

# Comment for planning application WSCC/045/20

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/045/20"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="Sara Reynolds"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="BARN MEADOW, 10, BARN MEADOW, HAYWARDS HEATH, RH17 6NQ"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>
Comments	<p>I strongly object to this application. This is an AONB and there is no place for heavy industry. Your reasons for rejecting this application stating it is not in the public interest and the residual (and diminishing) residual need for hydrocarbons can be met elsewhere, still stand. Please uphold your previous decision to deny this application. The damage and destruction to the local environment is unacceptable. The effect on the wildlife is extreme. When Cuadrilla were here in 2013 all the birds and bats disappeared and we had streams of dead fish. There are a number of protected species in the direct vicinity of the site including, dormice, crested newts, red kites, water vole, badgers and bats. It appears that the environmental report centres solely on concrete compound which is ridiculous. There is a stream 20m from the site which is used to take water from Ardingly reservoir to the river Ouse. This could easily be contaminated by surface run off from the site. The prevailing wind is towards the village and the proposed two flares (of which there is no indication of where they would be sited) will emit toxic fumes directly to the village which is an unacceptable risk to residents health. There is a strong risk of seismic activity as Balcombe has several fault lines. Activity at other sites in the Weald have been proven to cause earthquakes. We also have the viaduct and the Balcombe Tunnel (which is already in a delicate state) to consider. The Highways report is inaccurate and misses many important points. These are pointed out in the FFBRA objection and the traffic report from NoFIBs. The proposed traffic route takes the HGVs which are significantly larger than any normal HGV s that travel through the village takes them past the primary school. The pollution and detrimental effect on the air quality is a major cause for concern and means that the children would be unable to use their outside classrooms because of the threat to their health. There are also overhead cables and low tree branches that have caused these vehicles problems in the past. The damage to the trees in 2013 was extensive. There is also the possibility of an accident involving these HGVs carrying noxious sometimes even radioactive materials (NORMS) and the ensuing danger to residents. The risk of contamination of the aquifer is high and would effect the drinking water of hundreds of thousands of people. I believe you are in possession of the recent hydrology report which states Angus Energys understanding of the groundwater systems is woefully inadequate. Going on their past attempt this would appear to be true. Who would of thought they would hit" unexpected water" in an aquifer? Not Angus Energy apparently. The existing oil well has been found not to be sound, and adds to the risk of contamination of the groundwater systems and once poisoned this cannot be rectified. This is also NOT a temporary development it is a step towards long term production with all the ensuing upset, disruption and threats to our heath, safety, environment and sanity. The council should be working to reduce any further production of hydro carbons in light of the climate change emergency. Please REJECT this application.</p>
Received	<input type="text" value="28/09/2020 13:35:05"/>
Attachments	