



Department for  
Energy Security  
& Net Zero

3-8 Whitehall Place  
London  
SW1A 2AW  
+44 020 7215 5000  
[energyinfrastructureplanning@energysecurity.gov.uk](mailto:energyinfrastructureplanning@energysecurity.gov.uk)  
[www.gov.uk/desnz](http://www.gov.uk/desnz)

Ref: EN070008

Paul Davis  
Chrysaor Production (UK) Limited  
151 Buckingham Palace Road  
London  
SW1W 9SZ

9 April 2025

Dear Mr Davis,

## **PLANNING ACT 2008**

### **APPLICATION FOR DEVELOPMENT CONSENT FOR THE VIKING CCS CARBON DIOXIDE PIPELINE PROJECT**

#### **1. Introduction**

- 1.1. I am directed by the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero (“the Secretary of State”) to advise you that consideration has been given to the Examining Authority’s (“ExA”) Report dated 5 December 2024. The ExA consisted of three examining inspectors, David Wallis (Lead Panel member), Alex Jack and Jonathan Gorst. The ExA conducted an Examination into the application submitted on 20 October 2023 (“the Application”) by Chrysaor Production (UK) Limited (“the Applicant”) for a Development Consent Order (“DCO”) (“the Order”) under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (“the 2008 Act”) for the Viking Carbon Capture Storage (“CCS”) Carbon Dioxide Pipeline Project (“the Proposed Development”). The Application was accepted for Examination on 17 November 2023. The Examination began on 26 March 2024 and closed on 26 September 2024. The Secretary of State received the ExA’s Report on 5 December 2024.
- 1.2. On 5 March 2025, the Secretary of State issued a Written Ministerial Statement announcing that the statutory deadline for the decision had been reset to 5 June 2025. On 8 January 2025, a request for information letter (“first information request”) was issued by the Secretary of State seeking an update on outstanding agreements and minor DCO drafting points. On 28 January 2025 an additional information request was issued (“second information request”) seeking information on further DCO drafting points. On 7 March 2025, a third information request was issued (“third information request”) seeking confirmation regarding shipping and a minor DCO drafting point.
- 1.3. The Order, as applied for, would grant development consent for the construction, operation and maintenance of a carbon dioxide (“CO<sub>2</sub>”) intake facility at Immingham, construction and burial of a gas transportation pipeline to transport the CO<sub>2</sub> to Theddlethorpe on the east coast of Lincolnshire, and the construction of a facility at Theddlethorpe to send the CO<sub>2</sub> out to a subsea reservoir. The project comprises a new 55 km (approx.) onshore underground pipeline from the point of receipt of dense phase CO<sub>2</sub> at Immingham, through its

transportation to facilities at Theddlethorpe Gas Terminal (“TGT”), and transportation from TGT through the existing Lincolnshire Offshore Gas Gathering System pipeline to Mean Low Water Spring (“MLWS”). Associated infrastructure and ancillary works are anticipated, including but not exclusive to – required valves, inspection, monitoring, venting and handling facilities and temporary construction compounds, storage areas and access roads. The Proposed Development aims to transport and store up to 10 million tonnes (“Mt”) of CO<sub>2</sub> annually by 2030, rising to 15Mt by 2035. The Proposed Development lies within the County of Lincolnshire and is wholly in England.

- 1.4. The Viking CCS Project constitutes three separate elements, not all of which are provided for in this NSIP application. These include: the infrastructure to capture CO<sub>2</sub> at source; an onshore gas gathering and transportation pipeline; and an offshore transportation pipeline with subsequent subsea storage facilities. The Proposed Development is purely for the construction, operation and maintenance of the onshore gas gathering and transportation pipeline. The Order Limits for this NSIP application end at MLWS [ER 1.3.3 et seq.].
- 1.5. The Applicant also seeks compulsory acquisition (“CA”) and temporary possession (“TP”) powers, set out in the draft Order submitted with the Application.
- 1.6. Published alongside this letter on the Planning Inspectorate’s National Infrastructure Planning website<sup>1</sup> is a copy of the ExA’s Report of Findings and Conclusions and Recommendation to the Secretary of State (“the ExA’s Report”). The ExA’s findings and conclusions are set out in Chapters 3 – 7 of the ExA’s Report, and the ExA’s summary of conclusions and recommendation is at Chapter 8. All numbered references, unless otherwise stated, are to paragraphs of the ExA’s Report [“ER \*.\*.”].

