) - SB  
Don Fields (Resident Representative, Sproatley Parish) - DF

**1. Welcome**

CF opened the liaison group meeting, welcomed everyone and thanked them for attending. The notes from the meeting on 02 December 2021 were agreed as a true and accurate reflection of the conversations at that time.

ST said that DF had decided to retire from the community liaison group having been actively and consistently involved for c10 years. He asked that Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited's thanks be recorded for DF's long and enthusiastic participation over the years. The community liaison group passed on its thanks and best wishes to DF. ST also confirmed that SB had decided to step aside to let somebody who lives in Aldbrough itself to take her place. Again, the community liaison group recorded its thanks to SB for participating in recent meetings.

CF said that, following East Riding of Yorkshire Council's determination on 30 September 2021, this meeting was to enable further comments regarding Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited's planning application for the West Newton A (WNA) production development and the West Newton B (WNB) wellsite to be discussed.

## **2. Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited brief on applications**

CF started by explaining the map showing the maximum drilling radius and said that it was always Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited's intention to directionally drill the wells as this would give maximum exposure to the reservoir with minimal surface infrastructure required. The map with the red hatched circle showed the area in which Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited could in theory drill their wells and extract from, but it did not indicate that there would be wells under the whole of the hatched area.

CF showed a diagram indicating where wells had been drilled to date which showed that West Newton A wells had been drilled 750m laterally and 450m laterally whilst the West Newton B wells had been drilled 720m laterally and then plugged back and redrilled at a 420m distance from the surface location in another direction. It is unlikely that a well would be drilled for 2km laterally but the application included this option as a worst case scenario.

CF asked the group what the concerns were about directional drilling. VN said that comments from Flinton were that people were concerned about drilling underneath their houses. CF showed an example of a piece of 4.5" casing (which is often the final casing size) and explained that 2km is roughly the length of the Humber Bridge. VN felt that people probably didn't realise that the well was 2km deep and that the well bore was so small.

CF explained that the target formation (Kirkham Abbey) is a competent rock which has oil and gas trapped in the pores within the rock matrix, rather than being a cavern that would be emptied as a result of extraction. As oil and gas flows through the rock and into the well, the rock would remain in place and couldn't collapse, and that in all likelihood, the oil and gas would be replaced by water within the rock formation.

RJ asked if the area would collapse into the hole after the crude had been "sucked out". CF explained that it wouldn't, as there is no hole for it to collapse into – the oil and gas is held within the rock which remains in place after extraction. CF showed some core samples of the type of rock the wells would be targeting.

DS asked how deep the Kirkham Abbey Formation (KAF) is. CF said it is 1,700 metres below surface.

HC asked a question from a resident about whether they could be assured that major subsidence or sink holes would not occur as a result of oil and gas extraction as he believed that this had happened in Texas. CF said that the geology is completely different. The target formation is around the same depth as the Aldbrough gas caverns which are as big as St Paul's Cathedral and have not collapsed. In comparison, Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited's wells will be just a few inches in diameter.

CF mentioned that London Underground has much bigger tunnels and they are just 50m below the surface of a major city. HC said that Underground tunnels are different as they are lined with concrete. CF explained that the wells have steel casing which are then surrounded by cement. HC asked how in that case the oil and gas was able to migrate into the well through the steel and cement casings.

CF explained that once the casing and cementing is in place, the well is perforated at key points which exposes the formation to the well and allows hydrocarbons to flow through the rock and into the well bore. The reason Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited has looked at directional drilling is that the target reservoir is only 60m thick so by approaching it

horizontally or at an angle they can access much more of the formation with one well and drain much more of the reservoir than if they drill vertically into it and so it means fewer well heads/less infrastructure at surface.

ST asked whether that answered the question and HC confirmed that it did. He said that he had a second question which was about the depth at which the horizontal side-tracks would be drilled out from the vertical well. CF said that at West Newton A, one starts to deviate at 500m depth and the other at 750m (\*depths confirmed after meeting).

HC asked if the wells would be horizontal at these depths. CF said that for the wells drilled to date, they deviate at 1-2° per 33m so they are at a relatively shallow gradient and haven't gone horizontal. The wells drilled so far have been at about a 30° inclination so that they hit the reservoir at the right point, although it is technically possible to turn a 90° corner in about 200m.

ST has asked if HC had any concerns with the answer. HC said he didn't and would pass the comments back to the resident.

DS asked if the other wells would go in the same direction. CF said this would not necessarily be the case as they would want to access different areas of the formation and access the maximum spatial area. DS asked whether the wells would be under Withernwick. CF said that they might, but the majority of the well would probably be in a vertical direction. DS asked about the size of the reservoir. TS explained that the reservoir covers an area of around 4,000 acres or five or six square miles approximately from West Newton A to West Newton B.

