

As a local resident living 900m east of the site, I wish to represent the huge number of local people directly threatened by the oil well's impact whose voices have been 'airbrushed out' both in scale and significance; Ashley referred to the community of some 370 people living within 500m of the site, mainly to the east, with hundreds more moving into Dunsfold Park, under construction a further 100m away. Alfold, Cranleigh and neighbouring parishes, totalling over 15,000 people, and Waverley Borough Council have all objected - the opposition to this is deafening, yet so far has fallen on deaf ears. Today, Councillors, you can change that! Your decision is on a matter of *balance*. The government has *not* told you 'you must have an oil well at this location'. You have to balance benefit against harm, and not simply dismiss local concerns as 'not significant'. Let's take Traffic Safety and sustainability: the section of A281 and B2130 approaching the site has an above-average accident rate, with recent fatalities – a fact not disputed by Officers – yet concerns are dismissed. Surely an inherently dangerous road is a dangerous road? This sole route into and out of the site, will be used by tankers, long low-loaders and Abnormal Loads. They will cross road centrelines on three blind bends and some are too wide to fit on the single track country lane approaching the site. Today's last minute Update shows this is a complex proposal and suggests a section 278 agreement. But you should have expected to see full details of this solution and a workable and safe traffic management scheme; you have not. There remains serious concern that the largest vehicles *will* ground on the acute profile at Pratt's Corner, and some vehicles *are* too wide for the lane. We all need the chance to correct errors that the Update contains. Officers told our Local Councillor that traffic control by a 'banksman' at the end of High Loxley Road would replace the previous traffic signal solution; there is no mention in the Update. This is a vital safety issue. Members, you cannot gamble on approving this application without full clarity that policy MC15 is satisfied. Secondly, the

local community hugely values its right to enjoyment and amenity of the AONB and AGLV countryside. Noise, light pollution, and odours cannot be lightly dismissed. Views of the 37m high rig from Hascombe Hill and by users of Bridleway 280 immediately adjacent, are said 'not have an unacceptable impact'. I have yet to find a single local individual that agrees. Thirdly, crucially, a key plank of NPPF is economic sustainability; you have heard from Tom and Ashley the real, quantifiable costs to their businesses. So, Councillors have you found any *quantifiable benefits* of this application? The answer is No, *because, Councillors, there are none* in this 3-year exploratory proposal! Under NPPF Clause 183, this risk is *not* 'acceptable use of the land'. You have an historic choice to make; to preserve the lives and livelihoods of our rural community, or to permit a speculative venture, risking lives on our roads, harming our environment and with zero benefit. The genie will be out of the bottle and history will be your judge.

Thank You.

536 words