## **2. Summary of the ExA’s Report and Recommendation**

- 2.1. The principal issues considered during the Examination on which the ExA has reached conclusions on the case for development consent are set out in the ExA’s Report under the following broad headings:
  - The Principle of the Development
  - Noise and Vibration
  - Major Accidents and Hazards
  - Landscape and Visual Amenity and Good Design
  - Cultural Heritage
  - Traffic and Transport
  - Flood Risk, Hydrology and Water Resources
  - Air Quality
  - Climate Change and Emissions
  - Ecology and Biodiversity
  - Geology and Land Use
  - Minerals and Waste
  - Other Planning Matters

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://national-infrastructure-consenting.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/EN070008>

- 2.2. The ExA recommended that the Secretary of State should grant **consent** for the application [ER 8.3.1].
- 2.3. Except as indicated otherwise in the paragraphs below, the Secretary of State agrees with the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the ExA as set out in the ExA's Report, and the reasons for the Secretary of State's decision are those given by the ExA in support of its conclusions and recommendations.

### **3. Summary of the Secretary of State's Decision**

- 3.1. The Application falls to be determined under section 105 of the 2008 Act [ER 2.2.2 et seq.]. Section 105 requires the Secretary of State, in deciding an application, to have regard to any local impact report submitted before the deadline specified under section 60(2); any prescribed matters in relation to development of the description to which the application relates; and any other matters which the Secretary of State thinks are both important and relevant to their decision.
- 3.2. The Secretary of State has considered the overall planning balance and, for the reasons set out in this letter and the ExA's Report, has concluded that the public benefits associated with the Proposed Development outweigh the harm identified, and that development consent should therefore be granted. Furthermore, the Secretary of State considers that there is a compelling case in the public interest for the compulsory acquisition and temporary possession powers sought.
- 3.3. The Secretary of State has decided under section 114 of the 2008 Act to make, with modifications, an Order granting consent for the proposals in the Application. This letter is a statement of the reasons for the Secretary of State's decision for the purposes of section 116 of the 2008 Act and the notice and statement required by regulations 31(2)(c) and (d) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 ("the EIA Regulations").
- 3.4. In making the decision, the Secretary of State has complied with all applicable legal duties and has not taken account of any matters which are not relevant to the decision.

### **4. The Secretary of State's Consideration of the Application**

- 4.1. The Secretary of State has considered the ExA's Report and all other material considerations, including representations received after the close of the ExA's Examination and responses to the consultation letters. 121 Relevant Representations ("RRs") were made in respect of the Application<sup>2</sup>. Written Representations, responses to questions and oral submissions made during the Examination were also taken into account by the ExA.
- 4.2. The Energy White Paper, *Powering Our Net Zero Future*, was published on 14 December 2020. It announced a review of the suite of energy NPSs but confirmed that the current NPSs, designated in 2011, were not being suspended in the meantime. The ExA has referred to these 2011 NPSs as EN-1 and EN-4 and this letter refers to them in the same way. Draft NPSs were published on 6 September 2021 and subject to a consultation which

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://national-infrastructure-consenting.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/EN070008/representations>

closed on 29 November 2021. Updated versions of these draft NPSs were published on 30 March 2023 and subject to a further consultation which closed on 23 June 2023.

- 4.3. Revised draft NPSs were released on 22 November 2023. On 17 January 2024, the revised NPSs were designated in Parliament (“the 2024 NPSs”), which the ExA took into account in its Report [ER 2.3.5]. The Secretary of State has had regard to the designated 2024 NPSs in deciding the Application and addresses these where relevant within this letter. The ExA considered that the revised NPS EN-4 (2024) sets out that natural gas use, as well as decarbonising industry, is consistent with the aims of reaching net zero by 2050, which the Secretary of State agrees with [ER 2.3.8]. The Secretary of State does not consider there is anything contained within the 2024 NPSs that would lead him to reach a different decision on the Application than would have been reached having regard to the 2011 NPSs. The Secretary of State has also had regard to the updated NPPF from December 2024 which was released after the close of the Examination and similarly finds that there is nothing which would lead him to reach a different decision on the Application.
- 4.4. The Secretary of State has had regard to the British Energy Security Strategy (“BESS”) published on 7 April 2022, which outlined the steps to accelerate the government’s progress towards achieving Net Zero by 2050 and a long-term shift in delivering cheaper and cleaner power.
- 4.5. The Secretary of State has also had regard to the Local Impact Reports (“LIR”) submitted by East Lindsey District Council (“ELDC”), Lincolnshire County Council (“LCC”), North Lincolnshire Council (“NLC”), North East Lincolnshire Council (“NELC”) and West Lindsey District Council (“WLDC”), environmental information as defined in regulation 3(1) of the EIA Regulations and to all other matters which are considered to be important and relevant to the Secretary of State’s decision as required by section 105 of the 2008 Act.
- 4.6. The Secretary of State agrees with the ExA’s conclusions and the weight it has ascribed in the overall planning balance in respect of the following issues:
  - a. The Principle of the Development – very great weight
  - b. Noise and Vibration – neutral weight
  - c. Major Accidents and Hazards – neutral weight
  - d. Landscape and Visual Amenity and Good Design – minor negative weight
  - e. Flood Risk, Hydrology and Water Resources – neutral weight
  - f. Air Quality – neutral weight
  - g. Climate Change – minor negative weight
  - h. Ecology and Biodiversity – neutral weight
  - i. Geology and Land Use – minor negative weight
  - j. Minerals and Waste – neutral weight
  - k. Other Planning Matters – neutral weight
- 4.7. The paragraphs below set out the matters where the Secretary of State has further commentary and analysis to add beyond that set out in the ExA’s Report. This includes

