


From: Broadford Bridge [<mailto:>   
Sent: 09 August 2017 08:33  
To: Jane Moseley  
Subject: Objections to WSCC/029/17/WC Woodbarn Farm, Adversane Lane, Broadford Bridge, Billingshurst, RH14 9ED

Morning Jane

I am writing to let you know that a small number of us - including Actors Sue Jameson and James Bolam - will be coming to County Hall this morning to present a giant postcard to WSCC council to register the objections of local residents to the KOGI/UKOG proposed extension to its drilling at Broadford Bridge.

I know you are familiar with the arguments, and you may have received some strange correspondence from UKOG's head of PR re some of our campaigners. I am attaching a rebuttal that we sent to County Councillors at the end of last month which will also explain the role of Broadford Bridge Action Group.

Meanwhile. we would welcome the chance to hand over the postcard we have had printed to you or one of your team as a photocall at around 1030.

Please let me know if that is possible or whether I should go through your press team.

Many thanks

Jane



# BROADFORD BRIDGE ACTION GROUP

31st July 2017

Dear Councillor,

We are writing as Broadford Bridge Action Group (BBAG) to address claims made in an email to you by UKOG's Media Relations Manager Brian Alexander (27<sup>th</sup> July 2017) and in a letter from UKOG CEO Stephen Sanderson (19<sup>th</sup> July 2017).

We appreciate you may be feeling swamped by correspondence so will keep this as brief as possible. However we believe it is important that you have a clear view about who we are and what our concerns are re: the KOG/UKOG oil drilling operation at Broadford Bridge.

BBAG is an alliance of local residents, mums, dads, grandparents, pensioners, City professionals, journalists, company directors, environmental experts, creatives, farmers, teachers, public service workers, planners, university lecturers and many others who want to ensure that the right questions are asked so that our countryside is not industrialised and our land, water and air quality is not put at undue risk.

We are not one person. You will have seen from the UKOG correspondence what happens to the very few who have put their names in the public domain – most of us are not prepared for that level of vilification. We seek to balance the debate which is being heavily driven by those who stand to benefit the most from the planning decisions. As local residents and WSCC taxpayers we want to know that our needs are being served.

We have held two packed public information meetings – inviting the company to sit on a platform both times with the experts they decry so that people can hear the facts and judge for themselves. They have declined. The chair of our public meeting in West Chiltington, who attended a UKOG site visit before the meeting, deliberately put the company's point of view across in the debate to ensure all points of view were on the table. She was thanked for her balance and fairness afterwards.

Our considered view – backed up by experts and workers in the industry – is that this site poses serious risks to the rural life of West Sussex and to the safety of our roads and that there is insufficient monitoring going on to be sure that our water, land and air will not be contaminated.

**Risk to water supply** – UKOG do not agree with the assessments by a variety of experts of the potential risks to water supply should chemicals used in acidisation seep into the water supply through geological faults in the Kimmeridge limestones. They have supplied other expertise from Envireau Water which refutes the level of risk. We do not believe the assessment of safety of our water supplies should rest with their experts. The expertise from the CPRE, Sussex Wildlife Trust and our other sources is valid and should be considered by planners. We do believe that the local authority should also conduct independent assessments so it can assure residents from its own knowledge base. In the absence of that independent assessment we have just engaged specialists in air and in water condition to



# BROADFORD BRIDGE ACTION GROUP

assess the risk. We have not come across a hydro-geologist who believes there is 'zero risk'.

**Monitoring** – in order to assess whether our water, air or land has been contaminated we need to know the baseline. We would expect Southern Water or the Environment Agency (EA) to conduct such monitoring above and below ground and in the local area - not just on site. We are only aware of UKOG doing its own surface monitoring and reporting that to the EA. We have therefore funded baseline monitoring to be undertaken by independent consultancies and will continue to conduct tests to be able to safeguard the local supplies. There is no such thing as 'zero risk' in this industry – we need to be alerted to any breach.

