Consultation on the proposed mine water treatment schemes in Nenthead and Nentsberry

Summary of the consultation responses received in response to the short-list of potential sites, July 2017

Introduction

This report provides a summary of the individual consultation responses received for the public consultation on the short list of potential sites to treat mine water discharges from the adits or levels serving the mine workings at Caplecleugh (Nenthead) and Nent Haggs (Nentsberry).

The consultation period ran from 6th July to 21st July 2017. It started with two public ‘drop in’ style events, held on Thursday 6th July and Friday 7th July 2017 at Nentsberry Village Hall, which ran from 8 am until 9 pm on both days. The events were staffed by personnel from both the Coal Authority and the Environment Agency, with comments and attendance recorded by Wilson Sherriff. Wilson Sherriff are the independent facilitation and engagement specialists engaged by the Coal Authority to support the consultation activities for the proposed mine water treatment schemes in Nenthead and Nentsberry.

Formal feedback forms were available to complete during the event or return via post or email. The consultation feedback form was also made available on-line. 38 responses were received to the consultation. Of these, 27 were submitted during the public drop-in sessions and 11 were submitted via email.

The public were also encouraged to provide additional observations, suggestions and to share their views. These comments were captured on post-it notes that were left on display on flip charts for the duration of the two drop in sessions.

All of the responses below are reproduced “verbatim” from whichever source they were received through.

92 people attended the drop in sessions over the two days, of these, some people attended both sessions. The majority of people (66%) had attended previous events, however for 31 people (33%), attendance at the July event was their first experience of attending one of the public events.
Consultation Responses

This summary of responses for Nent Haggs and Caplecleugh includes the information from feedback forms received at the public drop in sessions or submitted during the consultation period as well as any points that were captured on post its.

1. Which site is your preferred option for further investigation for Nent Haggs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site A</th>
<th>Site B</th>
<th>Site C</th>
<th>None of the sites</th>
<th>No preference given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments on the Individual Sites for Nent Haggs:

These comments include those submitted on the feedback forms, as well as those captured on post-it notes during the public drop in sessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nent Haggs</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A (Site 4) | - Too close to Isaac’s Tea Trail;  
- On Isaac’s Tea Trail – disadvantage;  
- If the EA/CA have to construct a mine water scheme here and subject to the successful abatement of hydrogen sulphide gas (i.e. zero emissions at the site boundary), then Site A, at first reveal seems a decent location away from homes and set away from the A689.  
- Probably the least overlooked site. Good access to river. My preference.  
- This is the most appropriate site impacting on fewer people and lower, therefore easier to pump water to.  
- Best option from Haggs – less intrusion – discharge direct into river; best access; discrete from main road – will have less impact on tourism.  
- None of these sites are a reasonable choice. All too close to houses.  
- Possible.  
- This would be my preferred option. Least impact on residents, tourists and the landscape.  
- Furthest away from property. Away from A689. Not visible from road or surrounding elevations. First impressions make this site the most suitable of the three.  
- I can honestly see very little in difference between any of the sites. So no preference, footpaths should be maintained or suitably diverted. Visual impact should be reduced by planting trees and using in-keeping boundary fencing/walling.  
- Probably the best on balance.  
- My preferred option on balance. Less proximate to larger numbers of dwellings.  
- I think this is my preferred site. Closer to river and away from the main road. |
• Least visual impact for most tourists.
• Appears to be the better site with regard to further proximity to dwellings. Concerns around flood plain and dredging; concerns for wildlife.
• (+) Furthest away from houses. Only 1 (Lovelady Shield Hotel) about 500m away and 2 others further down wind. There are 3 others nearby but usually upwind of the site. Even further downwind, there is mainly empty fell. (+) Discharges direct to River Nent – minimal H2S release. (+) In spite of the longer pipeline (compared with B and C), the pumping costs will be minimal since the site is actually below the Haggs mine adit. The water may even flow naturally without pumping if the pipe is large enough. There is also no need for a return pipe. (+) Easy access from the B6294, suitable for heavy vehicles and frequent traffic.
• Is farthest from habitation and prevailing winds should not impact those nearest should there be any odour. Shape is immaterial. It is not a natural scene and the public should remain aware – too ‘natural’ and they could forget or not realise the potential hazard.
• Furthest from habitation, but considerable visual impact.
• Most isolated, greatest distance to property from boundary and centre of the three sites.
• Subject to the successful abatement of hydrogen sulphide, this site is located further away from residential properties and would have less impact.
• This site is well away from properties so will have least impact on individuals and local community.
• Furthest away from properties.
• In terms of disruption to the area and traffic flow over the period of construction, Haggs A (4) would appear the best option for two reasons; firstly, the site appears flatter and so possibly would mean less levelling out for the ponds and as it is not on a main arterial route, there would be less disruption to local and through traffic. Pumping costs for Haggs A (4) appear most favourable, because of the downhill siting, but access is slightly worse than for B and C. In terms of visual impact, this site would have the least impact as it is not on a main arterial route through the AONB and is below the level of the road.

