From: Ian Gray El

Sent: 19 January 2017 13:20

To: Jonathan Essex CLR < jonathan.essex@surreycc.gov.uk >

Cc: Alan Stones El <alan.stones@surreycc.gov.uk>; Samantha Murphy El

<samantha.murphy@surreycc.gov.uk>; Stephen Jenkins El <stephen.jenkins@surreycc.gov.uk>

Subject: FW: activity at Brockham oil well, old school lane

Dear Jonathan,

I have attached below the email that was sent to Angus Energy yesterday afternoon and their subsequent reply that evening, which I hope will address your concerns.

The Environment Agency also monitor the site tom check for compliance with their own legislation.

We believe the works being undertaken are in accord with the terms of the authorised workover, however in light of what Angus Energy have stated publicly, we have sought their comments in relation to the statements made.

I will advise further next week when Samantha returns to the office, by which time she should have received a response from Angus Energy.

1/. I write further to communication with Samantha Murphy regarding concerns expressed about the movement of HGVs within the site and night time operations, with the resulting noise and light emission.

Following the information that you provided in December 2016 for Officers to consider in relation to the workover rig, maintenance works and data logging, it was confirmed by the County Planning Authority (CPA), that the works could take place as maintenance and would fall under Planning permission MO06/1294 dated May 2007. This planning permission was subject to conditions which provided control over the development.

Condition 5 states:

No operations or activities authorised or required by the permission shall be carried out, and no light except intermittent security or safety lighting within the site shall be illuminated, except between 0730 and 1800 hours Mondays to Fridays, and 0800 to 1300 hours Saturdays, and there shall be no working on Sundays or National or Bank Holidays.

As such, we would not have expected or accepted night time working, unless an emergency arose or health & safety event required attention. No mention of anticipation of night time work was made by you at Monday's site meeting to Alan Stones, Samantha Murphy or James Nolan. On Tuesday 17th January 2017 we received several communications from protestors, site neighbours and County and Local councillors about the night time work, with regard to noise and light and its impact upon

them. As a result Samantha Murphy contacted you and your response explained the reasons for the works.

Since Condition 5 does not allow night time working, and your December 2016 submission to the CPA had made no reference to night time working, such works are deemed unacceptable. However, in order that we acted reasonably and expediently when considering enforcement action, we sought the views of the Health & Safety Executive (HSE) before further consideration of taking enforcement action.

The HSE have advised that whilst not an emergency situation, twenty-four hour operation would allow the well to be partially abandoned with a reduced risk of complications. Daylight hours only operations would require the well to be shut in during the night, which would be a risk, albeit low and in that situation the well being open could expose the workforce to additional hazards. The HSE stated that the focus of the Health & Safety Executive in this case is the safety of the workforce and the completion of well operations in a safe and efficient manner. As such, it is their opinion that the well would be better served by continuous operations until the abandonment cement plug has been set and tested.

As such, the CPA will allow the 24-Hr works to continue for a further 6-days (until 25th January 2017), but will require daily email updates as to precisely what operations have been carried out in relation to the abandoning & sealing of the well; and the logging of data from the well and why for those night time activities are necessary. If for any reason an extension of the 24-Hr working is required, then please advise us immediately.

We would also remind you of the need to ensure that *noise emissions should be kept within the* noise limits and that the lighting should be the minimal required whilst not compromising safe working.

2/. We have also had reports of out of hours activities and have seen footage of a security vehicle and HGV being moved from site, purportedly at 8.43pm on Friday 13th January 2017. This is publicly available to view on Facebook using the following link.

https://www.facebook.com/BrockhamProtectionCamp/posts/367256140297622

Both you and your security manager have confirmed that such a movement took place, but believe it acceptable as the HGV did not leave the site. I would bring to your attention the following condition.

Planning Permission - MO06/1294 dated May 2007:

Condition 7:

Except for the case of emergency, no commercial vehicles shall enter or leave the site except between the hours of 0700-0800, 0900-1530, or 1800-1900, on Monday to Friday, and 0800-1300 on Saturday.

Whilst we accept that the HGV was simply moved from the site compound to the farmers yard to enable ease of egress the following morning, and did not leave the site, we do consider the internal movement of HGVs and any other equipment within the site as an operation. Such movements should not therefore be taking place after 19.00 Monday to Friday. As such, please ensure that the condition is complied with in the future.

I would be grateful to receive your written confirmation that Condition 7 will be fully complied with, and if HGVs need to move in the way you did, please ensure that it is done by 19.00 hours.

3/. Please reiterate to all those working at the site, be they on the rig or as security, that they must use the prescribed access route as referred to in the following condition.

Condition 6:

All vehicles entering or leaving the site shall follow the route shown on drawing entitled 'Figure No. 1' approved under planning permission MO92/0969 and attached to the legal agreement dated 9 January 1995.

