

Public speaking at SCC P & R Committee 27/11/20 – Chris Britton

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 continue to be 'airbrushed out' both in scale and significance; Ashley referred to the community with Protected Characteristics whose most recent petition represented 140 residents, including children, against this application. They have at no point been directly consulted by the County Council. In total some 400 people live within 500m of the site, to which will soon be added thousands more at Dunsfold Garden Village. They will all be blighted by noise and pollution above ground and the well directly beneath them. Alfold, Cranleigh and neighbouring parishes, totalling over 15,000 people, and Waverley Borough Council have all strongly objected - the opposition to this is deafening, yet the Officers Report dismisses all concerns of harm, preferring to trust the word of the applicant. Today, Councillors, you can change that! Your decision is on a matter of *balance*. Take traffic safety and sustainability; any layman visiting High Loxley Lane can picture the risks of HGVs (including abnormal loads) attempting to use this narrow lane. Yet the response by Officers has been dismissive. Over several months despite being given factual evidence exposing flaws in the applicant's plans for accessibility, and questioning the use of banksmen to control HGVs at the 4-arm blind junction at Pratts Corner, the Council still has not updated its 2018 Road Safety Audit. The blind bends on the B2130 will force HGVs into the path of oncoming traffic, but Officers say these bends 'can be safely negotiated'. They contend it's acceptable to put off traffic matters until later. Facts show this to be a false and unsound premise. This is not the first time the Council has been misled by UKOG. A Traffic Management Plan approved by SCC in October for the Horse Hill drill site, was flouted just days later when an Abnormal Load vehicle was photographed overriding verges, and grounding on a busy road without any traffic management - evidence you have seen yourselves. Your Policy MC15 requires you, members, to satisfy yourselves that the highway network is of an 'appropriate standard for use by the traffic generated by the development' and if deficient that you have 'proposals for suitable improvement', yet you have seen no firm proposals to mitigate these very real risks. Using 'banksmen' is completely different to previous proposals and should have been subject to a full Road Safety Audit and draft section 278. But for five months since first being mentioned, the Council has preferred taking the word of the applicant to undertaking proper due diligence. Members, you cannot take this gamble. You should refuse this application on the grounds of both Policy MC12 and MC15 because '*vehicular activity and vehicle routeing*' have *not* been properly addressed and there *will* be significant adverse impacts on 'highway safety, residential amenity, the environment and the effective operation of the highway network'. Today you can choose to preserve our rural community, or to permit a speculative and harmful venture, with no demonstrable benefit.

Thank You.

This page is intentionally left blank