

I am a resident and give this objection in conjunction with Dr Richard Seaborne

The strategic benefits in relation to national energy security from this site would seem to be less than significant in comparison to the many disadvantages and harm.

The area has been previously drilled and the limits of the fields have been established. No new geological data¹ has been provided by the applicant.

I refer to policy MC12 of the Surrey Mineral Plan of 2011.

Planning applications for drilling boreholes will only be permitted where adverse impacts on the environment have been minimised. Well sites should be located such that there are no significant adverse impacts and only approved where the need has been established to confirm the nature, extent and potential means of recovery.

Whilst the primary objective for drilling is given as gas, Godley bridge (a few miles away) was abandoned as being uncommercial and encountered a significant presence of hydrogen sulphide – sour gas. Previous appraisal drilling in the Portland Formation demonstrated that the volumes will be neither economically or strategically significant.

The secondary target is oil.

There is a strategic issue of oil security. But here we are not talking about Wytch Farm in Dorset, achieving some 100,000 barrels at peak. We are talking about a Horse Hill or less which is hardly strategic or significant for the economy.

The applicant states that the key reason for drilling at Loxely as set out on Page 20 para 72 of the officers report is to test “the presence of an open and continuous natural network of hydrocarbon deposits capable of flowing to surface without stimulation.” and to indicate the opportunity for future commercial recovery across the wider Weald Basin.

The geological setting and reports from wells drilled previously do not support this – Alfold-1 drilled by Conoco in 1986 a well to the south east of the proposed location failed to prove the presence of meaningful hydrocarbons and any continuous network of hydrocarbon deposits. The failure of UKOG Broadford Bridge well to recover meaningful volumes of hydrocarbon demonstrated that whilst the potential micritic reservoir horizons in the Kimmeridge may be pervasive, the fracture systems are not.

Loxley-1 may well encounter hydrocarbons in the Kimmeridge and there may well be natural fractures that will allow some hydrocarbons to be recovered to surface. What this will not do is prove or even support the presence of an open and continuous natural network of hydrocarbon deposits capable of flowing to surface without stimulation.

So I would argue that this application is contrary to MC12, does not justify further drilling and the suggestion of an extensive open and continuous natural network of hydrocarbon deposits without stimulation does not fit with the facts.

The site has not been well chosen, the environment and social impacts are high and I would ask you to reject this application.

This page is intentionally left blank