matters where the Secretary of State considers it is necessary to provide further detail on his rationale for agreeing or disagreeing with the conclusions of the ExA:

- The Principle of the Development
  - Onshore and Offshore Elements
- Cultural Heritage
- Traffic and Transport

### Principle of the Development

#### *Onshore and Offshore Elements*

- 4.8. Natural England (“NE”) advised that the Proposed Development should not be consented unless a holistic consideration of the offshore elements of the project (i.e., the full CCS Chain) has been completed, particularly in the context of a Habitats Regulation Assessment (“HRA”). NE proposed a Grampian Requirement to be added to the Order to prevent the onshore works commencing until the offshore works had been consented [ER 3.2.59]. The Applicant considered this unnecessary, citing other recently made DCOs which have followed this approach in splitting the onshore and offshore elements into their respective consenting processes.
- 4.9. The ExA were concerned that the full benefits of the Viking CCS Project could not be realised until the entire CCS chain had been consented and if the pipeline were to be consented in isolation, the project would have no tangible benefits in relation to storing CO<sub>2</sub>. The onshore elements are therefore wholly dependent on the offshore elements coming forward in order to be operational [ER 3.2.64]. The ExA noted paragraph 4.8.20 of NPS EN-1 (2024) which states that due to the process of deploying CCS in clusters within the UK, it is likely that applications for CCS projects may not apply for consent for the full CCS chain, reflecting the argument of the Applicant [ER 3.2.63].
- 4.10. The ExA recommended that the Secretary of State consider the Applicant’s ‘without prejudice wording’ for a new Requirement (“R”) (now R20 (offshore consents)) to ensure the onshore works could not begin until all offshore works or CA rights have been consented, preventing the authorised development commencing until evidence has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority, which the ExA did not consider would unfairly burden the Applicant [ER 3.2.68] [ER 3.2.83] [ER 7.3.9]. With the definition of ‘relevant planning authority’ including several parties, the ExA, recommended that the approving body for the Requirement be the Secretary of State to simplify the process [ER 7.3.9].
- 4.11. The ExA concluded that the Proposed Development, as part of a whole CCS project, would make a meaningful contribution to the goals of decarbonising the UK economy, achieving Net Zero by 2050, and meeting the urgent need for low carbon energy. However, for the purposes of examining the need for the Proposed Development, the ExA considered that the Grampian Requirement is necessary and ensures that the needed benefits of CO<sub>2</sub> capture and storage are secured and that this resolved its concerns [ER 3.2.83]. The ExA also recognised the policy position of a Critical National Priority (“CNP”) for this type of infrastructure and the policy acceptance that the urgent need for low carbon energy will generally outweigh other residual impacts, however considered that with the application being determined under section 105 of the 2008 Act, the full thrust of CNP policy presumption is not directly applicable to the Proposed Development [ER 3.2.82].

- 4.12. The ExA was satisfied that the overarching need argument for the Proposed Development justified ascribing this matter very great weight in the planning balance in favour of making the Order [ER 3.2.85].

