

Viking CCS Pipeline

9.65 Response to
Examining Authority's
Proposed Schedule of
Changes of the dDCO



Document Reference: EN070008/EXAM/9.65

Applicant: Chrysaor Production (U.K.) Limited,

a Harbour Energy Company PINS Reference: EN070008 Planning Act 2008 (as amended)

The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 - Regulation 5(2)(q)

Date: September 2024





PINS Reference	Document Reference	Document Revision	Date
EN070008		Version 1	August 2024

Prepared by	Checked by	Verified by	Approved by

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this Document

- 1.1.1 This document has been prepared for the Viking CCS Pipeline (the 'Proposed Development') on behalf of Chrysaor Production (UK) Limited ('the Applicant'), in relation to an application ('the Application') for a Development Consent Order (DCO) that has been submitted under Section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008) to the Secretary of State (SoS) for Energy Security and Net Zero.
- 1.1.2 This document provides the Applicant's response to the Examining Authority's schedule of proposed changes to the draft DCO.

Table 1-1: Responses to the Examining Authority's schedule of changes to the draft DCO

Referen ce No. PC001 Requirement 2 Addition of new clause: (3) The authorised development must not commence unless and until the necessary offshore consents have been fully obtained The ExA note that the construction programme appears to have slipped and there are enduring concerns over the approach to offshore consents. In addition, to ensure certainty over the unnecessary delivery of the benefits for the Viking Carbon Capture and Statement.	cant has not made this change to the draft DCO.
PC001 Requirement 2 Addition of new clause: (3) The authorised development must not commence unless and until the necessary offshore consents have been fully obtained The ExA note that the construction programme appears to have slipped and there are enduring concerns over the approach to offshore consents. In addition, to ensure certainty over the unnecessary delivery of the benefits for the Viking Carbon Capture and Statement.	Ğ
from the appropriate authorities.' Storage (CCS) Pipeline project as a whole, the ExA proposes adding this clause into the Requirement. Benefits of to section second will examine a necessary, which is price is similar to Capture E 2022. The clearer or commence Defined te Schedule: "carabon did storage pe Dioxide (Li licence, authorities) of offshore point finance or infrastructure. Without pr 2 (Require (1) No part until details approved to (a) evidence offshore pointshore or offshore per until details approved to (a) evidence (b) evidence section 14	dicant considers such a requirement to be ary, contrary to the policy in National Policy t EN-1 and out of step with precedent from other similar development. The Applicant's position is a more detail in the Position Statement on the of the Proposed Development and in its responses in 2.05 (Compulsory Acquisition) of the ExA's ritten questions. It in response to WQ 2.5.15, in the event that the he Secretary of State disagree with the Applicant's and determine that such a requirement is and determined as a requirement is and determined as a requirement of the Readby 3 (Carbon Equipped Gas Fired Generating Station) Order and Applicant considers that the wording below is on what consents are required prior to be dement of works for the onshore pipeline. Iterms to be added to paragraph 1 of Part 1, a 2 (Requirements) of the draft DCO: It is a consider that the wording below is an analysis of the such of the authorised development will be carbon dioxide transportation and storage ture into which the authorised development may commence the authorised development may commence its of the following have been submitted to and by the relevant planning authority-ince that a carbon dioxide storage permit for the oppeline and storage works is in place; and of the Petroleum Act 1998 for the offshore and storage works.

WORK\53771939\v.2

Referen	Provision	Proposed Change	ExA reasonining	Applicant response
ce No.				
PC002	Interpretation, Article 2	Delete and replace reference to "outline operational and maintenance environmental management plan" with "operational phase mitigation."	There is no document in the Examination Library labelled outline operational and maintenance environmental management plan. The closest equivalent is the document identified [REP2-014], as referenced in Article 44(1)(n).	The Applicant has updated the draft DCO (Revision G) as requested.
PC003	Interpretation, Article 2	Update the definition of "general arrangement plans" to refer, as necessary, to any updated plans or documents for each of the respective facilities.	To ensure no ambiguity in what constitutes a "general arrangement plan." A cross reference to article 44 may be appropriate.	The Applicant has updated the draft DCO (Revision G) as requested.
PC004	authority" with "following advance notification to the street authority, but without the need for express		In response to Lincolnshire County Council's sustained objection. This still removes the need for consent but provides some means of managing works within the public highway across the network.	The Applicant has not made this change to the draft DCO. The Applicant considers that the intention of this amendment is already secured by other articles in the draft DCO (Revision G). Article 11 (Application of the 1991 Act) applies certain provisions of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 ("1991 Act") to any works carried out under article 9 (street works) or article 10 (power to alter layout etc. of streets). This includes applying section 55 of the 1991 Act, which requires advance notice to the street authority prior to undertaking certain works. Furthermore, the Applicant has added a new article 8 (application of the permit schemes) to the draft DCO that applies Lincolnshire County Council's permit scheme to any street works to address their concern.
PC005	Article 32 (4)(c)	Add ';' at end of sentence.	Typographical.	The Applicant has updated the draft DCO (Revision G) as requested.
PC006	Article 32(8)	Change "precluded from" to "precluded from –".	For formatting consistency with other similar articles drafted.	The Applicant has updated the draft DCO (Revision G) as requested.
PC007	Article 33(13)	Merge with Article 33(12) preceding it.	The ExA question whether Article 33(13) has been misnumbered as it appears to be a follow on from 33(12) in terms of relevance and formatting.	The Applicant has updated the draft DCO (Revision G) as requested.
PC008	Schedule 1	Under work number 11, delete (g).	Typographical error.	The Applicant has updated the draft DCO (Revision G) as requested.
PC009	Schedule 1	Under work number 36, delete (g).	Typographical error.	The Applicant has updated the draft DCO (Revision G) as requested.
PC010	Requirement 3	Remove '- '.	Typographical error.	The Applicant has not been able to identify the typographical error referred to and has therefore not made any update to the draft DCO in respect of this item.
PC011	Requirement 8	Rewrite 8(1).	The formatting and sentence structure in the first line has misplaced punctuation.	The Applicant has updated the draft DCO (Revision G) as requested.
PC012	Requirement 16(2)	After the word "include" delete the '- '	Typographical error.	The Applicant has updated the draft DCO (Revision G) as requested.
PC013	Requirement 22(3)	Replace "within 21 days of receipt of the application" with text "within 20 business days of receipt of the application."	The ExA consider the slightly longer period, as originally advocated by the Environment Agency [REP2-038] [REP4-104], to be fairer when a consultee is engaged within the Requirement	The Applicant has updated the draft DCO (Revision G) as requested.

WORK\53771939\v.2

Referen ce No.	Provision	Proposed Change	ExA reasonining	Applicant response
			discharging process.	
PC014	Requirement 25(7)	Change "sub-paragraph (7)" to "sub-paragraph (8)".	The ExA query as to what "sub-paragraph (7)" relates to in this context and is believed to be a reference to sub-paragraph (8) below in relation to costs claims	

WORK\53771939\v.2