

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [PL Planning Applications](#)  
**Subject:** Objection to Cuadrilla's planning application no WSCC/040/17/BA  
**Date:** 30 November 2017 23:55:37

---

NB Please withhold my name and other personal details from the public record of objections.

Please find below my objections to Cuadrilla's planning application no WSCC/040/17/BA at Lower Stumble Hydrocarbon Exploration Site, London Road, Balcombe, West Sussex, RH17 6JH

The financial standing and past performance of Cuadrilla (re breaches of planning and failure to meet its public engagement obligations) at Balcombe and other UK sites makes it an unsuitable applicant and should be sufficient for the County Council to refuse this application.

This Balcombe resident objects to the application because in addition to the above, the application is incomplete and inadequate – it does not give detail of the types and sizes of vehicles travelling through the village, nor does it address the risks of carrying hydrochloric acid and hazardous waste through the village. The application lacks a detailed Traffic Management Plan.

This Balcombe resident also objects to the application because the noise from the flare has not been included in the noise assessment – this makes the application incomplete and inadequate.

In addition, the top of the proposed flare is below the height of the village and the prevailing wind means that highly dangerous toxins will be carried straight over the village, bringing a risk of inhabitants and visitors breathing contaminated air and garden produce also being contaminated. There is similar risk to the health of livestock.

At 6.5.5 on page 23 of the planning statement it is stated that 'any air quality impacts associated with the proposed development will be negligible'. It is submitted by this objector that this statement is false, because no account has been taken of the likely impact on air quality from venting of material from the well and/or products from the flare.

This Balcombe resident also objects to the application because no independent baseline or operational period testing of air or water quality is proposed. However both are essential and should permission be granted, should be stipulated by WSCC and conducted on behalf of WSCC by an independent operator, with the results being made publicly available as soon as those results are obtained.

This Balcombe resident also objects to the application because page 13 of the planning statement references the possibility of the need for HGV movements outside of the working hours set out in the same document in the event of 'a borehole control situation where work needs to be undertaken urgently'. While the applicant raises this possibility, it fails to provide an emergency plan as part of the application. This makes the application incomplete and inadequate and provides another reason to reject the application.

The proximity of the site to human habitation, agricultural operations, major rail and road infrastructure makes an emergency plan incorporating an assessment of

local services (for example such as would be needed to cope with a blowout) an essential part of the application but none has been provided – further grounds for rejection of the application.

The application references a spill plan, pollution incident plan, and a pollution prevention plan but these are not included in the application, they should be included and their absence is another reason to reject the application.

The application is incomplete because section 11 re employees has not been completed by the applicant.

At 18 on the application form, the applicant has declared that the proposal does not involve the need to dispose of trade waste or effluent. This is incorrect and another basis for rejecting the application.