Comments made on post-its in drop in sessions:
• This does flood and the road wall next to the site might need reinforcing because of Nent Force Level which is beneath the site.
• Looks good – the sooner the better
• Least impact on our environment.
• Prefer this site - the whole Tyne waiting for you to get on with cleaning up these poisons.
• Please consider the footpath. Would welcome a scheme here if the footpath could be improved.
• Best of the 3 Haggs options. Lower, if any pumping costs; access is off a main road, but higher capital cost because of the longer distance from the adit.
• Appears to be the better site with regard to proximity to dwellings. Concerns would be around flood plains and dredging, concerns for wildlife and any smell that would affect the hotel – any toxicity on farming land.
• Good access and discharge directly to river.
• Least impact on people and tourism
• This site is more suitable as furthest away from properties.
• Isaac’s Tea Trail – can you enhance/help at any of the sites (e.g. Site 4 Haggs)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B (Site 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Too close to caravans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If the EA/CA have to construct a mine water scheme here and subject to the successful abatement of hydrogen sulphide gas (i.e. zero emissions at the site boundary) – but this site is close to a caravan park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work would need to be done for access to site. Would impact on a higher number of people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Very close to caravan park and hotel. There is likely to be opposition to this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This site is next to Hudgill Holiday Camp and therefore inappropriate. It would impact on tourism, a major source of income in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• By main road, by campsite, by too many dwellings – impact on tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• None of these sites are a reasonable choice. All too close to houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Very close to large caravan site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I can honestly see very little in difference between any of the sites. So no preference, footpaths should be maintained or suitably diverted. Visual impact should be reduced by planting trees and using in-keeping boundary fencing/walling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Next to caravan site – big source of over-adventurous children and possible vandalism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Too close to caravan site with associated health and safety concerns about youngsters with time on their hands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accidents at the intersection and that stretch of road are fairly common. Easy access for contractors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Although close to Nenthall and Caravan site, this looks the preferred site as there are lots of trees already on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Very close to Hudgill mine entrance which is proposed as a SSSI (Underground).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No – too close to dwellings. A lot of opposition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• (-) Too near houses. There are 4+ Nenthall Hotel down wind, and 2 + caravan site (100 caravans) usually up-wind (but, in Summer, when odours are more likely to be a problem, also often down-wind). There are several other properties further down-wind. (-) Discharges to Hudgill Burn – H₂S odours downstream more likely than in A (would directly affect Lovelady Shield Hotel and nearby farm). This problem could be alleviated by a return pipe to the Nent at Haggs (or Nent Bridge). (-) Moderate pipeline length and pumping costs – the site is only slightly higher than the Haggs adit. (-) Poor access from narrow Galligill/Hayring Road for heavy vehicles. Widening needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Too close to habitation and in line of prevailing winds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Close to habitation – caravan site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Too close to habitation (Caravan site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pumping costs for Haggs B (9) are dependent on where the ponds are sited. In terms of visual impact, this is off any main route, but could possibly impact on the nearby caravan site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments made on post-its in drop in sessions:

