

Comments

Rathlin Energy (UK) Limited-West Newton Wellsite (04/02/14 to 04/03/14)

Comment ID	RathlinEnergy_70
Response Date	04/03/14 23:19
Consultation Point	Views on the.... (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.3
Application Reference Number	

Please select which application you wish to make comments on Both

Only your comments and not your personal details will not appear on the Environment Agency public register and website.

Do you want confidentiality? Yes

Comment ID	RathlinEnergy_69
Response Date	04/03/14 23:00
Consultation Point	Views on the.... (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2
Application Reference Number	

Please select which application you wish to make comments on EPR/BB3001FT/A001

Only your comments and not your personal details will not appear on the Environment Agency public register and website.

Do you want confidentiality? No

Comments

Please provide your comments below.

Dear Madam or Sir at the Environment Agency, I tried to send this as an email but it bounced several times. However, I wish to comment on the planning application made by Rathlin Energy at the West Newton Wellsite, Fosham Road, Marton, Hull, HU11 5DA for exploring for oil and gas, Permit Number: EPR/BB3001FT/A001. I want to register an objection to this. The UK has signed up to the Climate Change Act 2008 which commits us to reducing our greenhouse gas emissions by 80% by 2050, based on a 1990 baseline. This is a legal obligation, and in my opinion, a moral one, if future generations are going to be able to cope with the climate chaos which will already happen because of the current CO2 levels, which have risen from about 280ppm in pre-industrial times to 400ppm today. The accepted 'safe' level of CO2 in the atmosphere is 350ppm, so anything which puts yet more fossil carbon into the atmosphere has to be wrong, immoral and should not be permitted by a civilised society. If we 'invest' in more exploration for oil and gas, and the exploration finds these materials in amounts which makes it cost effective for the company to extract them, then they will apply for an extraction licence and require permission for that. As I'm opposed to this, I see no sense in allowing them to explore. My second reason for objecting is that none of the gas extraction companies can absolutely promise to have no fugitive emissions of methane. Methane is a much more powerful greenhouse gas than CO2, over a 100 year timespan, about 23 times as powerful, but over a 20 year timespan, due to its half-life of 14 years, it's effect is somewhere between 70x and 130x that of CO2. We absolutely cannot have ANY methane leaks due to the aforementioned climate catastrophe waiting to impact on our children and grandchildren. Finally, I'm not convinced that aquifers will be adequately protected. The vertical bores go down through areas of saturated rock, which are often the source of fresh water for agriculture and livestock. Although the petrochemical companies do their best to put casings around the boreholes, these do have a statistical chance of breaking, and thus there's a chance that aquifers could be contaminated with whatever is being put down the well, or what comes up. Because of this, I do not support ANY drilling for oil or gas through water-bearing rocks. I ask you to reject this application.

Yours, John Cossham 129 Hull Road, York, YO10 3JU

Comment ID	RathlinEnergy_68
Response Date	04/03/14 21:55
Consultation Point	Views on the.... (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.3
Application Reference Number	

Please select which application you wish to make comments on Both

Only your comments and not your personal details will not appear on the Environment Agency public register and website.

Do you want confidentiality? Yes

Comment ID	RathlinEnergy_67
Response Date	04/03/14 21:35
Consultation Point	Views on the.... (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2

Application Reference Number

Please select which application you wish to make Both comments on

Only your comments and not your personal details will not appear on the Environment Agency public register and website.

Do you want confidentiality? No

Comments

Please provide your comments below.

