

## ENVIRONMENT & HEALTH

I am concerned that the environmental impacts of this development have been under evaluated and that, even in the short term, let alone the long term, will create air, land and ecological contamination of my neighbourhood and damage to wildlife.

The hedgerows around this area are a popular nesting , foraging and sheltering site for a variety of species of birds and insects, bats and protected dormice and badgers. I am concerned about the long-term damage to these habitats for the main site and access road.

I am concerned that the surrounding soil and ditches beyond the site boundary will be polluted from overflow of chemicals, oil waste and other strata pollutants from the site in the event of road access accident, spill or flooding – particularly given the levels of rain flooding experienced this year . The amount of runoff from the bank below the St Georges site was prolific right down to the main road.

This will disturb local wildlife and I am not confident that the company has fully consulted with the appropriate local agencies and wildlife groups and there has been no badger study as far as I can see.

Despite claims to the contrary this whole plan will disturb local wildlife and the damage caused will never really be known or understood. Wildlife is diminishing as it is. We should keep these green corridors and not industrialise them.

The site will be visible from the ridge of the AONB and will destroy what is, or should be, a landscape delight. This is a popular hiker area and part of the Walk The Wight annual fundraising walking tour. There is enough industrialisation in this area as it stands and we should be preserving our green spaces not creating more dense industrialised landscapes without consideration to the implication for eco-tourism.

I am completely fed up with the constant demand from people who want to erode and ruin our peaceful enjoyment of the green environment and spaces for financial gain and nothing more . We need to keep our green spaces and not destroy them piecemeal. It is one of the main attractions of the island for inhabitants and tourists.

Time to stop the continued Industrialisation of the land between the quarry and the digester along the route of the Bembridge trail which is enjoyed by walkers on the IOW.

The remaining scenery and wildlife rich views across the area will be completely annihilated by this development . It is unthinkable that we should sit quietly and allow this to happen without any consideration to the residents of Arreton and Merstone.

There is currently no legislation for monitoring or maintenance of abandoned or decommissioned onshore well sites which number in their thousands including those already here. This will be our legacy for future generations of our Island. It is shameful.

I was told at the company community meeting that an Environmental Impact Assessment was not considered necessary and thankfully, planning officers demanded a full Environment Assessment. I am concerned that this may have set a precedent for all other assessment areas that they have classified in their application documentation as being low risk!

## TRAFFIC

It is not feasible to believe that the number of vehicle movements to the site will not put traffic at risk. Night or day, and whatever season. It's bad enough with the number of huge farm vehicles that have to access the biogas plant! I think it will make the very busy main road a nightmare and the traffic jams will cause even more air pollution.

The proposed routes to sites for HGV and other large industrial machinery bearing vehicles will produce nightmarish scenarios for traffic congestion and traffic jams on the main arterial roads from ports to the general area to service the site.

How will emergency service vehicles be able to access and serve the local residents competently if there is such an increase of daily traffic over such a long period and –God forbid- if there was a major accident involving any of the HGVs en route to the site?

Island Roads has already rejected the application on the grounds of inadequate design and inadequate reporting of traffic volume and potential risk. There is already concern about volumes of traffic and the amount of pollution . This is not the place for more industrial sites.

## GEOLOGY

The island's geology is very fragile. The company stated in its booklet that there will be no earthquakes through drilling despite the Newdigate Swarm, close to Horse Hill. The British Geological Survey confirms this - unsurprising since the last time financial figures were produced, the BGS's annual report showed 29% of the organisation's funds came from fossil fuel companies. Can we expect this to be an independent opinion and can we trust that it won't happen here?

There is too much uncertainty about the stability of the geology on the Island, with frequent small movements causing landslips and leading to unstable coastal falls. How can we consider even further risks by the possibility of multiple wells being drilled on the island? There is no BGS monitoring equipment here either.

I am not convinced that the industry's statement about conventional drilling is bona fide. I have researched some of their other site activity and this has not been without criticism at both agency level and community level. How will we monitor this?

There is no BGS active monitoring station on the IOW, it should be requested as a condition of this application being accepted, that the company should pay for BGS monitoring station to be set up for monitoring around and beyond Arreton in case there should be any earthquakes

### **ECONOMY, SUSTAINABILITY AND VIABILITY**

Planning Officers should demand a substantial warranty bond ADVANCE PAYMENT from the company for the punctual and full restoration of sites if uneconomical, to prevent the two years delay of restoration as happened at their site in Markwells Wood.

I am concerned that, due to inadequate funding, the IWC planning and enforcement authority, will struggle to deal with appropriate and efficient monitoring of oil and gas extraction on the island and the enforcement of any mitigation suggestions by UKOG in its planning application. Who will check them when they are self regulating?

There has been no convincing, independent case made for the existence of more easily recoverable hydrocarbons on the island since the 1980s and the most recent BGS survey insists that there is very little evidence of economic quantities of oil here without using extreme extraction methods which has caused so many environmental onshore impacts so far. This is not a viable or beneficial or even sustainable application

This company is seeking "permission creep" by claiming that it will only be an exploration well over 3 years, when in reality they must be hoping to be able to go to full production and expand well sites and wells over a 25 year period of the licence. They need to go to production – no matter how small the quantity of oil. How can they possibly claim that this will be a temporary activity and therefore attempt to minimise the obvious cumulative environmental impact of the industry on our island?

It was very obvious from my discussion at the Public Meeting in December that claims about firm environmental protection concerns were very much secondary to their perceived need to ship more oil off the island for important items such as rulers for schools and headsets and containers for yoghurt! It was embarrassing really and did not inspire confidence or credibility.

Property Agencies have a section in their documentation regarding the proximity of properties to within a 4km range of oil and gas sites. I am concerned that having a well pad so close to my property will have a detrimental impact on my property value if oil wells are within this distance.

### **AIR POLLUTION AND EMISSIONS**

I read recently a report that Hydrogen Sulphide release is a by product of oil and gas drilling. Levels of the gas have been recorded from Horse Hill in Surrey. This is a very toxic gas and could be carried from the site by the usual south and south westerly wind direction to residences, the school and farms.

The Company's Environmental Document for Arreton says that they did not do any base line air pollution monitoring for their report! Surely IWC should ensure that this is independently assessed prior to the developing the site so that the baseline is recorded and levels of increased pollution can be monitored against it.

It has been agreed by the UK and majority of informed nations that we have enough fossil fuels to transition to renewable if we act now. We also know we cannot meet our decarbonisation targets by 2030 if we burn more than 30% of fossil fuels that already. We do not need this well or the oil in it!

How can this application satisfy the Government strategy and NPPF statements to retain UK oil for UK oil security when the UK is still exporting millions of tonnes of UK oil to East Asia and Europe and then are having to import oil?

We should not be permitting new industrial sites that will pump even more emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> rather than working to reduce our carbon emissions. We should act locally to prevent further polluting industry to support the reduction of national levels of emissions.

The MPA should reject this industrial application on the basis of prospective cumulative increased emissions and the need to phase out fossil fuels as agreed by the majority of countries across the globe due to the climate emergency that this Council acknowledges.