

Bridge End,  
Ramsgill,  
Harrogate  
North  
Yorkshire  
HG3 5RL

20<sup>th</sup> March 2025

Attention Ms Amy Taylor  
Planning Control,  
North Yorkshire Council.  
County Hall  
Racecourse Lane  
Northallerton. DL7 8AD

Dear Sirs,

Planning Application: NY/2025/0030/ENV Burniston

I am writing to voice my wife's and my objections to the planning application by Europa Oil & Gas for the site at Burniston. We do not live in the Burniston area, but my wife and I are frequent visitors to the Camping & Caravanning Site at nearby Scalby Mill, which we believe will be impacted by the works should the application be allowed.

We are concerned over several issues, but due to the extremely short time scale that has been allocated for objections to what is hundreds of pages of documentation are having to restrict our comments to the more obvious.

- 1) Pollution: - Fracking in the USA has resulted in extreme levels of pollution of both soil and air around fracking sites. Whilst it is recognised this operation at Burniston will not be using similar levels of pressure injection, there is no proof that any less pollution results from the system. The geology of the area has not been revealed in the documentation as far as we can tell, but from our knowledge of the cliff path it is a fairly fractured sandstone type rock which will allow chemicals used in the process to escape into the surrounding rocks and aquifers. Even if steel casing is used to contain the liquids, this will not be totally fool proof as joints are notoriously weak when pipes are bent (as experienced my time as a Civil / Structural Engineer in the steel industry).
- 2) Noise pollution during the continuous drilling period will be heard at the Campsite, which is just across the fields at Scalby. Caravans do not have similar levels of noise reduction as solid house walls, so there is every chance that anyone on the site will be kept awake by the drilling noise. Also light pollution will be evident across the fields.
- 3) On the subject of light and noise pollution, no assessment seems to have been made of the impact on the local bird populations which roost on the cliffs.
- 4) I see no assessment of the stability of the geological strata of the area. The cliffs are slowly eroding around the area, and the use of high amounts of water will permit increased levels of erosion and introduce slip planes in the rocks which are liable to cause collapse, and loss of breeding sites for birds and insects as well as the loss of both agricultural land and the cliff recreation amenity.
- 5) The area for the site is near the Peak Fault, a fact that in the brief reading of the documentation submitted, seems to have been ignored. Fracking was paused in the UK due

OFFICIAL

to the generation of minor earth tremors even in areas without fault lines. How this will affect the major Peak Fault line has not been investigated.

- 6) There will be extra HGV movements around the area. These Lorries will be moving at all hours, and will probably need to come in through either the A64 route from York, or the A170 from Pickering, both through the main area of Scarborough. The increase will generate traffic jams and cause disruption to both locals and tourists.
- 7) Tourism is one of the main employers in the area, and will be hit by the devastation caused by the works. Not only through the impacts of travel, but also by the desecration of the beautiful countryside and cliffs of the area.
- 8) Climate Change requires us all to reduce our carbon footprints. Burning fossil fuels is not acceptable any longer, and this is unnecessary chasing of profit with no regard to the effects on the moves to Net Zero. Gas produced will not be used locally, but will be moved around the country / internationally to make the most profit. There has been no study (as is required I believe) of the impacts of producing or burning the gas on the environment either locally, nationally or internationally.

As referred to earlier, it is a pity that more time had not been allowed to make representation on the full documentation submitted, and I would suggest that the 26<sup>th</sup> March cut off should be reassessed to allow a better study of the application.

In the meantime please take our objections into account and do the right thing – refuse this application.

Sincerely,

██████████

██████████

Helen Wright.

Peter Wright BA. CEng. MStructE (Retired). AMICE (Retired).