- 4/. It would be very helpful if Angus Energy would consider circulating a short update statement to the local community.
- 5/. I would be grateful to receive a copy of the remaining schedule of works required under the workover programme, including which operations will be taking place between 18.00 and 8.00am.

I look forward to receiving your earliest response and thank you for your assistance on this matter.

Regards, Ian

Ian Gray - Team Leader Planning Enforcement

Dear Mr Gray,

Thank you for your email and your comments are taken on board a 100%. Regarding your points below.

- We shall comply 100% by condition 7.
- We shall re-integrate to all contractors.
- We circulated a statement today informing all we aim to be completed within 7 to 10 days.
 Additional we shall directly contact the Parish council tomorrow to keep them updated.
- We also have been performing noise monitoring operating noise is still below 75 decibels at front gate.

I am additional in daily communication now with the HSE now keeping them up to speed with the work program and completion thereof.

Regards

Jonathan Tidswell-Pretorius Angus Energy Ltd.

From: Samantha Murphy El Sent: 19 January 2017 11:05

To: lan Gray El < <u>ian.gray@surreycc.gov.uk</u>>
Cc: Alan Stones El < <u>alan.stones@surreycc.gov.uk</u>>

Subject: FW: activity at Brockham oil well, old school lane

lan, this is Cllr Essex email. Are you able to respond?

Sam

Samantha Murphy Principal Planning Officer Planning & Development Group Telephone: (020) 8541 7107

Mobile:

Email: samantha.murphy@surreycc.gov.uk

GCSX email: samantha.murphy@surreycc.gcsx.gov.uk (for content up to RESTRICTED)

Please note that my working days are Monday, Tuesdays, Wednesday & Thursday mornings. Please contact mwcd@surreycc.gov.uk in my absence.

From: Jonathan Essex CLR Sent: 19 January 2017 08:44

To: Samantha Murphy EI < samantha.murphy@surreycc.gov.uk > **Subject:** Fwd: activity at Brockham oil well, old school lane

Dear Samantha,

This appears (to my relatively untrained eye) to be a breach of planning conditions.

I don't understand why a Lorry should be arriving on site without its lights on at night if there was nothing to hide.

Please can you confirm what follow-up and enforcement action is being required. If they are in breach of planning cnnot the unregulated activities be required to stop?

Do the additional activities on site that appear to be outside of current planning activities have consent from the environment agency?

I am sorry I am not familiar with the details of what is going on here but it appears somewhat irregular and there appears to be a complete (or at least significant) disconnect between what has been agreed with the planning authority and what the company is claiming through the press.

Best regards Jonathan

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jacqui Hamlin

Date: 18 January 2017 at 23:51:19 GMT

To: Samantha Murphy EI < samantha.murphy@surreycc.gov.uk >, Helyn Clack CLR < helyn.clack@surreycc.gov.uk >, Hazel Watson < h.watson@surreycc.gov.uk >,

Stephen.cooksey@surreycc.gov.uk, jonathan.essex@surreycc.gov.uk

Subject: Re: activity at Brockham oil well, old school lane

Dear Samantha,

Thank you for your prompt response;; it is, indeed, of assistance, but has thrown up more questions than answers.

I do have some concerns about the behaviour of Angus Energy.

Here is what Angus Energy is feeding the investor press today _ http://www.proactiveinvestors.co.uk/companies/news/171783/angus-energy-advances-brockhamwell-near-gatwick-gusher-171783.html

and I'm afraid this doesn't sound anything like simply 'cementing up (closing) of the well' to me, as you've stated in your email above.

This company has exhibited a flagrant disregard for their existing planning permission (which prevents them from working at night or on Sundays) for the last five nights running. They clearly had no intention whatsoever of requesting permission from SCC to do this; they clearly thought they could get away with it, and would have done so had they not been caught out and filmed. Who at SCC can verify that what they say they are doing is actually being done?

In your letter to them it states in one of the bullet points 'Anticipated 8 HGV transport loads of equipment as required'. When I was there (Monday last week) 10 lorries arrived on the one day, and additional lorries have been arriving pretty much every day before and since (they've all been logged and photographed, and their registration numbers taken, with a description of the load). They've now taken to curtaining the lorries so the loads can't be seen.

Memorably, one flatbed truck together with it's security escort decided for some reason to navigate the extremely narrow lane at night with all their lights off. It was only when they were challenged (and realised that they had been filmed and had their registration numbers logged) that both vehicles decided to turn their lights on - up until that point they were travelling in pitch darkness on the unlit road. Interestingly, they much prefer to work at night. They then stop during the day, and blame the protectors for the delay

Here's an article from the BBC Science desk

http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-26692050 and a quote from it

'But scientists say there is another pollution risk - from structural failure of the well casing - and this risk is not particular to shale gas. It is common to all hydrocarbon drilling sites.'