• Not here. Hudgill ➔ too much going on, hotels, caravan site, homes and river activity.
| **C (Site 16)** | **Looks almost natural. From road could pass for a natural feature.**  
| | **If the EA/CA have to construct a mine water scheme here and subject to the successful abatement of hydrogen sulphide gas (i.e. zero emissions at the site boundary) – Site C is at least located not near several homes or a hamlet.**  
| | **Not really familiar with this site.**  
| | **It is worrying that this site is also being proposed for Caplecleugh and using it for both brings back problems of sight and prominence. It is in full view and therefore more noticeable.**  
| | **By main road, therefore high impact. Seen from across valley, several adjacent dwellings – impact on tourism.**  
| | **None of these sites are a reasonable choice. All too close to houses.**  
| | **No.**  
| | **Would have huge visual impact on Nent Valley – especially if combined with ‘D’**  
| | **Not suitable. Too close to A689. Site occupies exposed position, visible from many surrounding properties.**  
| | **I can honestly see very little in difference between any of the sites. So no preference, footpaths should be maintained or suitably diverted. Visual impact should be reduced by planting trees and using in-keeping boundary fencing/walling.**  
| | **May be too far away – therefore too much pumping.**  
| | **Higher energy use because of pumping.**  
| | **Works well with Site D and using one site would possibly be least obstructive. Could access be from the other road?**  
| | **Mineral vein under the site with mine workings – adit runs west from river bank.**  
| | **Far too close to Nenthead village.**  
| | **No – too close to dwellings. A lot of opposition.**  
| | **(-) Too near houses: There are 3 houses, and within 1000m, most of Nenthead village is also down-wind. There are 6 houses nearby up-wind. (-) Discharges into Grassfield Burn – very low flow (often dry in summer). H₂S odours more likely than in A and could affect 4 properties further downstream. As in B, this problem could be alleviated by return pipe to the Nent at Haggs/Grassfields bridge. (+/-) Shortest pipeline length, but highest pumping cost of three, due to height difference. (+/-) Possible capital/servicing costs might be reduced by combining with Caplecleugh D (16) on this site, but visual impact of the large combined scheme would then be unacceptable. (+) No access problems from A689 for heavy vehicles. Bridge over ditch needed.**  
| | **Too close to habitation and in line of prevailing winds. High visibility.**  
| | **Is the furthest from houses and out of site from the main road, hope you can stop the smell.** |
• Too close to Grassfield Farm house. Possible impact of outflow into very small stream with inadequate provision for increase in flow if high rainfall. SMELL IMPACT on area.
• Too close to habitation.
• Second choice as it is located further away from residential properties.
• This site is not suitable. Consists of highly visible mowing/grazing land with a greater ecological value than the site proposed in April 2016. Grassfield is a fairly steep, sloping site which will need a great deal of earth shifting to create the ponds etc. and will fundamentally change the characteristics of an area classed as a AONB. This desecration will be extremely visible to passing cyclists/motorists on the A road, residents and walkers on the existing footpath through the site. In addition, pumping the water uphill and then back to a watercourse is a permanent ongoing cost and something else to go wrong. The lack of positives for this site suggest that the only reason it is available is because of an absent landowner. We moved to the area 5-6 years ago to live in the open countryside, not next door to a mine water treatment plant with smells, midges and mosquitoes.
• Although it is noted that there is greater flood risk at Haggs A (4), the water coming off the fell at Haggs C (16) can be unpredictable and changes to the landscape could impact not just on the ponds, but on nearby buildings i.e. when water runs down the road to Nentsberry, and has caused minor flooding of bunkhouse and old chapel in the past.
• This site is on the main arterial route, so disruption to local and through traffic could be considerable during construction, as could access through a gateway just below the top of a blind summit where traffic speeds up, having just left the 30 mile per hour restriction. The slope of the site would suggest the need for more digging out and consequently more removal or levelling of earth, causing disruption and possibly some noise and air pollution for neighbouring houses; together with disturbance/displacement of wildlife and rodents, to adjoining land and properties. Pumping costs are dependent on where the ponds are sited, and if as suggested at the consultation, the ponds are moved further away up the fell away from housing, the points shown on the site evaluation criteria would need adjusting downwards to reflect the increased cost. In terms of visual impact, this site is highly visible wherever placed on site, not only to the surrounding or adjacent properties, but because of height and geographical position, it can be seen from many hillsides, roadways and tracks in the environ. The sloping site and topography would be irreversibly altered in this sensitive area. This would be at the expense of the view of inbye land up the fell, which has developed over many centuries as well as the loss of grazing mowing land.

