

Comment for planning application WSCC/045/20

Application number

Name

Address

Type of Comment

Comments

This proposed development, like the previous application, is 'not in the public interest' and 'not appropriate to the area', in the words of the WSCC planners following Angus Energy's last attempt to secure planning permission for Balcombe. Balcombe remains in an AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY. At a time in England when the devastation of CLIMATE CHANGE is queuing behind the calamity of Brexit and the crisis of Covid19, another oil well is simply wrong. Renewables are ever cheaper. Getting rid of fossil fuels is urgent, a national obligation. This oil site has no place in modern England. Angus Energy operating this site in Balcombe for one year would establish an INDUSTRIAL PRESENCE here and make it difficult for the council to refuse later stages of development at the site. The presence of the Conoco well (abandoned in the 80s) is irrelevant in his respect. The site has been used in the interim for forestry purposes. We the public do not want it. Balcombe village has voted three time to reject this development. IT IS NOT IN THE INTERESTS OF LOCAL PEOPLE or of the people of England. Quite the contrary. Ask them about those 'UP-TO' JOBS they promise. They seem unlikely. What jobs? Where? Lorry drivers? Security staff? Office staff? I should be very surprised if any local people were employed at the site. This application wastes the time of all of us. Angus Energy must be aware that it is unlikely that the Balcombe well will yield oil at commercial rate and in commercial quantity. The application in my opinion is A SHOT OF TRANQUILLISER FOR ANGUS' SHAREHOLDERS rather than a serious contention that the site can operate successfully. In the SAME GEOLOGICAL FORMATION in nearby Brockham, Angus Energy have declared that they CANNOT OPERATE WITHOUT STIMULATION. Stimulation means fracking or acid fracturing. As ever, Angus claim in this application that they would use an 'acid wash', the first step in the acidising journey from wash through matrix to acid frack, all too loosely defined. They appear to seek to minimise potential impact and downplay their apparent intentions. As before, the 14m-high FLARE constitutes an air pollution risk to local people, especially given the lie of the land, the site being below and upwind (prevailing wind) of the village centre with any pollution being funnelled along the valley towards the village. The top of the flare is roughly the height of the centre of the village, as the site lies in a dip. Especially if flare operation at sub-ideal efficiency, the flare will deliver noxious, potentially cancer-inducing pollution right into the village, with care homes and a nursery in direct line of fumes. AIR QUALITY is not 'controlled by environmental permits'! The flare would be noisy (like a jet engine) and we would also be DISTURBED BY NOISE of other machinery on site, as well as additional traffic. Bats and other WILDLIFE would be disturbed by both noise and light pollution. There is ancient woodland nearby, home to bat colonies. The impacts will not be 'minor averse', they will be seriously averse. Work is often planned SEVEN DAYS A WEEK, 24 HOURS PER DAY. Judged in MENTAL HEALTH terms alone, in terms of SOCIAL STRIFE AND COHESION, the effects of this proposal are huge. Up to 16 two-way TRAFFIC MOVEMENTS per day is also huge on a B road past the village school and past the many houses along the London Road. Angus Energy have a history of BREAKING THE TERMS of traffic management and behaviour. We know from experience that this traffic is obtrusive, dangerous and polluting in the context of our village.

Received

Attachments