RJ said Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited was going under around 300 acres that he farms at Burton Constable and 300 acres of his own. He felt that he was being adversely affected. CF explained that no decision had been taken yet about which direction Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited would drill. To date the only information available shows the maximum radius and possible areas for consideration to show worst case scenario for planning purposes. As exploration is an iterative process, as more is known about the reservoir and its performance, this would inform future drilling plans. RJ said he was concerned that people wouldn't know where Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited was drilling. TS explained that all affected landowners would be notified prior to drilling and that there is a process for this which will be undertaken once Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited has sufficient information from the wells to inform the future drilling programme. HC asked what determined which way side-tracks would go. TS said it would be based on a variety of factors such as distribution of the reservoir in the subsurface, structural elevation, porosity trends, natural fracture networks and optimising position of the wells in terms of drainage of the reservoir to optimise recovery.

TC asked if, when drilling, you were able to accurately locate where the drill bit was in the subsurface. CF said that when drilling they took very regular surveys which can accurately describe where the drill bit is in the subsurface, where it is facing etc.

ST explained that as this is exploration, one step will inform the next step. The red circle on the map gives flexibility to go in whichever direction the exploration indicates is best.

RJ said no one would know where drilling was taking. ST restated that there is a process for informing landowners in advance of drilling. In addition, Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited had run the community liaison groups for representatives to ask any questions they wanted for

several years and would continue to do so through drilling and production if these stages went ahead. CF said that aside from informing landowners, a number of consents must be sought and regulators notified of the directional drilling plans prior to drilling taking place.

TC asked if all properties would be informed in advance if drilling was to take place underneath them. NM said this is required by the Infrastructure Act 2015. RJ asked if there was any form of appeal. NM said unfortunately not, as all subsurface minerals belong to the Crown and Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited is extracting on behalf of the Crown Estate. This is the difference between the UK and the US. In the US, landowners became rich by inviting oil and gas companies to extract hydrocarbons from underneath their land. In the UK, it is highly regulated and companies have to be completely transparent and rightly so. This means that all landowners will be informed prior to drilling under their land.

AF asked what media would be used to inform landowners. NM said it would be a personal letter as this had to be documented and recorded.

### **Clarification Point:**

The Infrastructure Act 2015 makes provision for notice to landowners as follows:

*(1) The Secretary of State may, by regulations, require relevant energy undertakings to give notice of the proposed exercise, or exercise, of the right of use.*

*(2) The regulations may require relevant energy undertakings—*

*(a) to give notice—*

*(i) to owners of relevant land or interests in relevant land;*

*(ii) to persons of other specified descriptions;*

*(b) to display notice within the area in which relevant land is situated or elsewhere;*

*(c) to publish notice (otherwise than by displaying the notice).*

TC asked what would stop Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited drilling a fifth or sixth well. CF explained that Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited doesn't have permission for any additional wells. Anything beyond what has been applied for in this planning application would mean going back to the council with a new application. TC then asked if there was space for five or six wells on the same site. CF said that the site had been designed for the four additional wells but it was possible to drill further wells from the site if modifications could be made to the current site set up. TC asked if Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited thought they could get everything they need from the four wells or would they be likely to need more wells in the future. CF replied that they had initially looked at six new wells but the geological team advised that the scheme could still work with four wells.

HC said that Union Jack Oil had commissioned a presentation by RPS which concluded that the Kirkham Abbey Formation would deliver more from horizontal wells than vertical wells. This report estimated that one well could initially produce up to 1,000 barrels of oil per day

and tankers have been capped at 10 vehicles per day. At these initial rates, one well would require half of all the tankers permitted for the site.

**Clarification Point:**

The report was commissioned by Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited. The figures quoted were initial production rates which would be subject to natural decline

HC then asked if Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited would increase the 10 HGVs they had quoted. CF explained Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited has committed to 10 HGVs per day for the production phase and will stick to that. If production is higher, Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited would definitely look at another offtake route such as a pipeline and that at that level (10 HGVs) it is likely to make a pipeline commercially viable.

DS said when the first Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited application went in for exploration, residents didn't know what the outcome would be. ST said that the message from Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited has been clear from day one. The exploration would prove or disprove what is below surface and the project would be developed as the results came back. Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited always said that if there was potential, it would require a new application for production. VN agreed that Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited had always engaged with the community from day one.

