

Note of Meeting

Brockham Oil Field

11.00

15 February 2017

Jonathan Tidswell Director Angus Energy (AE)
Mark Oldridge Planning Consultant AE
Peter Brody Solicitor representing AE

Alan Stones SCC Planning
Samantha Murphy `` ``
Ian Gray `` ``
Saira Tamboo `` Legal

AS	Welcome Side track had been drilled even though there was express written advice from the County Planning Authority (CPA) that it would be unauthorised and planning permission was required. The facts and circumstances have been shared with Cabinet Member and Chair of Planning & Regulatory Committee. This is unauthorised development and will not meet with public expectation.
JT	Gave a brief potted history of the site, referring to BP, Teredo, Midmar, Key Petroleum & First Drill Ltd. & stated that AE took ownership in 2012. He referred to the wells not being as well maintained as they expected and AE's wish to improve them.
AS	Have to consider planning process and procedure. Nature of the various consents is key. Basic question to be asked - what new development has happened?
PB	My view is that retrospective Planning Permission is not necessary.
AS	The sidetrack works are of significance and should be regularised.
JT	X4 - well 7" casing, but should be a 7" hanger: OGA doc said 9 5/8" string. Goes down 3 joints cut costs 9 5/8" came to surface.
	No 1 well is not as it is defined by the OGA. No 4 well is not No 1 well. I cannot currently refer to any of the well heads in terms of being

	related to X1, X2 or X4 with certainty at present.
	Have to apply to HSE for 28 day permission (when you break well head). Have to have opening valve and running cable down.
	X 1 - 9 5/8" (meant to be) 13 3/8" actually according to OGA map. X 4 - "7" internal string actually 9 5/8" to surface.
IG	On 26 January 2017 – the AE website statement does not refer specifically to X4, when previous statements had done so. However, the last paragraph referred to the sidetrack X4Z, so the previous paragraphs can be taken to deal with X4.
IG	Surely you knew it was X4, you knew where you were.
JT	Yes.
IG	That refers to X4.
JT	Yes.
IG	You are injecting water in to X 3.
JT	Haven't injected water in X1 (it's actually the sidetrack X3) for years.
	We stopped because of concern from HSE when there was a doubt, so we stopped injecting
	Rain water still goes down
	A company called BKP takes the reservoir water from the two production wells.
	Cleaning, ditching, no production of any description Waiting for maturity results Have to decide whether we apply to HSE to abandon or carry on. No production for 4-6 months.
AS	Video released by AE recently refers to electric submersible pumps (ESP's) having been installed. AES advised that a change to submersibles would be acceptable under Permitted Development arrangements where these applied, but if already installed, a planning application would be required.
JT	No ESPs working as yet and need to install the associated electrics. Both 'nodding donkeys' have been removed from the well heads. Bottom pump assembly remains.

	<p>Rod instead of cable. Prefer to use the quieter ESP's and will not be visible above the bunds as they are only 1m high. Will provide details and submit before installing.</p>
AS	<p>There is a presumption in favour of hydrocarbon development in respect of planning policy, subject to the avoidance harm to the environment and amenity. Development proposals have to be taken forward in a particular way, with due process and consultation. Public will lose faith in the system if due process is not followed.</p>
JT	<p>Future development depends on the maturity samples. </p>
AS	<p>You have to talk to the CPA about what you want to do. You don't have permission for everything it all needs to be regularised. Has to be done properly. Are AE physically active on site?</p>
JT	<p>Only current physical work involves re-making grates. Have to scrape and level to reinstate previous conditions. It is likely that a further 5-6 weeks work onsite is required for 3 workers to finish the works required by the EA in terms of the surrounding ditch and surface of the compound.</p>
MO	<p>Once site is tidy we would need to make an application and have the site survey done to cover the new palisade fencing & lighting and any other changes which differ from approved plans.</p>
	<p>Can have a site meeting in 5/6 weeks.</p>
AS	<p>When will you tidy & regularise.</p>
JT	<p></p>
AS	<p>Maturity whether you walk away or do other things.</p>
JT	<p>Application beginning of March to open wells.</p>
AS	<p>It would be helpful to have a plan of where you think you are going over next 6 months.</p>
JT	<p>Mid March.</p>
SM	<p>County Elections coming up.</p>
AS	<p>There is no committee April & May. May be different Committee composition fr first meeting in June. New members will require training.</p>

AS	You've not said you have drilled side track. Is it your intention to say that
JT	If OGA gives a number for the side track, I will advise of that.
AS	I would you to be clear in an announcement that you have drilled a side track against the advice of the CPA.
IG	Why was decision made to carry on?
JT	We had already gone 30 ft, which is notifiable to the OGA, so decided to carry on.
IG	You knew you made mistake & carried on.
JT	Once we made the mistake we carried on, yes. You were not informed. Yes. We were using a milling head to remove the cement plug and were surprised we were able to drill as far as we did. We did not have a drilling head on the workover rig.
JD & PB	We are not going to admit that we misled the County Council.
AS	You did so without planning permission.
JT	[REDACTED]
AS	There are 2 different things: 1 You didn't have planning permission for the sidetrack, 2 Retrospective planning permission can be obtained to regularise unauthorised development, which may be appropriate in some circumstances. The public should have the opportunity to make representations on a planning application.
PB	If retrospective planning permission is to tidy things up I do not have a problem with this
	There was a discussion about the palisade fencing 2.2m in height green powder coated being in place. There was a discussion about lighting being in place but covered by condition. MO to meet with SM to run through all changes to ensure none are missed: possible site meeting.
AS	The site may have a significant future.

	The public should have the opportunity to comment and be involved.
IG	If you are going to have a side track with no planning permission that is a concern re: public perception.
JT	In 2 weeks, 3 rd March 2017 cited, maybe beforehand, AE will understand maturity, and therefore whether we will apply for retrospective permission or abandon. JD & PB confirmed a draft statement would be sent to Alan for agreement prior to issue: likely to be on 28 th February 2017, but could be later if their advisors delay in reporting.
AS	We do not want to mislead the public so you need to tell us ASAP.
JT	3 month application Scrape off topsoil etc 1 year to abandon the site
AS	Is it definitely the programme to remove off site without any other activity.
JT	 We are not testing we just want to log it Until you get sample i.e. is it water/oil ? 2 weeks left. Either going to be water/soil 
MO	Will attach suitable information and plans If not commercially viable won't be
IG	Mass production would still need side track ?
JT	Yes, we would require a directional horizontal sidetrack to maximise the yield from relevant oil reserve.
AS	Must address retrospective planning application for the side track
SM	When will you make a decision re: appraisal/production
JT	Would not do appraisals would either be production or abandon Other local interests and so would probably exchange information with partners and progress on that basis as the rock formation is very similar.
IG	Why did work start at 4pm – through night
JT	No 1 (X4) should have been brine but we found oil. The timing was

	due to failed equipment. There was confusion, as we said we were displacing fluid.
AS	We would ask for a weekly update to Ian & Sam, Mark Oldridge to supply via email.
MO	To do update – Mon/Tuesday