The Cuadrilla drilling rig which triggered the earthquakes at Preese Hall near Blackpool released traces of radioactive radium, uranium and thorium in the flowback water coming back to the surface. The level of radium in the water coming up from their well was more than 90 times higher than the level found in natural drinking water. Radium is a radionuclide formed by the decay of uranium and thorium and occurs at low levels in virtually all rock, soil, water, plants, and animals. Long-term exposure to radium increases the risk of developing diseases. Inhaled or ingested radium increases the risk of lymphoma, bone cancer and blood diseases like leukaemia and aplastic anaemia. External exposure to gamma rays from radium increases the risk of cancer in all tissues and organs. Cuadrilla shut down the Preese Hall site in December. The company's original legal authority allowed them to process 2 million gallons of waste water as industrial waste, hauled by road tankers to the Davyhulme works near Manchester where it was treated and dumped into the Manchester Ship Canal. But European 2011 regulations now require flowback water to be treated as radioactive waste.

<http://www.thelancashiremagazine.co.uk/local-news/frackers-now-facing-radioactive-waste-setback-say-bbc-tv-investigators/>
There is currently no safe way of dealing with this type of radioactive waste which, even at the exploratory stage of unconventional drilling, appears to be voluminous and excessively high. As unconventional gas extraction involves many perforating charges being detonated during exploration, to access a greater area of formation than conventional drilling, there will be a concentration of radioactivity which will be released from the gas which is flared and also into the flowback water. The health and environmental effects of the new type of reactive perforating charges, which are enabling this dash for unconventional gas have not been adequately researched and there is no transparency about their composition nor the extent of their use during either exploratory well completion or production, which both appear to involve explosive perforating as a stimulation method. The drilling muds mentioned contain many chemicals and acid. As this area appears to have chalk aquifers, anything harmful, which dissolves chalk and is liable to leach into the vital water aquifers, should be prohibited. The coastal area is prone to erosion and so explosive charges and chemical stimulation will compromise its geological stability, particularly when unconventional extraction methods are so heavily dependent on numerous long multilaterals, up to 2 miles long, involving extensive explosive charges.

https://scontent-a-ams.xx.fbcdn.net/hphotos-ash3/t31/1658579_10203126702593703_47090365_o.jpg

The surface impact is also intensive and industrialises the countryside

[:https://scontent-a-ams.xx.fbcdn.net/hphotos-prn2/t1/1499598_511957892255750_1582854471_n.jpg](https://scontent-a-ams.xx.fbcdn.net/hphotos-prn2/t1/1499598_511957892255750_1582854471_n.jpg)

On-shore oil and gas exploration, for unconventional resources, should not be allowed to proceed, particularly in this beautiful East Riding area of Yorkshire and there should be no radioactive substances permit.

Comment ID	RathlinEnergy_66
Response Date	04/03/14 19:25
Consultation Point	Views on the.... (View)

Status Processed
Submission Type Web
Version 0.2
Application Reference Number

Please select which application you wish to make comments on Both

Only your comments and not your personal details will not appear on the Environment Agency public register and website.

Do you want confidentiality? No

Comments

Please provide your comments below.

Under Section 78A(2) of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 to RISK causing land to become contaminated is an offence. There has been a lot of flooding in this area and future flooding is inevitable. Can Rathlin give a 100% guarantee that the soil will remain uncontaminated? Can Rathlin stop the 8% methane going into the atmosphere which is higher than fossil fuel output thus contributing greatly to global warming? Can Rathlin reverse the process once it has discovered that the fauna and flora have died and the water poisoned upon which our planet depends? Not IF the devastation of our eco-system is ruined but WHEN, will Rathlin play God and put it all back as it was? Poisoned water, poisoned soil, poisoned world! Is this the heritage Rathlin and all the other drilling companies are leaving for the future generations? All for what? GREED MONEY! Not for our good,

Comment ID RathlinEnergy_65
Response Date 04/03/14 17:49
Consultation Point Views on the.... ([View](#))
Status Processed
Submission Type Web
Version 0.4
Application Reference Number

Please select which application you wish to make comments on Both

Only your comments and not your personal details will not appear on the Environment Agency public register and website.

Do you want confidentiality? Yes

Comment ID RathlinEnergy_64
Response Date 04/03/14 17:22
Consultation Point Views on the.... ([View](#))

Status Processed
Submission Type Web
Version 0.2
Application Reference Number

Please select which application you wish to make comments on Both

Only your comments and not your personal details will not appear on the Environment Agency public register and website.