I am glad that you have involved the Health and Safety Executive as I'm extremely worried as to how we can determine that the sealing of the old well casing has been rigorously conducted. Given that they've already demonstrated that they don't really like to do rules, such as planning permission, road safety, etc how can they be trusted? There have already been leakages at two wells in West Sussex. How do we know that oil isn't already seeping into the (quite high) Brockham water table at this moment? Is there any oversight?

It's now 11.30 at night, and, as you can see, it's all go on site.



Remember the Lyons flatbed truck with the lights off? He's got them on in there now.

You can hear the sound of grinding metal from the lane.

Thank you for attempting to address my concerns.

.Yours sincerely,

Jacqui Hamlin

On Wed, Jan 18, 2017 at 4:51 PM, Samantha Murphy El < samantha.murphy@surreycc.gov.uk wrote:

Dear J Hamlin

Thank you for your email and I apologise for the delay in responding.

At this stage, the County Planning Authority understand that the activity at Brockham Wellsite is the maintenance works on the existing Brockham 1. The planning permission for Brockham Wellsite that Angus Energy is working to does not allow for night time working. The County Planning Authority wrote to Angus Energy for clarification on how much longer the night time working will continue for and to bring Angus Energy's attention to the fact the planning permission does not allow for night time working at the site.

The information that we received in response from Angus Energy was shared with the Health and Safety Executive (HSE). Their advice to the CPA in light of the well where the maintenance works is taking place being 'live', was that they believed it prudent to allow Angus Energy to complete their maintenance works in the most efficient manner, and on grounds of health and safety the CPA therefore consider these extenuating circumstances where it is reasonable to allow 24 hour working to Angus Energy for a further 6-days to complete the cementing up (closing) of the well.

I hope this is of some assistance.

Kind regards Samantha

Samantha Murphy

Principal Planning Officer

Planning & Development Group

Telephone: (020) 8541 7107

Mobile:

Email: samantha.murphy@surreycc.gov.uk

GCSX email: samantha.murphy@surreycc.gcsx.gov.uk (for content up to RESTRICTED)

Please note that my working days are Monday, Tuesdays, Wednesday & Thursday mornings. Please contact mwcd@surreycc.gov.uk in my absence.

From: Jacqui Hamlin

Sent: 18 January 2017 00:54

To: Helyn Clack CLR <helyn.clack@surreycc.gov.uk>; Samantha Murphy El

<samantha.murphy@surreycc.gov.uk>; Hazel Watson CLR <h.watson@surreycc.gov.uk>; Jonathan

Essex CLR <jonathan.essex@surreycc.gov.uk>; Stephen Cooksey CLR

<stephen.cooksey@surreycc.gov.uk>

Subject: Re: activity at Brockham oil well, old school lane

For example, what are they working on tonight? Photograph taken at about midnight. A timestamped live stream is also available on Twitter. This is the fifth night in a row.



Could you let me know your thoughts, please?		
Thank you,		
Jacqui		
On Wed, Jan 18, 2017 at 12:04 AM, Jacqui Hamlin	wrote:	
Dear Councillor Clack,		

I'm so sorry that I inadvertently failed to copy you in on this email exchange with SCC planning.

A number of us are very concerned about activity at the site of the oil well in Old School Lane. Lorries are arriving and leaving at all hours (one even at night, with it's lights deliberately turned off), and work on site is being conducted out of hours in contravention to the existing planning permission.

Generally in Brockham you can't bang a nail into a piece of wood without a Planning Officer turning up to inspect..

However, that do you require it.	efinitely doesn't seem to be the case here . Video evidence is available to view, if
Looking forward	to hearing your thoughts,
With best wishes	5,
Jacqui Hamlin	
From: Jacqui Hai Date: Tue, Jan 17	ed message mlin
	urphy@surreycc.gov.uk, Hazel Watson < h.watson@surreycc.gov.uk >, @surreycc.gov.uk, jonathan.essex@surreycc.gov.uk
Dear Ms Murphy	<i>,</i>
	o confirm our telephone conversation and my concerns around the site of the oil hool Lane at Brockham.
	ctivity seems to be taking place at this site, and I'd appreciate your confirmation dance with the existing planning permission.
	ng and leaving outside of agreed hours, and work is taking place well into the night, ays and Sundays. A huge plume of smoke came out of the well not an hour ago.
Can you reassure	e me that all is WELL, please?
Thank you.	
Jacqui Hamlin	

This email and any attachments with it are intended for the addressee only. It may be confidential and may be the subject of legal and/or professional privilege.

If you have received this email in error please notify the sender or postmaster@surreycc.gov.uk

The content may be personal or contain personal opinions and cannot be taken as an expression of the County Council's position. Surrey County Council reserves the right to monitor all incoming and outgoing mail. Whilst every care has been taken to check this e-mail for viruses, it is your responsibility to carry out any checks upon receipt.

Visit the Surrey County Council website http://www.surreycc.gov.uk