Comments made on post-its in drop in sessions:

• More visible than others. Too close to properties. May be re-site ponds in other fields on this site.
• Not Site 16 – natural springs supply water to properties – too close to residences.
• Too close to properties and discharge streams through other owned land. Too close to the road – unsightly.
• Concern re: water vole populations in the streams where water is discharged to. Could it have a negative impact.
• No because of locality to properties, caravan park and hotel.
2. Which site is your preferred option for further investigation for Caplecleugh?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site D</th>
<th>Site E</th>
<th>Site F</th>
<th>None of the sites</th>
<th>No preference given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments on the individual sites for Caplecleugh:

These comments include those submitted on the feedback forms, as well as those captured on post-it notes during the public drop in sessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caplecleugh</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| D (Site 16) | • Favoured site with proviso that i) active treatment has a smaller footprint; ii) no evidence of effectiveness in the context of the Tyne catchment.  
• Too close to road  
• Too close to village.  
• It is worrying that this site is also being proposed for Haggs and using it for both brings back problems of sight and prominence. It is in full view and therefore more noticeable.  
• Too near main road, high impact. Seen from across other side of the valley, several adjacent buildings – impact on tourism.  
• (+) easy access; (-) too close to houses.  
• No.  
• Although none of the three sites affect me, I feel that they will affect some Nenthead residents.  
• Would have huge visual impact on Nent Valley – especially if doubled up with Site ‘C’  
• Not suitable.  
• Probably best – good access for construction and maintenance. Preferred.  
• My preferred option on balance.  
• Good to merge both sites.  
• Rough pastures area – less impact. Mineral vein runs under the site – with adit.  
• No – too close to dwellings. Flooding already across road – not appropriate so close to cemetery.  
• (-) Too near houses: 3 houses and, within less than 1000m, most of Nenthead village is also down-wind; 6 houses nearby upwind. (+) Lowest of the three sites – probably the lowest pumping costs. (+) As for Haggs C, no access problems from A689.  
• Too close to habitation and in line of prevailing winds. Too high visibility.  
• Too many ponds/pumps etc. concentrated in one area close to Grassfield Farm and Foulard. Smell of H₂S.  
• Too close to habitation  
• Probably the least amount of engineering and pumping.  
• This site is not suitable. Consists of highly visible mowing/grazing land with a greater ecological value than the site proposed in April 2016. Grassfield is a fairly steep, sloping site which will need a great deal of earth shifting to create the ponds etc. and will fundamentally change the characteristics of an area |
classed as a AONB. This desecration will be extremely visible to passing cyclists/motorists on the A road, residents and walkers on the existing footpath through the site. In addition, pumping the water uphill and then back to a watercourse is a permanent ongoing cost and something else to go wrong. The lack of positives for this site suggest that the only reason it is available is because of an absent landowner. We moved to the area 5-6 years ago to live in the open countryside, not next door to a mine water treatment plant with smells, midges and mosquitoes.