Do you want confidentiality? No

Comments

Please provide your comments below.

Dear Sirs As yet little is known about the environmental consequences of fracking in the UK. a great deal is known about the environmental disasters elsewhere in the world and these are not to be considered here just in order to obtain a very short term supply of energy. There are plenty of other sources of energy available to us especially from the sea. As I understand it shale gas is to be found several kilometres deep - way below coal and oil. Damage to the stability of our geological basis at that level is unknown and should not be envisaged. It appears that the gas produced will be methane which will have to be converted into household gas. It will need to be transferred somewhere to achieve this. there will thus be a need to build miles of pipeline or there will be a constant convoy of tankers both of which will disturb the local environment yet further. There appears to be no way that the use of lethal chemicals can be monitored by unbiased experts [are there any?] Our water table and especially our local aquifers will be extremely vulnerable. A totally unnecessary risky venture for no reason other than to provide very short term profits for overseas companies coupled with the potential for very long term disruption for future generations to deal with. Planning applications must be refused. Yours faithfully

Diana Sandy

Comment ID RathlinEnergy_63
Response Date 03/03/14 23:05
Consultation Point Views on the.... ([View](#))
Status Processed
Submission Type Web
Version 0.2
Application Reference Number

Please select which application you wish to make comments on Both

Only your comments and not your personal details will not appear on the Environment Agency public register and website.

Do you want confidentiality? No

Comments

Please provide your comments below.

This proposed fracking in our area of East Riding, was not advertised and was kept quiet from the people of the East Riding of Yorkshire. WHY?? So that it would be allowed through without a fuss?

You, at the Environment Agency, should protect the environment from this money making practice. Fracking is lethal for the water supply, the people who drink the water, the animals, the plant life, not to mention of the ground under our feet.

In the US, it is causing many problems to people who are in fracking area's. To mention just a few, the gas coming through their water taps, contaminated water killing cattle, the home owners cannot sell their properties and cannot get home insurance, in fracking area's.

These companies should be stopped from contaminating our country.

Comment ID	RathlinEnergy_62
Response Date	03/03/14 22:53
Consultation Point	Views on the.... (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2
Application Reference Number	

Please select which application you wish to make comments on Both

Only your comments and not your personal details will not appear on the Environment Agency public register and website.

Do you want confidentiality? No

Comments

Please provide your comments below.

I disagree strongly with fracking in any part of the UK. It is a dangerous and environmentally harmful practise that should not be considered within our political boundaries. We have the power and the political integrity to say no to large fossil fuel companies, instead opting for the less invasive and positive options of renewable energy. I urge you to reject their application without delay. It has no place here.

Comment ID	RathlinEnergy_61
Response Date	03/03/14 22:37
Consultation Point	Views on the.... (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.3

Application Reference Number

Please select which application you wish to make comments on Both

Only your comments and not your personal details will not appear on the Environment Agency public register and website.

Do you want confidentiality? Yes

Comment ID RathlinEnergy_60

Response Date 03/03/14 22:35

Consultation Point Views on the... ([View](#))

Status Processed

Submission Type Web

Version 0.3

Application Reference Number

Please select which application you wish to make comments on Both

Only your comments and not your personal details will not appear on the Environment Agency public register and website.

Do you want confidentiality? Yes

Comment ID RathlinEnergy_59

Response Date 03/03/14 22:03

Consultation Point Views on the... ([View](#))

Status Processed

Submission Type Web

Version 0.2

Application Reference Number

Please select which application you wish to make comments on Both

Only your comments and not your personal details will not appear on the Environment Agency public register and website.

Do you want confidentiality? No

Comments

Please provide your comments below.

Clearly nobody in the local area will want to have this application go ahead, only those benefitting financially and these people will generally not live in the local area so have no personal risk of suffering the health and environmental consequences.