HC said Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited had employed a consultancy (LTP) to look at the traffic and they had come back with a higher figure over the lifetime of the project than the figures Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited were quoting and asked why this was the case. CF explained that LTP's figures were based on 25 HGVs per day over the production phase which had now been reduced to 10 (following Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited's original consultation) and had assumed maximum figures every single day which wouldn't be the case.

AF asked at what point a pipeline would be considered. CF said when 10 tankers per day were required a pipeline would probably be viable. ST added that another option would be to leave the oil in the ground and extract it over a longer period to keep tanker numbers down.

CF explained the difference between maximum assessed vehicle figures and the likely average. Based on actual figures for previous wells, the likely actual daily figure for HGVs will generally be much lower than the maximum figure which has been assessed for planning.

TC asked if the figures included water offtake. CF said the figures were for all HGVs including water offtake, but very little water has been seen so far.

ST summarised that the figures in the application are maximum figures and that they apply to a worst case scenario which is standard procedure for a planning application.

RJ asked about night-time vehicle movements. CF said vehicle movements would generally only be daytime hours only. The only time it would be likely for vehicles to be planned during the nighttime hours would be during drilling or testing phases.

TC asked about the time of year for construction in terms of avoiding harvest. CF said that no times had been determined yet but where possible other external high traffic times, such as during harvest, would be taken into account.

HC asked if there would be more than one side-track from a wellhead. CF explained that Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited is applying to drill upto four new wells but that this would be four drilling *phases*, each a maximum of 15 weeks long. An example being WNB-1 and WNB-1z where one well was drilled, plugged back and drilling to a different direction but all done in one operation.

DS asked if Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited could side-track where they want once planning had been granted. CF explained that after planning, Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited still has to submit and get approval for a WR11 well design from the Environment Agency to protect the aquifers and geological strata. They then have to submit drilling plans and financial information to the Oil and Gas Authority to get consent to drill. The HSE also has to be notified about the detailed drilling programme so that they can make sure they have no safety concerns with the programme. If they then decided to side-track the well, they would have to go through the whole process again before they could continue drilling.

AF asked which direction the four wells would go if the application was successful. CF said that the red circle on the map is the maximum theoretical extent of a well, but that each well would have its own individual path to the final location. If the area of extraction were to be re-drawn after drilling, you would perhaps end up with extraction of oil within a quarter of a mile radius of the well and extraction of gas within a ½ mile radius of the well.

HC said that in the Union Jack report he mentioned previously it states that there is potential for gas production from the site which could be 35 times higher than the largest current onshore producer. He asked whether Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited would be able to quickly get a pipeline on site? CF said it would require a new application for a pipeline and facilities. TC asked how quickly this could be done and CF said she felt it would probably take between 3-5 years. TS said Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited doesn't know how much associated gas will produced along with the oil at this stage. For small quantities of gas, they could use it onsite to generate electricity for the site. For larger quantities, they would look at a National Grid tie in and they have had initial discussions with National Grid about this. They have also talked to operators at Saltend who may use gas directly either as fuel or as a feedstock. However until there is clear production data, it is not possible to be more specific.

TC asked how gas would be used onsite. NM explained it could be used to generate electricity using a gas engine, but ideally there would be a connection into the local grid for gas or electricity or possibly even battery storage for electricity if volumes were larger.

TC asked if the flare was only for emergency use. CF confirmed that during production the flare would only be for emergency use, although the flare would need to be used for a short period during clean up and well testing to incinerate any associated gas before a means of using it could be installed.

CF asked the group to understand that any information put into the public domain by Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited's partners regarding the potential resource and production levels may be relevant in the future but that Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited can only progress plans and regulatory applications based on the information currently available, and that information required to plan and permit a pipeline currently isn't available.

TC said that everyone is saying the site is for fracking. He said he understood that there is no application for fracking but asked if would be possible that fracking could happen in the future. CF said Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited is not looking at high volume hydraulic fracturing

for shale. TC asked if it was possible and TS replied that there is a UK moratorium on high volume hydraulic fracturing.

TC said that he understood in Texas they extracted oil and gas traditionally until the wells were exhausted and then they went back and fracked them. He asked if this could technically happen here. CF said that Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited wasn't applying for this and it would require different regulatory approvals.

DS said Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited had already undertaken a mini fall off test which she believed was a frack and which found gas. CF said this wasn't the case. The mini fall off test never took place even though Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited had permission for it. DS thought she remembered it happening and that the smell was horrific. CF said the well was drilled to 3,000m in 2013 and they applied to conduct the test on the Bowland Shale but never went ahead with it and decided to concentrate on the Kirkham Abbey instead. CF confirmed Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited has no intention to look at the Bowland again.