- This is on the main arterial route from Alston to Weardale, and as such in the day is busy, not just with local traffic but large lorries, coaches and other commercial vehicles. This site is the most sensitive ecologically.

**Comments made on post-its in drop in sessions:**

- Seems to be the least intrusive and least environmentally sensitive/impactful.
- Covers both sites/near main road – needs to be east of site to avoid proximity to residential
- NOT this site – Too close to dwelling and natural springs supplying homes. Effects on privacy and the smell! No guarantees.
- No to this site - it is too close to dwellings and the cemetery.
- No because of locality to properties, caravan park and hotel.
- How is Site 16 affected if the same site is chosen for Haggs?
- Site 16 and Site 43 – both good choices. Least invasive (impact on community, e.g. Hotels, caravans, homes, local revenue and tourism). Accessible; safest on roads.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E (Site 24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Impact on public right of way;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Possible, but slightly too close to people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Access is poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- This is again close to residents and traffic during construction would create difficulties. It would have a huge visual impact and if problems do arise, would affect lots of people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Poor access at either end of road (Nenthall and Nenthead) – normally quiet road with holiday cottages – impact on tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No advantages to this site. (-) Ridiculous access along a single lane road. Too close to houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- All three sites involve major costs in pumping up to the required head. Also there are major problems in acquiring the land and permissions to run the connecting pipe work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Access very difficult – close proximity to housing and farming areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Not suitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Poorer access for construction? Perhaps more visible too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Poor access for construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Concerned about the pipe laying and disruption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mine workings at depth below the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No – too close to dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- (-) Too near 6 houses, all but one down-wind. The whole northern area of the village is also less than 1000 m down-wind. (-) Long, steep, narrow access route</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from Nent Hall corner. Shorter route from Nenthead unsuitable for heavy vehicles. (-) Frequent heavy vehicle access would cause problems on this single-track road.
- A possibility, but certainly not preferred.
- Possible visual impact.
- Too close to habitation.
- Access to this site is not easy, especially near the proposed site.

Comments made on post-its in drop in sessions:
- No to this site - too close to dwellings and the cemetery.
- No to this site – locality to housing.
- Access is dreadful. It’s bad at both ends. Wouldn’t get lorries through and there is a bad bend over Gudham Gill. NW end is single track, sharp bend.
- Designations re 24 are a concern. But preferred site re locality to people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F (Site 43)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Impact on ground nesting birds and active blanket bog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Away from people, but need to look at protection of any local species on that moor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preferred site of those offered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• From point of view of residents, this has minimal disruption and impacts on everyone the least. It is a long way to pump the water up, but a turbine could be put in for water after it is released to create electricity towards pumping costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Best option – away from dwellings. Less impact on tourism. Return water possibly through electricity turbine to pump water up to treatment site – or as community project – less impact on environment and sustainable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• (+) Best of a bad bunch, as it’s well away from houses. Reasonable access. If this site (43) is chosen, then I consider it absolutely essential that the pipeline does not go through the village, but follows the Carrshield Road via the A689.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The only site worth thinking about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If you are prepared to accept the costs of pumping the consider taking the ponds further up the feel and accept a greater cost! The benefit being “out of sight, out of mind.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preferred site – for same reasons as above i.e. impact on area is the lowest and easy access from Allendale Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Furthest away from properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would take open moorland. Also altitude would necessitate much energy intensive pumping. Most visible too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Less environmentally sensitive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preferred site – more out of the way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Best site away from houses and out of sight, except for grouse shooting parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would be very noticeable to most visitors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Best of bad choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This looks like the ideal site – couldn’t you just have one site and put it all there? Could offer to provide a better bird habitat for the estate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • (+) Easily the furthest from houses. There are none down-wind of this site (except Coalcleugh Farm and Sunniside a mile away over the hill in
Northumberland). The nearest houses will usually be up-wind of the site. (+/-) Relatively poor access from track, but this (CC) road could easily be improved at the top (tarmac?) for heavy vehicle access. Even frequent traffic to the site will cause no disturbance. (-) Longer pipeline than D or E, with potentially the highest pumping costs due to high flow and greatest height difference. However, pumping costs could be reduced by recovering energy from the return flow e.g. By also installing a turbine in the return line at the pumping station. The energy costs could then be little more than those due to friction losses in the two pipes.