*The Secretary of State's Conclusion*

- 4.13. In the Secretary of State's first information request, the Applicant was invited to make any further comments on the wording of R20, which recognised the interaction between the onshore and offshore consents required for the Viking CCS Project. On 22 January 2025, the Applicant confirmed that it was content with the wording proposed by the Secretary of State should the Secretary of State determine such a requirement necessary and agreed with the Secretary of State as the discharging authority instead of the relevant planning authority.
- 4.14. The Secretary of State agrees with the ExA that the overarching need argument has been made for the infrastructure, and that R20 resolves the ExA's concerns around securing the full benefits of the project. The Secretary of State considers that the Applicant has adequately assessed the potential for indirect, secondary and in-combination/cumulative effects of the Proposed Development with other developments, including the wider Viking CCS Project, to the extent that information is available. The Secretary of State notes that there is nothing to suggest that the potential indirect, secondary and In-combination/cumulative effects of the offshore works with the Proposed Development, both in terms of EIA and HRA, will not also be assessed by the applicant and the relevant consenting/competent authority as necessary and required during the consenting process for the associated offshore works at that time. The Secretary of State agrees with the ExA's conclusion [ER 3.2.83] that there is no reason that a decision cannot be taken on the Proposed Development prior to the consent or construction of the wider pipeline or storage.
- 4.15. The Secretary of State recognises that whilst the 2024 NPS EN-1 is an important and relevant consideration, the Secretary of State has concluded that the policies on CNP should not be applied in this way during the transitional period because 2024 NPS EN-1 is not yet in effect for the purposes of decision-making.
- 4.16. In conclusion, the Secretary of State agrees with the rationale of the ExA and ascribes this matter very great weight for making the Order in the planning balance.
- 4.17. In the Secretary of State's third information request, the Applicant was requested to clarify the extent to which vessels may import CO<sub>2</sub>, and whether it considered it necessary to update the EIA and HRA to include the assessment, alone and cumulatively, of any potential indirect upstream effects of operational shipping movements, including any GHG emissions of the ships. On 21 March 2025, the Applicant confirmed that the Proposed Development does not include a connection to the Port of Immingham (or any other port). Similarly, whilst the Humber Green Energy Project could receive liquified CO<sub>2</sub> imports, that development does not include a connection to the Proposed Development Immingham Facility. There is no causal link between the Proposed Development and shipping movements that would require assessment, and shipping movements are not a direct or indirect effect of the Proposed Development. The Secretary of State is satisfied with the response of the Applicant and considers this matter to have no impact on the planning balance.

## Cultural Heritage

- 4.18. The 2011 NPS EN-1 contains policy relevant to the historic environment, including both designated and non-designated heritage assets.
- 4.19. Whilst paragraph 5.8.14 recognises that there should be a strong preference for conserving designated heritage assets and any loss requires clear and convincing justification, paragraph 5.8.15 sets out that any harmful impact must be weighed against the public benefit of the development. The revised 2024 NPS EN-1 reiterates this view, stating in paragraph 5.9.31 that where the harm is less than substantial, it should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate securing its optimum viable use.
- 4.20. The ExA noted that residual moderate adverse construction effects were identified on the setting of above ground designated and non-designated heritage assets within a 2-kilometre study area, of which temporary archaeological effects were considered to remain post-mitigation for the following:
- Grade II\* - Church of St Edmund in Riby.
  - Grade II - Manor House and surviving parkland at Barnoldby le Beck; Ashleigh Farm in Theddlethorpe.
  - Non-Designated – Dicote House; Greenland Farm; Moorhouse Farm; Westfield Farm; Yew Tree Cottage; and The Poplars [ER 3.6.14 et seq.].
- 4.21. The ExA acknowledged that the Applicant had committed to engaging the County Archaeologist for implementing an archaeological mitigation strategy with focused monitoring during construction, while also aiming to restore specific earthwork features impacted by the Proposed Development through measures D1 to D12 outlined in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (“CEMP”), secured by R5 in the draft DCO [ER 3.6.17] [ER 3.6.36].
- 4.22. LCC and NELC raised concerns regarding the Applicant’s lack of fully formed mitigation strategy in their Detailed Archaeological Mitigation Strategy. However, the ExA held that it would be disproportionate to expect the entire construction corridor to have been surveyed at the Examination stage and instead considered an iterative and reactive approach to be standard practice during pre-construction and construction phases. According to the ExA, the Environmental Statement (“ES”) assesses the potential effects on cultural heritage adequately, and the lack of fully informed mitigation strategy at this stage does not conflict with the EIA Regulations, despite being a weakness in the Applicant’s case along with the adverse effects that would remain post-mitigation. By the end of the Examination, the ExA expressed some confidence that archaeological matters and mitigation would be resolved with input from LCC and NELC should the Proposed Development be consented [ER 3.6.34 et seq.].
- 4.23. The ExA considered that the construction works, coupled with the mitigation measures secured in the CEMP and the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (“OLEMP”), would be sufficient to prevent substantial harm to heritage assets and their settings occurring [ER 3.6.41].
- 4.24. The ExA noted that although the Proposed Development would result in potential losses to archaeological deposits for which mitigation would not compensate, taking into account the

