

# Comment for planning application WSCC/045/20

Application number	WSCC/045/20
Name	steven daultrey
Address	GLENDALE, LONDON ROAD, LONDON ROAD, HAYWARDS HEATH, RH17 6HT
Type of Comment	Objection
Comments	<p>In addition to the self-evident and often published objections, which I entirely endorse and support, risk to water table, unsuitability of access through Balcombe village (particularly the school), polluting effect of flaring, to name but three, I wish to highlight the following: 1. Cuadrilla / Angus are straw companies whose sole purpose and business model is to "discover" oil or gas in sufficient apparently commercially viable quantities that they can sell or licence their rights in the land to an oil major who will then develop the site. Their balance sheets show, absent shareholder support, which the shareholders appear to have no legal duty to provide, in the event of an adverse event, there is no certainty that either would or could finance remedial action. As matters appear to stand, those costs would fall to WSCC / Government whose monies in these present Covid times, are being spent elsewhere. What are Cuadrilla's / Angus' contingency plans and how will they be financed? 2. To the best of my knowledge, neither company carry insurance covering disaster risk and this must be imposed as a condition precedent to any future planning permission which might be granted. Blackpool has suffered tremors but I do not recall Cuadrilla ever comforting affected residents by reference to insurance nor its plans in such an event. 3. In these present Covid times we see diverse opinions offered by scientists (often referred to as "the science") while it remains the case, worldwide, that "the science" is divided in relation to fracking, a process which both companies now purport not to be undertaking. The present application appears generic what, precisely, is comprised in the process of removing drilling fluids, what is the toxicity of these fluids, what secure processes are applied to the carriage of fluids and, again, what contingency plans (insurance?) do the companies have in place in the event of a "leak"? What are extended well tests, is this fracking in all but name or, perhaps, the Emperor wearing new clothes? 4. Scientists remain divided upon the effects of oil / gas exploration of the type proposed in Balcombe (and Blackpool) but while such uncertainty as to consequence remains it is utterly wrong to permit further work to be undertaken. In the 1950's in the Christmas Islands, scientists tested the atom bomb with observing soldiers protected by sand bags and coloured glass; years later, they all died a terrible cancerous death which was a directly attributable consequence of those tests. What legacy will be left to future generations by permitting works to be undertaken pursuant to this application and those which will surely / must follow? 5. It is presently the case that international oil prices are at their lowest for decades while, in the USA, significant numbers of "fracking" fields are closed and the operators insolvent; the costs of extraction are simply too high. In recent days, I have read, China, one of the world's leading carbon polluters, has announced an intent to be "environmentally clean" shedding its former stand on carbon pollution while, worldwide, cleaner alternative power sources are proceeding apace. Battery powered cars within decades, will replace petrol powered vehicles which, it has been suggested, will become illegal. What value then a small field of unspecified reserves in Balcombe? Pending determination of the Balcombe reserves Cuadrilla / Angus must undertake further tests the consequences of which are wholly uncertain but which, at several levels, will be detrimental to the residents of Balcombe and the surrounding area of outstanding natural beauty. 6. During recent years a number of oil majors have questioned the benefits of "fracking" or other similar processes dressed in new clothes, and there is no certainty that if these present planned and inevitable subsequent tests in Balcombe result in the identification of viable commercial quantities they will ever deliver any commercial sale; indeed, with present worldwide statements concerning carbon (see reference to China, above) , it might be said that such a sale is unlikely. With an eye to global warming, BP is openly promoting a green future business; to whom, therefore, will Cuadrilla /Angus sell the results of their polluting and environmentally damaging processes? What damage will remain at the site and what obligation do Cuadrilla / Angus have to rectify whatever damage, visible or non visible to the land? For the present, it might, justifiably, be said that Cuadrilla / Angus are chasing rainbows, during the past ten years the world's view on carbon emissions and global warming, to say nothing of the support of the UK Government under Prime Minister Cameron has changed beyond recognition while the potential of serious adverse consequence to the entire process remains. It is my submission that this present application must be refused.</p>
Received	27/09/2020 09:54:50
Attachments	