## Comment for planning application WSCC/046/23

Application number Name Address

WSCC/046/23

Lorraine Inglis

Objection

Type of

Comments Comments

Michelbourne Close, Burgess Hill, RH15 9QX

I strongly object to this application

Seriously WSCC? Are you not getting bored with "additional time is needed", "enable a review of existing data in light of data to come", "to enable sufficient time", "restoration of Broadford Bridge premature", "a further extension of time", "To enable sufficient time", "extending the timeframe", "To enable sufficient time for data retrieval"?

The Broadford Bridge site is a dud site. UKOG have already claimed "unlikely to produce commercial quantities of hydrocarbons without stimulation outside the scope of their permit". As to their farcical geothermal ideas that is merely just "hot air". Surely any proposed plans needs to be a separate planning application.

As to the reasons for their constant extensions, when will there be any "reasonable prospects of new data from existing and new sites". UK Oil & Gas are financial unstable and their site at Loxley, Dunsfold will not happen in the next two years (please do ask about their timeline), and as you should be aware the legal challenge surrounding Horse Hill has absolute nothing to do with them assessing "the connectivity and similarity of the geological formations. They already have planning permission FROM 2017 for 2 wells to assess this. UKOG have even been quoted in saying that the legal challenge has not stopped them pushing on with their work plans but in their submission to you they say different. The deceit and lies from this company are endless.

There should be no more delay in Phase 4 site retention and restoration. This site needs be restored as per the NPPF guidelines, Paragraph 217 (e) indicates that "restoration and aftercare" is required "at the earliest opportunity".

"When is a financial guarantee justified?" If the council are to consider delaying the restoration yet again then the councillors should AGAIN insist on a bond. Chris Bartlett said in 2018 that any financial guarantee for restoration is not justified quoting "National guidance indicates that a bond or financial guarantee is typically only justified for quarries or development which requires 'novel' approaches" BUT the National Guidance also indicates "very long-term new projects where progressive reclamation is not practicable" Paragraph: 048 Reference ID: 27-048-20140306 - www.gov.uk/guidance/minerals

I object to any extension to this site.

Received

25/01/2024 09:43:02

**Attachments**