significant public benefits of the Proposed Development, including its contribution to the deployment of CCS central to the decarbonisation of the UK economy and reaching Net Zero by 2050, the ExA was satisfied that there was a clear and convincing justification for the harm that would arise to designated heritage assets, therefore according with the relevant provisions of the 2011 NPS EN-1, 2024 NPS EN-1, NPPF and local planning policies [ER 3.6.46 et seq.]. The ExA acknowledged that there were no outstanding comments from IPs that disputed the Applicant's scope of assessment nor the conclusions that less than substantial harm would occur during the construction phase, observing that no points were raised by Historic England [ER 3.6.45].

- 4.25. The ExA concluded that the significant benefits of the Proposed Development would clearly outweigh the less than substantial harm(s), and that the mitigation is adequately provided for and secured in the recommended DCO ("rDCO") to reduce the impact on the significance of heritage assets. The ExA considered this should be afforded moderate negative weight in the overall planning balance [ER 3.6.49].

#### *The Secretary of State's Conclusion*

- 4.26. The Secretary of State agrees with the ExA's assessment and conclusions and considers that the great need for the Proposed Development outweighs, in each case, the harm in relation to the significance of designated heritage assets. The Secretary of State notes that all the designated heritage assets considered would experience an adverse effect that would amount to less than substantial harm. Furthermore, mitigation in the form of R5 (construction environmental management plan) of the DCO has the potential to reduce harm to the sites sufficiently.
- 4.27. Whilst the Secretary of State affords great weight to the desirability of preserving these assets, he is mindful that the effects would be ultimately temporary. In agreement with the ExA's conclusions and having regard to his duty under regulation 3 of the Infrastructure Planning (Decisions) Regulations 2010 in his consideration of these issues, the Secretary of State ascribes this moderate negative weight.

#### Traffic and Transportation

##### *Transport Assessment*

- 4.28. Section 5.13 of the 2011 NPS EN-1 provides guidance and policy for assessing traffic and transport impacts, and sets out in paragraph 5.14.21 that the Secretary of State should only consider refusing development on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe, or it does not show how consideration has been given to the provision of adequate active public or shared transport access and provision.
- 4.29. National Highways ("NH") raised concern with the quality of the Transport Assessment submitted, particularly with regard to what it described as a "vague approach undertaken to derive the traffic impact resulting from the construction phase of the Authorised Development" [ER 3.7.19. et seq.].
- 4.30. In particular, NH maintained concerns regarding the robustness of the Transport Assessment. NH highlighted that there was potential for a severe impact on the operation of the Strategic Road Network ("SRN") at the Habrough Roundabout outside Immingham, for which the Applicant had not provided any information to clarify or demonstrate otherwise.



NH stated it would not usually defer consideration of such information to a post-consent stage but, to be pragmatic, and to be reassured that the Proposed Development would not cause severe or unacceptable road safety issues to the SRN, NH suggested it be made an approving body for the Construction Traffic Management Plan (“CTMP”) under R6 of the draft Development Consent Order (“dDCO”) and Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan under R16 [ER 3.7.24].

- 4.31. The ExA recognised NH’s statutory obligation to maintain the SRN. It stated that under the NPPF, projects with a severe residual impact are insisted to be refused and, as such, the ExA acknowledged NH’s role notwithstanding the Applicant’s position that the Transport Assessment is sufficient. The ExA recommended that NH is made an approving body for R6 and R16 in the dDCO. The ExA expressed confidence that NH would, in considering the information within the CTMP and deciding whether to make any discharges under these Requirements, ensure the SRN would not be subject to a severe impact [ER 3.7.26. et seq.].