- Farthest from habitation.
- This is the ONLY site suitable for the Caplecleugh mine, I still think this is a big waste of money. What is the village getting?
- Furthest from habitation.
- Most isolated, greatest distance to property from boundary and centre of the three sites.
- This is nearest to Nenthead mine and access is good via the ‘B’ road and track, wide enough to be made suitable for construction and maintenance lorries. In terms of the closeness to housing, this is the obvious site as there are no houses in the near vicinity and in terms of the degree of slope that the construction will have to encompass, this site would appear preferable.

**Comments made on post-its in drop in sessions:**

- Prefer this site – away from habitation
- Lack of disruption to residents, but issues with pumping water.
- Recommend Site 43
- I don’t think the chosen sites should be close to dwellings. So ideal site looks like No. 43 – could offer to create a better habitat for birds, which would appeal to the estate – for shooting.
- Any potential for doing a turbine to generate electricity for the scheme/community = highest site? Take advantage of the site.
- Access from SE corner might be better.
- Site 43 – least intrusive
- Site 43 looks good – away from people.
- Site 43 – SE area was a frog spawning area. Need to avoid it. Not sure trees would grow on the site.
- Designations re 43 are a concern. But preferred site re locality to people.
- Site 43 – but what are we getting out of this??
- Site 43 is most remote, but would need a lot of pumping (= high energy use)
- Site 16 and Site 43 – both good choices. Least invasive (impact on community, e.g. Hotels, caravans, homes, local revenue and tourism). Accessible; safest on roads.

**General Comments (From post-its)**

- Gravity feed flow rather than pumping.
- A pumping station would be ok in Site 38 (old site 4)
- How are you getting the pipework to the sites?
• B6294 to A689 ➔ this junction is notorious for accidents.
• Route of pipeline – need to think about how/where they cross watercourses because there is so much water. Old spring wells, no longer used, but the water continues to flow down the hill and across land.
• Discharge location needs to consider high flow conditions – some small tribs (near site 16 for example) cause flooding issues for properties. This should not be made worse.
• What about the impact on the river as a result of the chemicals used for dosing as part of the odour abatement?
• Brownley Hill water does go into Haggs mine!
• Russell Bulman, Geologist has written a book on all the lead veins of Nenthead – he was brought up here. Russell says that the water at Brownley Hill does not go into Haggs mine. As stated, my father, John Elliot was born at Hudgill Rigg and his father farmed there. They never had any ill health from water for all those years. Why worry now?
• Dredging checkweirs – condition of land after works completed.
• NWL old pipeline from Carrshield turn off to Fairhill corner on A road then heads N and W of trees close to footpath towards Hardedge = has two fire hydrants and cast iron pipes across Gilligill Burn – does CA know this?
• Ecology data – historic data re: Force Crag. Has /is Force Crag working?
• Unique ecology in the Nent as a result of the Nent mines.
• General – still disagree that anything needs doing.
• Tyne is one of the cleanest rivers in the country isn’t it? It used to be used for drinking water.
• Treating water underground?
• Showing the pipeline routed from discharge to sites would help visualise.
• Where will the pipes run?
• Speak to Chris Graham, Rights of Way Officer, Cumbria Council.
• Check weirs – movement of the river. Spring wells affected by the pipe line?
• Would you get reeds to grow at 1600ft height?
• Could any top soil be given to the community?
• Don’t cause more problems with the discharge.
• We are the guinea pigs – trials are happening here and we have to pay.
• Active schemes would be cheaper and are well established.
• How do we know that funding will be available in the long term?

