

ASHLEY HERMAN SUBMISSION TO SCC

When I met Brian Alexander, UKOG's PR Executive, he told me that they had chosen this site because it is "in the middle of nowhere."

Really?

The proposed site is located in the heart of a community which includes my farm and two others. All heritage listed buildings.

It also includes two Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities, comprising 85 homes, housing 340 people.

The perimeter of UKOG's activities will be 230 metres from my house and 115 metres from the site of our cancer awareness festival and retreats.

The nearest Gypsy home, belonging to Simon Doherty, is only 290 metres from the site. Yet he and his GRT community have not been properly consulted nor afforded a voice in this process.

The effects of UKOG's activities on us are described as "insignificant" in the Officers' Report.

But I beg to differ.

Over 370 people will be living, working and bringing up their families, within 450 metres of an oil well.

Soon, we could all be exposed to the 24-hour noise, odour, flares, air, light and water pollution and the risk of sour gas.

For at least three years.

Our cancer awareness enterprise runs throughout the year.

Involving health professionals ranging from oncologists to palliative care experts.

It hosts cancer sufferers and their families: over 1000 people last year.

It cannot exist next to an oil well and will have to cease. With the loss of two full-time and 42 part-time jobs.

Our craft brewery employs ten local people. It has abandoned plans for a water borehole because of the risk of contamination, increasing its reliance on Mains Water, at an extra cost of £15,000 this year alone.

We have raised these concerns repeatedly. But they have been batted away as 'insignificant'. That's why Tom and I wrote to you directly.

You **can** refuse this application.

Yes, the NPPF says that that "great weight should be placed upon the **need** for more oil and gas". But this **need has gone** as is evidenced by climate science, affirmed by UK Statute, international law, the Vatican and by the markets. Even BP have pulled the plug on further exploration.

Happily, the NPPF stresses the **over-riding need for you to promote sustainable development, by weighing “National economic benefit” against “local harm “.**

-3-

The permanent local harm caused by this application far outweighs any dubious National good.

Happily, too, your Surrey Minerals Plan advisory MC 14, states development will be permitted “only where a need has been demonstrated”. There isn’t one. And “if there are significant adverse impacts of mineral development on communities and the environment, permission should be refused.

Having undertaken to create a greener Surrey, as people of integrity, I am asking you, please, to consider our situation, vote with your conscience and refuse this application.

ASHLEY HERMAN
29 JUNE 2020

THATCHED HOUSE FARM

This page is intentionally left blank