#### *Strategic Road Network*

- 4.32. The ExA noted that trenchless pipe-laying under the SRN could destabilise ground conditions. The ExA recognised NH’s mandate to maintain SRN safety and that in many recent instances clauses have been inserted into made DCOs securing financial support to rectify any failures or defects in the condition of the SRN.
- 4.33. The ExA judged the Applicant’s concern that it would be liable to repair the SRN for problems unrelated to the Proposed Development as unsubstantiated by evidence or justification. The ExA considered that even if the real risk of damage, subsidence or land heave undermining the SRN may be low, NH have made a clear and compelling case for security for the SRN, consistent with other recent decisions. To time limit liability claims and the need for securing financial support to 12 months, as requested by NH, seemed reasonable to the ExA to alleviate the Applicant’s concerns regarding an ongoing liability for any repair works to the SRN. On this basis, the ExA recommended to the Secretary of State that the protective provisions in favour of NH are amended, in the interests of protecting the SRN, as set out in Chapter 7 of the ExA’s Report [ER 3.7.35 et seq.].
- 4.34. The ExA concluded, on the basis of the technical objections from NH, that it is not satisfied that the Transport Assessment fully appraises the impacts upon the SRN, leaving the possibility of a severe residual impact upon the SRN. This appeared to run contrary to the aims of paragraphs 5.13.6 of the 2011 NPS EN-1 and 5.14.21 of the 2024 NPS EN-1. However, NH suggested a means by which the Proposed Development could be rendered acceptable through protective provisions and through post-consent discharging processes. The ExA advised that NH’s approach is taken and recommended the following to the Secretary of State, which are captured in paragraph 9 of this letter:
- NH is made an approving authority for R6 and R16 in the dDCO;
  - A clause securing a financial bond for repairs to the SRN is entered into the protective provisions; and
  - A defects period of 12 months is provided to ensure any damage to the SRN is remedied appropriately [ER 3.7.55].
- 4.35. The ExA is satisfied that the transport and traffic assessment for the local highway network set out in the ES meets the requirements of the 2011 NPS EN-1 and 2024 NPS EN-1. The ExA is also satisfied that no significant traffic or transportation effects upon the local highway

network are likely to arise from the Proposed Development, in compliance with local planning policy. The test of severity in the NPPF would not be breached.

- 4.36. On 13th November 2024, Network Road Safety Limited (“NRSL”) submitted a Road Safety Audit Stage 1 (“RSA-S1”) Report as a post-examination submission. This report, prepared by NRSL on behalf of NELC, identified road safety issues during construction and provided recommendations to address these risks. The Secretary of State has considered these recommendations and is satisfied that these can be taken into account within the CTMP, pursuant to R6 of the DCO, and access plans pursuant to R7 of the DCO.

### *The Secretary of State’s Conclusion*

- 4.37. The Secretary of State agrees with the ExA’s conclusions on the traffic assessment and SRN and ascribes this minor negative weight against the Order. The Secretary of State agrees that NH should be made an approving body in R6 and R16 in the DCO in relation to the SRN. The Secretary of State agrees with ExA that the Applicant should secure financial support to rectify any contingent failures or defects in the condition of the SRN for a period of 12 months after construction. The Secretary of State acknowledges the issues set out in NRSL’s RSA-S1 Report and is content that the controls within R6 and R7 of the DCO are sufficient to ensure that the recommendations of that Report can be addressed as part of the process of discharging those Requirements. The Secretary of State notes that Part 2 of Schedule 2 to the DCO incorporates an appeal mechanism in relation to the Requirements to which the Applicant has recourse if it considered NH is behaving unreasonably in its role as a discharging authority for R6 and R16.

## **5. Habitats Regulations Assessment**

- 5.1. The Secretary of State has undertaken a Habitats Regulations Assessment (“HRA”) and has carefully considered the information presented during the Examination, including the HRA Report [REP6-011] as submitted by the Applicant, the Report on the Implications for European Sites (“RIES”) [PD-022] as produced by the ExA, the ES, representations made by IPs, and the ExA’s Report.
- 5.2. The Secretary of State considers that the Proposed Development has the potential to have a Likely Significant Effect (“LSE”) from nine effect pathways on four protected sites when considered alone and in-combination with other plans or projects.
- 5.3. The Secretary of State has undertaken an Appropriate Assessment (“AA”) in respect of the Conservation Objectives of the protected sites to determine whether the Proposed Development, either alone or in-combination with other plans or projects, will result in an Adverse Effect on Integrity (“AEoI”) of the identified protected sites. Based on the information available to him and subject to the mitigation measures as secured in the final Order, the Secretary of State is satisfied that the Proposed Development, either alone or in-combination with other plans or projects, will not adversely affect the qualifying features of any protected sites. The full reasoning for the conclusions is set out in the HRA which has been published alongside this decision letter.