TC asked if it was possible to frack whilst producing. CF said that the wells would not be drilled as deep as the Bowland Shale and therefore it couldn't be done whilst producing a well from the Permian depth (Kirkham Abbey). HC said he believed it also required a lot more equipment on site. CF agreed that it would require more equipment including pumps and water storage tanks whilst TS added that the shale formation is 1000m deeper than the Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited wells. TC said he was concerned that an initial small application would progressively get bigger and bigger. CF reaffirmed Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited would only have permission to do what was being applied for, if the application were approved.

RJ asked why the site at Walkington wasn't pursued. CF said West Newton was pursued instead as it was deemed to have greater potential.

CF explained that one of the concerns raised with the last application was that you would be able to see the CCTV and security fencing from the nearby footpaths. She said that the new application included a hedge planted on the outside of the fence to help screen to site from the footpaths as well as the hedges being infilled where possible and trees planted on the bunds.

### **3. Proposal from the landowner**

CF informed the group that the landowner has decided to undertake a planting strip on the north side of Fosham Lane. This will comprise a 10m strip of trees and a 5m strip for a footpath so that the narrow stretch of road adjacent to the site will have a safer path for pedestrians. TC welcomed this as he felt it would provide a safer alternative.

CF said that she also spoken to the Highways department regarding the potential for installing a trod from the wellsite to Piper's Lane. If the scheme progresses then Highways will meet with Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited to discuss the possibility further.

TC asked if any of these proposals would be conditioned as part of the application. CF said this was not possible as they were not within the red line boundary for the site. TC said the main time when there would be a problem would be during the construction phase so he would like to see these elements in place before then.

DS asked why the landowners had agreed to plant the woodland on the north side of Fosham Lane. CF said it would help screen the site from Withernewick as well as it being the best place to provide a safe place for a footpath past the site.

#### **4. Comments raised from planning applications**

ST said that on the last application scale and visual impact were two of the major concerns. CF added that HGVs and views of the site from the public rights of way were also a concern. As a result of feedback from the local community and the planning committee, the number of wells has been reduced from six to four – a 30% reduction, drilling time on site when the rig will be visible has been reduced, the extension has been reduced in size by 40% which will reduce the volume of construction traffic, production HGVs will be capped at 10 per day and the storage tanks will now be horizontal. The tallest proposed item on site will be the flare at 15m but there will probably be scope to reduce this as it is a maximum figure rather than an actual figure. NM added that it is also related to the volume of gas produced and that it would be unlikely that a 15m flare would be required for this site given his knowledge of other producing sites in the UK.

CF said visual mitigation had been improved by including extra hedges and additional and more extensive tree planting.

TC asked about lighting. CF said that there is a lighting management plan included in the submission which details the requirement for downward lighting and for work to take place during daytime hours where possible. TC said this was one of his biggest concerns living close to the site. ST explained that on previous drilling programmes, Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited had moved lights around on the site in response to feedback from residents. CF added that currently you may see the odd light on when someone is working on site and this is likely to be more indicative of what the lighting would be like in the longer term.

#### **5. AOB**

ST asked if there were any other questions people would like to ask.

HC asked about community funding. He said he believed that it was subject to the scheme going ahead and that there was a figure of £60,000 mentioned. He wanted to know if this figure was a one-off payment or an annual payment for the 25 years of the site. He said that a scheme in the Shetland Islands paid a percentage of every barrel of oil produced to the local community and between 1974-2008 £81m was paid into the fund and the fund currently sits at £250m.

CF explained they still planned to provide a community benefit fund and that Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited would make a payment into the fund at each stage of the project, starting with construction, each well drilled and then a fee in line with the volume of production – either a percentage of the revenue or a certain amount per year.

NM explained that legally a community fund cannot be included as part of a Section 106 so it is separated and managed by an independent body. ST said there were a number of different ways of managing the fund such as a community panel with an independent chair or have East Riding of Yorkshire Council run it as they can often find match funding to increase the revenue available for schemes.

AF asked who would be able to apply for the fund and what area would be covered. ST said that would have to be determined when the fund is established.

VN and GN said the wind farm community funds were being used as parish councils were receiving funding and grants and that the schemes seemed to work well.

ST explained that the wind farm funds were given to local communities who decided how to distribute them whereas Centrica Storage ran a good scheme where the money was given to local environmental initiatives. ST felt a good combination was local communities determining where funds went and the local authority administering it so that they can attract match funding where possible.