I don't need to list the reasons why fracking is dangerous and harmful to life, they have been stated again and again.

The fact that there has been no obvious publicity of these proposals to local people suggests that those proposing it are more than aware of the backlash it would cause.

On this basis I strongly object to both application and call for an extension of the consultation period supported by publicity to raise awareness. I work in the media but knew nothing of this until I saw it on someone's Facebook feed today, on the final day of consultation. Does anyone honestly believe that there are only 44 people who care enough about this to object to it on this site. Far more likely that only a handful of people are aware

Comment ID	RathlinEnergy_58
Response Date	03/03/14 21:48
Consultation Point	Views on the.... (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2
Application Reference Number	

Please select which application you wish to make comments on Both

Only your comments and not your personal details will not appear on the Environment Agency public register and website.

Do you want confidentiality? No

Comments

Please provide your comments below.

I am extremely concerned that this operation is occurring so close to the drinking water supply without sufficient consultation with local people. There is the potential for this to affect people in a much wider area than residents in the immediate vicinity. A better quality of information, more widely advertised over a longer period of time is necessary.

Comment ID	RathlinEnergy_57
Response Date	03/03/14 21:30
Consultation Point	Views on the.... (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web

Version 0.3

Application Reference Number

Please select which application you wish to make comments on Both

Only your comments and not your personal details will not appear on the Environment Agency public register and website.

Do you want confidentiality? Yes

Comment ID RathlinEnergy_56

Response Date 03/03/14 21:29

Consultation Point Views on the... ([View](#))

Status Processed

Submission Type Web

Version 0.2

Application Reference Number

Please select which application you wish to make comments on Both

Only your comments and not your personal details will not appear on the Environment Agency public register and website.

Do you want confidentiality? No

Comments

Please provide your comments below.

I'm really disappointed at the secrecy that seems to have surrounded this application. If there were no potentially negative impacts stemming from this activity, why have they been so careful to ensure residents were under-informed. I object to the use of fracking in my area for the reasons listed by others here, and I further object to the underhand way it has been approached.

Comment ID RathlinEnergy_55

Response Date 03/03/14 21:25

Consultation Point Views on the... ([View](#))

Status Processed

Submission Type Web

Version 0.3

Application Reference Number

Please select which application you wish to make Both comments on

Only your comments and not your personal details will not appear on the Environment Agency public register and website.

Do you want confidentiality? Yes

Comment ID RathlinEnergy_54
Response Date 03/03/14 21:21
Consultation Point Views on the... ([View](#))
Status Processed
Submission Type Web
Version 0.3
Application Reference Number

Please select which application you wish to make Both comments on

Only your comments and not your personal details will not appear on the Environment Agency public register and website.

Do you want confidentiality? Yes

Comment ID RathlinEnergy_53
Response Date 03/03/14 21:18
Consultation Point Views on the... ([View](#))
Status Processed
Submission Type Web
Version 0.2
Application Reference Number

Please select which application you wish to make Both comments on

Only your comments and not your personal details will not appear on the Environment Agency public register and website.

Do you want confidentiality? No

Comments

Please provide your comments below.

As with previous posts I oppose the application on the grounds it will introduce pollutants into our water supply.

Comment ID RathlinEnergy_52
Response Date 03/03/14 21:15
Consultation Point Views on the.... ([View](#))
Status Processed
Submission Type Web
Version 0.3
Application Reference Number

Please select which application you wish to make comments on Both

Only your comments and not your personal details will not appear on the Environment Agency public register and website.

Do you want confidentiality? Yes

Comment ID RathlinEnergy_51
Response Date 03/03/14 21:14
Consultation Point Views on the.... ([View](#))
Status Processed
Submission Type Web
Version 0.3
Application Reference Number

Please select which application you wish to make comments on Both

Only your comments and not your personal details will not appear on the Environment Agency public register and website.

Do you want confidentiality? Yes