General comments from detailed responses

Site Choice - I cannot recommend any of the sites as I do not agree with building these plants on fragmented sites with a high ongoing energy cost. I think the various outlets/adits should be combined into the Nent Force Level and treated in the large uninhabited areas near to Alston that you have refused to consider.

Local Benefits – A particular concern is highlighted is that, as a ‘massively expensive’ project, it does nothing for the local community. The community is increasingly reliant on tourism and other sources of income that are sensitive to environmental quality – even a
whiff of ‘rotten eggs’ could destroy businesses, halve property values and put people out of work (in an area where it’s already hard to find work). Concern that those who live in urban areas, with multiple options for employment, transport, schools etc. do not appreciate the challenge of living in a rural area. Also a view that there is general disquiet at the amount of money available for environmental or ‘heritage’ projects when projects that would really benefit the local community, such as flood protection, road improvements etc. can’t be funded due to ‘budget cuts.’

Odour control:

1) This is the ‘major concern for everyone.’ Tests at Force Crag report a reduction of 80% in H2S, leaving a residual of about 20% likely to be released into the atmosphere. Treatment in a reed bed may reduce this, but will reeds actually flourish in Nenthead? Frequently cited that there is no detectable odour outside the boundary of Force Crag, but this conflicts with evidence from local farmers and workers on the site who say they frequently ‘feel ill’ because of the smell when working there. Without relevant evidence, there is no confidence in assurances that there will be no problem with odour from the site. The Coal Authority’s extensive experience is almost exclusively for coal-mine water (which produces discoloration but not smells). Force Crag seems to be its only experience of treating metallic pollution and laboratory tests are no substitute for real, year-long ‘field’ experience.

2) Reading the report on odour and looking at the proposal to deal with this, obviously the further the site is from housing, the least chance of this proving to be an unacceptable consequence of the ponds. On these counts Haggs A (4) and Caplecleugh F (43) best fit this criterion.

3) Odour treatment is expensive – it will be too expensive to continue dosing indefinitely.

Mosquitoes and midges – Although at present, this has not proved a problem at Force Crag, all environs are different and certainly at some of the proposed sites these can already be a problem. Consideration must then be given to sites farthest away from housing. Animals are also affected by midges – sheep are around the suggested sites.

Justification for the project – It appears that the ‘official’ reason is to improve water quality under the EU Directive. However, there are clearly other questionable driving forces behind the project – and the EU Directive.

Waste Disposal – How will the waste dredged here be disposed of? It will have a high metallic content, so cannot be dumped at sea. Expensive processing will be needed, as surely it can’t be tipped on an infill site as that creates polluted land, which would seem to negate the whole environmental principle on which the scheme is based. It needs to be properly treated – probably expensively.

Effect on fish and fauna - We have been told that the main justification for the project is to ‘clean up’ the Tyne to increase the population of salmon and other fish. But reports from 2016 indicate that salmon populations on the Tyne are at record levels. Fauna and flora adapt to their environments and that is clearly what has happened here. Indeed, the SSSI
located below Foreshields was established to protect the ‘specially adapted’ species that have evolved to cope with the high levels of pollution.

3. Which event did you attend?

(Notes: 1) some people attended on both days, so their attendance is included on both days; 2) Not everybody attending an event completed a feedback form)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thursday 6th July</th>
<th>Friday 7th July</th>
<th>No Date Specified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How did you find out about this event?