NM pointed out that the Shetland was a much bigger project than the West Newton scheme. CF said that she believed that there was a proportionate element to the West Newton production phase, but because construction and drilling is more intrusive, Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited wanted to make payments in line with the development phases. HC said some clarity was needed on how the community fund scheme would work and ST gave a commitment to minute his comments. CF said she believed that Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited had stipulated that there should be representatives from the community, a representative from Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited and a representative from the council. There were also certain restrictions such as the fund could not be used for political purposes and should be used to benefit local communities, the environment, education, archaeological and historical projects, etc. CF said that Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited would clarify the funding proposals in the post-meeting notes. ST added that local authorities were very good at ensuring compliance with fund rules and regulations.

**Clarification Point:**

Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited has proposed to develop a Community Benefit Scheme whereby the following sums of money would be paid to the fund;

- £20k on construction
- £20k x 4 (per well) = £80k
- 0.5% of the additional annual property revenue to a maximum of £25,000 per year

The Community Benefit fund would be available for;

- (a) the development, enhancement and/or maintenance of carbon sinks;
- (b) relieving those in need or in poverty by the advancement of energy projects including energy generation, energy efficiency and/or the relief of fuel poverty;
- (c) improving accessibility for people with disabilities living with the local area;
- (d) the advancement of education;
- (e) the advancement of environmental protection or improvements;
- (f) the advancement of the arts, culture, heritage or science;

(g) the advancement of community development including rural regeneration

HC asked when the planning application would be heard by the committee and CF said it would probably be the 17 March.

DS asked whether it would go to appeal if it was refused. NM explained that if unsuccessful, there was an option to appeal the decision to the Planning Inspectorate but there was also still an option to appeal against the decision on the first planning application. ST commented that it was important to understand how all parties can live together in the longer term. Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited wants to work with the local community for mutual benefit, hence why they have submitted a second amended application rather than immediately appeal against the first decision. If Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited appealed, the Local Planning Authority would lose its ability to put conditions on the project and it is likely that the community fund may not happen.

ST explained that the first application was compliant on planning grounds and that is why officers had recommended it for approval. It would have been very easy for Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited to appeal against the decision as the planning case was so strong, but they had decided to take on board local feedback and have now submitted a second, smaller application.

CF told the group that in response to feedback, three extra passing places have been included for Pasture Lane and these would likely be conditioned if the application was approved.

RJ said he was concerned about traffic and DS said she felt that the roads weren't built for heavy traffic. ST said he understood the points they raised and the objective was to ensure minimal impact on local residents.

GN commented that everyone in the local villages had vehicles that they needed to drive and that both him and RJ needed diesel to power their machinery to work the fields and that this has to come from somewhere. He said that energy needs have an impact on everybody if we want to live like we do.

CF said that everyone was hoping for enough oil for a pipeline. RJ asked where the pipeline would go to. CF said that it could possibly be to a refinery on the south bank, or to a transportation link at Saltend or used as a raw material at Saltend.

TC asked what the oil would be used for as he had heard that the oil would be not be of sufficient quality for fuel. CF explained that it could be used as a raw material or it could go to a refinery where they would crack it to create different types of hydrocarbon such as diesel, petrol, etc. What they have found so far is a nice light oil which is fairly versatile..

DS asked where the refinery would be. CF said that the Humber refinery would probably be the closest. NM outlined the massive potential for this area to be future-compatible in terms of carbon capture and storage, hydrogen production, etc. The area needs to adapt if it wants to be prosperous. The Humber economy is highly dependent on hydrocarbons and process industries and it will decline unless it adapts. National Grid has an application at the moment to take carbon dioxide out and store it under the North Sea. Tying into this sort of activity will be the future for local industry and he said he personally doesn't want to be involved in anything that would be harmful for the future environment. He said he would

love to be able to update the group in the future and say that Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited was proposing a pipeline that would tie into the wider Humber net zero project.

DS said she didn't feel that this was a suitable area for production. NM explained that there wouldn't be the number of HGVs that were being claimed by objectors. CF added that they can only explore for and produce oil and gas where it exists, and the site is relatively far from properties compared to other possible sites. DS asked if it could have been located at other sites but CF said that from the site selection and constraints process, this was the nearest site to the reservoir with the fewest neighbouring properties.

ST asked if there was any other business and said that if there were any questions not asked at the meeting to send them to him and he would get answers.

The meeting closed at 9pm.

## **5. Next Meeting**

CF proposed that the next meeting take place once the outcome of the planning hearing is known. She said that ST would be in touch nearer the time.

TS said that any further updates will be available via Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited's Energy (UK) Limited website at: [www.Rathlin Energy \(UK\) Limited-energy.co.uk](http://www.Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited-energy.co.uk)

**Standing note:** Emergency calls should be directed Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited's 24-hour freephone number: 0800 1959154.