National Infrastructure Consents Team,
Department of Energy and Climate Change,
2nd. Floor Kings Buildings,
3, Whitehall Place,
London.
SW1A 2AW

Dear Sir,

PREESALL UNDERGROUND GAS STORAGE FACILITY

With reference to your letter of the 8th. April, 2014.

I do not have any technical knowledge in respect of the storage of large amounts of gas at high pressure in salt caverns. However, I understand that the proposed storage facility would be quite close (circa 300 metres) to the surface. I have been informed that if granted permission this would be one of the shallowest (if not the shallowest) storage facilities in the U.K. This causes me concern in that leakage would be more likely to occur than if the facility were deeper underground.

Unlike a storage facility in steel spheres at ground level it will never be possible to physically inspect the caverns prior to commissioning. This in a facility where it is proposed to store 650,000 tonnes of gas at high pressure and with some 80,000 - 100,000 people living within a three mile radius.

Given the size of the local population evacuation would present a major logistical problem in the event of a large gas escape. This especially as on the west side of the River Wyre is the town of Fleetwood which is surrounded by water on three sides. On the east side of the River Wyre the main road is the A588. Whilst it is designated an 'A' road it is no more than a country lane along much of its length. In the event of a road accident severe congestion occurs. In the event of a major gas escape the situation would become impossible with residents trying to leave the area and emergency services trying to gain access.

In the Blackpool area 'Fracking' almost certainly caused two earthquakes. The earthquakes were small. However, their effect on caverns in salt deposits in which natural gas is stored at high pressure cannot be predicted.

This is the fourth planning application for gas storage since 2002. The first one was for some two million tonnes of natural gas. Whilst the present one is for 650,000 tonnes Halite would give no guarantee that if this application were successful it would not be followed by further application(s).
There must have been good reasons for the first three applications being rejected. I understand that was mainly because of uncertainty about the geology in the area. I have been advised that there have been few further detailed geological surveys and, therefore, the same doubts as to the safety of the scheme must exist.

I therefore urge D.E.C.C. to reject this application.

Yours faithfully,

Susan M. Tucker
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