## **6. Consideration of Land Rights and Related Matters**

- 6.1. The Secretary of State notes that to support the delivery of the Proposed Development, the Applicant is seeking powers of CA and TP of land and rights. The Applicant is seeking the following:

- Permanent acquisition of land for the Immingham Above Ground Infrastructure for the three block valve stations (“BVS”) along the route of the pipeline and for the Theddlethorpe Above Ground Infrastructure (“TAGI”) to be located within the site of the former TGT [ER 6.2.6];
  - Permanent acquisition of land identified on the Land Plans as being shaded in pink, with permanent acquisition of the subsurface only shaded in yellow [ER 6.2.8];
  - Extinguishment of rights to ensure that easements, restrictions and other private rights identified as affecting the land can be extinguished or suspended. These powers allow the Applicant to construct, operate and maintain all elements of the Proposed Development [ER 6.2.10].
- 6.2. During the Examination the Applicant submitted two formal change requests. Neither invoked the Infrastructure Planning (Compulsory Acquisition) Regulations 2010 (CA Regulations) because no additional land or rights were sought. All the changes proposed sought a reduction in the extent of land and/ or rights sought by the Applicant [ER 6.2.11].
- 6.3. The ExA noted that CA powers could only be granted if the conditions set out in s122 and s123 of the 2008 Act are met, the relevant guidance for which is set out in Guidance Related to Procedures for the Compulsory Acquisition of Land, September 2013 from the Department for Communities and Local Government (“the CA Guidance”) [ER 6.3.1].
- 6.4. The ExA considered the benefits of the Proposed Development in isolation and found that those benefits would be limited since, without the ability to transport and sequester the CO<sub>2</sub> offshore, the Proposed Development would not deliver the benefits purported and relied upon by the Applicant. The delivery of tangible benefits would come when the Proposed Development, via its connection to the LOGGS, would be able to transport CO<sub>2</sub> to the subsea reservoir as part of the entire Viking CCS project [ER 6.6.1].
- 6.5. For there to be a compelling case in the public interest, as s122(3) stipulates, the ExA considered that a Grampian Requirement is essential to secure the benefits of the entire Viking CCS project: Before land or rights are acquired by compulsion the offshore components must also be adequately consented and secured [ER 6.10.1], thereby linking the onshore and offshore elements of the scheme. This was subsequently recommended by the ExA as Requirement 20 of the dDCO [ER 6.6.15].
- 6.6. Having considered all of the material submitted to the Examination, and subject to the imposition of the Grampian Requirement stated above, the ExA reached the following conclusions:
- The Application site has been appropriately selected;
  - All reasonable alternatives to CA have been explored;
  - The Applicant would have access to the necessary funds and the rDCO provides a clear mechanism whereby the necessary funding can be guaranteed;
  - There is a clear need for all the land included in the BoR to be subject to CA or TP;
  - There is a need to secure the land and rights required to construct, operate and maintain the Proposed Development within a reasonable timeframe;
  - That in all cases relating to individual objections and issues that CA and TP are justified to enable implementation of the Proposed Development;

- The powers sought generally satisfy the conditions set out in s122 and s123 of the 2008 Act;
- In the majority, subject to the ExA's recommended amendments to protective provisions detailed, the powers sought in relation to SUs meet the conditions set out in s127 and s138 of the 2008 Act and the CA Guidance [ER 6.10.2].

6.7. Considering all of the above, the ExA finds there is a compelling case in the public interest for the CA and TP powers sought and the ExA recommends acceptance of the CA and TP powers proposed in the dDCO [ER 6.10.3].

#### Outstanding Objections and Protective Provisions

6.8. At the close of the examination a number of Statutory Undertakers ("SU") had unsigned agreements, some of which were received by the Secretary of State post-examination. On 8 January 2025, the Secretary of State sought updates on the outstanding agreements in his first information request, with responses received from the Applicant and IPs on 22 January 2025. All responses received by the Secretary of State in the form of post-examination submissions and information request responses are summarised below.

##### *Uniper UK Gas Limited*

6.9. On 8 October 2024, Uniper UK Gas Limited confirmed it had agreed with the Applicant a Statement of Common Ground ("SoCG"). No update was provided by the Applicant regarding the protective provisions requested by Uniper although the Applicant did submit an updated DCO on 21 March 2025 which included protective provisions for Uniper, in the Applicant's preferred form. For the reasons set out in the ExA's Report [ER 6.8.47 – 6.8.53 and Table 5], the Secretary of State has decided to incorporate the protective provisions requested by Uniper. These are included in Part 14 of Schedule 9 to the DCO.

##### *National Gas Transmission Plc*

6.10. On 13 November 2024, National Gas Transmission Plc ("NGT") confirmed withdrawal of its objection based on a mutual agreement that has been completed with the Applicant.

6.11. On 22 January 2025, in its response to the first information request, the Applicant confirmed that it had submitted an updated form of protective provisions that the parties agree should be used in the Order, if granted. These protective provisions are included in Part 4 of Schedule 9 to the DCO.