**Increased HGV and road traffic** - the company has confirmed in the letter to you that there is a 'very small' 'potential for a **large increase** in tankers'. They claim to be investigating possible alternatives, 'including pipeline and rail transport' but such alternatives would only be viable if there was an industrialisation of the process and, as far as we are aware, they are only planning on 8-10 weeks further work so HGV increases will be the only way to service the site in this time. Contaminated waste water will be driven along narrow roads to Kent, drilling mud wastes will be driven to Southern Water at Burgess Hill and unrefined oil will be driven to Fawley through the narrow junctions on the A29 in Pulborough. Pipelines would further damage the countryside and toxic waste is dangerous regardless of the form of transport used. The junction with the A29 at Adversane is already eroded and WSCC is liable for the repair bill.

**Acidisation** – the company draws attention to the use of potato starch in the drilling process but does not spell out the list of potentially toxic chemicals it has stated it plans to use in the flow testing. Some of the chemicals recently mentioned by UKOG are carcinogenic and toxic to invertebrates. It is this part of the process which poses potential danger and concerns us most. The EA will not be on site to assess and have to rely on self-regulation by UKOG to be aware of any issues. WSCC has responsibility for risk of contamination to land (and thereby water supply), water sources and a duty of care to us residents.

**Acid storage** – UKOG claim they will only store enough acid for a few days use – yet the application requests permission to store 50,000 litres of hydrochloric acid (3 x 100 barrel storage tanks are noted on their current plans compared to 94 barrels in their EA permit application). This appears excessive and we are concerned that this volume of chemicals will be driven on and off the site on our already unsuitable local roads. Keeping large amounts of acid on site may not conform to Condition 23 of their current planning permission which expressly prevents any hazardous materials being stored there.

**Emergency plan** – we continue to be concerned that the company appears to have scant knowledge or interest in emergency planning. It refers to 'Chichester' hospital as being one of the two nearest hospitals with A and E departments by which we assume St Richard's Hospital. That, and East Surrey Hospital at Redhill are a significant distance away. Residents living near the site should be made aware of what to do if there is a spill or major incident.



# BROADFORD BRIDGE ACTION GROUP

**Transparency**– we welcomed the idea of site visits but the majority of visits were not widely publicised and were held without enough notice or space on them for local residents to attend. Many were made up largely of parish councillors and their partners. We believe that the public needs to hear fair and accurate presentations of the facts in order to draw their own conclusions. We regret the fact that the consultation period for this extension to the planning permission is being during summer holidays which must be limiting participation.

**Legitimate protest** – the public have a right to make their views known and to be seen to be asking questions. Protestors have been respectful and sincere. A small number visited the UKOG's serviced offices in Guildford and two went to reception to request to meet company representatives. They were pleasant and polite throughout and left when asked without fuss. UKOG claim that the 'police were called' – they did not attend.

**Environmental Impact** – UKOG has now acknowledged there are 8 protected sites within 10k of the KOGI site (contrary to information in the permission it is operating under). Rather than assess the impact of its operation on these sites it has reduced the radius for measuring the impact risk to just 1km. Within the 1k radius there is an ancient and semi-natural woodland with irreplaceable, wildlife-rich habitat and breeding birds and bats will be affected both inside and outside of this radius.

**Planning extension excess**– According to the original timetable UKOG need 8-10 weeks to complete flow testing – why are they asking for 12 months? If they intend to work on site for another 12 months then they should make a fresh planning application in order to cover additional risks which arise in connection with the new activities they propose that were **not** part of the original plans submitted by Celtique Energie (Feb, 2013).

Thank you for your time. We hope that these balancing views are helpful in highlighting areas where we believe questions still need to be answered. We would be happy to discuss any issues further or provide any information needed from our experts in the field.\* Please contact us [action@broadfordbridgeaction.co.uk](mailto:action@broadfordbridgeaction.co.uk).

Yours Sincerely,

**BBAG**

**Broadford Bridge Action Group**

- *An A-Z explaining many of these issues in detail should have been sent to you. If you require hard or soft copies please let us know.*