

**PLANNING BOARD**  
**Thursday, 25th January, 2018**

Present:- Councillor Atkin (in the Chair); Councillors Andrews, Bird, D. Cutts, M. Elliott, Ireland, Jarvis, Price, Taylor, Tweed, Vjestica, Walsh and Whysall.

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Fenwick-Green.

The webcast of the Council Meeting can be viewed at:-

<https://rotherham.public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

**60. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Walsh declared a personal interest on the grounds of being a member of the Energy Institute.

**61. DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL - CONSTRUCTION OF A WELL SITE INCLUDING THE CREATION OF A NEW ACCESS TRACK, MOBILISATION OF DRILLING, ANCILLARY EQUIPMENT AND CONTRACTOR WELFARE FACILITIES TO DRILL AND PRESSURE TRANSIENT TEST A VERTICAL HYDROCARBON EXPLORATORY CORE WELL AND MOBILISATION OF WORKOVER RIG, LISTENING WELL OPERATIONS, AND RETENTION OF THE SITE AND WELLHEAD ASSEMBLY GEAR FOR A TEMPORARY PERIOD OF 5 YEARS ON LAND ADJACENT TO COMMON ROAD, HARTHILL, ROTHERHAM AT LAND ADJACENT COMMON ROAD HARTHILL FOR INEOS UPSTREAM LIMITED (RB2017/0805)**

In accordance with the right to speak procedure, the following people attended the meeting and spoke about the application:-

Mr. M. Sheppard, INEOS (Applicant)  
Mr. L. Marston Harthill Against Fracking (Objector)  
Ms. D. Gibson, Harthill Against Fracking (Objector)  
Mr. R. Dyer, Friends of the Earth (Objector)  
Mr. I. Lloyd, Harthill with Woodall Parish Council (Objector)  
Mr. I. Daines, Thorpe Salvin Parish Council (Objector)  
Mr. A. Tickle, Campaign to Protect Rural England (Objector)  
Councillor D. Beck, Ward Member – Wales (Objector)  
Mr. K. Goodall, Harthill Resident (Objector)

Resolved:- (1) That the Planning Board declares that it is not in favour of this application and that the application would be refused for the following two reasons:-

1. The Council considers that vehicular access to/egress from the site is intended to be via country lanes which are considered to be unsuitable to cater for the significant increase in commercial vehicular traffic to be generated by the proposal in terms of their limited width, restricted

visibility, adverse alignment and lack of separate pedestrian facilities. The development, if implemented, would therefore increase the risk of vehicular conflict with vulnerable road users and other vehicles to the detriment of road safety, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework which expects developments to include safe and suitable access for all people.

2. The Council also considers that the supporting ecological information is deficient with no breeding bird survey details submitted, insufficient bat survey details, and a substandard Phase 1 Habitat Survey carried out in January. Accordingly the applicant has not sufficiently demonstrated that the development can satisfactorily mitigate the potential for harm to the ecology of the surrounding rural environment, contrary to paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework which indicates that if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided then planning permission should be refused.

(2) That the above reasons form the basis of the Council's Statement of Case in respect of the appeal against non-determination of planning application RB2017/0805.