Other:
- Email from the Coal Authority
- From Alston newsletter

5. How useful did you find the display materials?
Do you have any additional comments on the display materials?
- It would have been helpful to have maps to take away (of the proposed sites).
- No A4 maps available.
- Clear and informative.
- Materials give good information about chosen sites, but the process of elimination of other sites is non-existent.
- Perhaps more information needed on the benefits.
- If possible, would have liked more details of costs and benefits, as well as outcomes on similar sites.
- When you have chosen sites, can you work up several views of what it will look like i.e. from the road, from someone’s house, over the actual site.
- Informative; comprehensive.
- Much better. The larger pictures were easier to understand.
- Not clear about how Site 16 might be used for both sites.
- Useful to see the information boards and to be able to talk through with CA/residents.
- It would be great to have an educational tool/display boards on all sites.
- Clear and comprehensible. Does not address the issue of H2S production.
- The displays were fine, but did not address people’s main concern regarding the odour.

6. Please let us have any comments on the engagement process so far – is there anything we need to improve?
- I do believe your engagement process has been weak. Poor attempts at community engagement and your headings on letters/posters misleading and too simplistic. You could improve on it all, including proper meetings with Q&A session – definitely not drop ins.
- More transparency and honesty about evidence supporting likely efficacy of the schemes.
- Impressed that preferred options do seem to have taken community worries on board.
- If you continue with this, what are we (the people of Nenthead) going to get out of this? Our village hall needs updating and other areas need money as well. It might help you to get this through.
- I still don’t think you have addressed the option of using Hansom Mea or Perry’s Dam option. 1) Take the water from the two mine outfalls and new pump into Hansom Mea via a suitable filtration system. 2) purchased the hydro system and gift it to Nenthead village and let us manage the facility providing we get a percentage of the electrical power generation. You know it makes good sense!
- It’s been very haphazard – a lot of it appears lip service – however, in later stages there has been an improvement.
- People staffing event are first-class. Maybe you need to identify local ‘opinion formers’ and convince them first (some people hostile to anything of course).
- Your staff are very well-informed and communicative. Andy deserves special mention here for coolness under fire!
- Can you bring someone to talk to us that this has happened to, so we can hear their real opinion and the long term opinions they now have.
- You have not made the case for the project, either environmentally or financially. It is a waste of public money and a menace to the local community.
- Giving the community the opportunity to comment is laudable. However, you have not presented any credible evidence that the proposed odour abatement system actually works. Therefore, it is difficult to trust or have any confidence in your concern for anything other than getting this project up and running.
- People’s main concerns are the odour (H2S) and the landscaping. No solid reassurances have been given about these. It appears that you can’t give any.
- The present questionnaire and information display suffer from the same defects as those previously issues. They ask the questions you want to ask to provide data for your numerical evaluation procedures, but provide no information – or inadequate answers – to the questions uppermost in our minds. All of us are critically concerned about the possibility of the ‘delightfully fresh air’ of the area being polluted by H2S. We don’t really want a midge infestation around the proposed wetlands either. Neither of these issues is mentioned in the current display.
- Locals who have lived in the area for many years and mostly work in the area accept that if ‘an omelette must be made, eggs must be broken’ and the visual impact of the scheme may well be less than the environmentally-friendly wind turbines, but we would question how many eggs need to be broken. Folk that have moved to the area tend to have more sympathetic attitudes to environmental objectives and are more concerned about disturbance/impact on their quiet community. Your questionnaire and evaluation criteria tend to reflect these ‘suburban’ attitudes much better – those who designed it probably come from just this environment and have just the same concerns.
- While we question the whole basis for this project and have strongly opposed it at the various meetings, be assured that our animosity (at times) was not really directed at your staff. Please accept our apologies for any offence given to them in the heat of the moment. They all had a job to do and, in spite of the strong opposition, they nevertheless did it courteously and helpfully to the very best of their ability.

7. Post Code of respondees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post Code</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA9 3HX</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA9 3LF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA9 3LP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA9 3LT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA9 3LQ</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA9 3LZ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA9 3LW</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA9 3NA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA9 3NP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Code</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA9 3PE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA9 3PG</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA9 3PL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA9 3PS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA9 3PW</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA9 3RW</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL13 2SF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE46 3JW</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No post code provided</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>