##### *Air Products (BR) Limited*

6.12. On 11 December 2024, Air Products (BR) Limited confirmed that agreement had been reached with the Applicant and that it withdrew its representation.

6.13. On 22 January 2025, the Applicant confirmed that it had agreed protective provisions with Air Products (BR) Limited. These protective provisions are included in Part 13 of Schedule 9 to the DCO.

### *Network Rail Infrastructure Limited*

- 6.14. On 26 November 2024, Network Rail Infrastructure Limited (“NRIL”) confirmed the withdrawal of its objection based on an agreement that protective provisions are included in the Order.
- 6.15. On 5 December 2024, the Applicant confirmed that they had agreed protective provisions with Network Rail. These are included in Part 6 of Schedule 9 to the DCO.

### *Cadent Gas Limited*

- 6.16. On 20 December 2024, Cadent Gas Limited confirmed that agreement had been reached with the Applicant over the protective provisions to be included in the Order and for it to withdraw its objection, subject to the Secretary of State’s determination in relation to two matters in dispute i.e., Paragraph 53(5) and Paragraph 57(3) of the protective provisions.
- 6.17. The Secretary of State has considered the matters in dispute and decided to incorporate the wording requested by Cadent Gas, for the reasons set out in the ExA’s Report [ER 6.8.29 – 6.8.32 and Table 5].

### *Immingham Oil Terminal Operators*

- 6.18. On 21 January 2025, the Applicant confirmed that it had agreed terms of a legal agreement with Immingham Oil Terminal (“IOT”) Operators for agreed protective provisions, in substitution for Schedule 9, Part 12 of the dDCO (Revision H), to be included in the DCO should it be granted. The Applicant confirmed it was expecting IOT to withdraw its objection imminently.
- 6.19. On 22 January 2025, both the Applicant and IOT Operators separately confirmed that they had entered into agreement terms in respect of the protective provisions and that IOT Operators had withdrawn its objection to the application. The agreed protective provisions are included in Part 12 of Schedule 9 to the DCO.

### *Crown Consent*

- 6.20. The ExA noted that consent for plots of land from the Crown Estate (“TCE”) had not been obtained by the Applicant during Examination and advised the Secretary of State to seek an update from the Applicant on this matter [ER 6.8.62 et seq.].
- 6.21. On 3 December 2024, TCE provided an update in a post-examination submission confirming that an agreement had been reached with the Applicant which provides the Commissioners with sufficient assurance as to the way in which compulsory acquisition powers (as contained in Articles 23 and 25 of the dDCO) may be exercised in respect of third party interests in land forming part of the Crown Estate.
- 6.22. As such, TCE confirmed its consent to the compulsory acquisition of the third-party interests in TCE Plots (i.e., Plots 36-14 and 36/16) and Assumed TCE Plots (i.e., Plots 36/12 and 36/15) to the extent that each of the Assumed TCE Plots form part of TCE for the purpose of Section 135(1) of the 2008 Act, on the condition of the following:

1. *“The inclusion and continuing application of the following amended “Crown rights” wording in the Order at Article 42:*

*"(1) Nothing in this Order affects prejudicially any estate, right, power, privilege, authority or exemption of the Crown and in particular, nothing in this Order authorises the undertaker or any lessee or licensee to take, use, enter on or in any manner interfere with any land or rights of any description (including any portion of the shore or bed of the sea or any river, channel, creek, bay or estuary)—*

- i) belonging to His Majesty in right of the Crown and forming part of The Crown Estate without the consent in writing of the Crown Estate Commissioners;*
- ii) belonging to His Majesty in right of the Crown and not forming part of The Crown Estate without the consent in writing of the government department having the management of that land; or*
- iii) belonging to a government department or held in trust for His Majesty for the purposes of a government department without the consent in writing of that government department.*

*(2) Paragraph (1) does not apply to the exercise of any right under this Order for the compulsory acquisition of an interest in any Crown land (as defined in the 2008 Act) which is for the time being held otherwise than by or on behalf of the Crown.*

*(3) A consent under paragraph (1) may be given unconditionally or subject to terms and conditions; and is deemed to have been given in writing where it is sent electronically.*

- 2. the Commissioners being consulted further if any variation to the Draft DCO is proposed which could affect any other provisions of the Order which are subject to section 135(1) and 135(2) of the Act.*

*Subject to:*

- i) the inclusion of Article 42 in the Order as amended above and its continuing application; and*
- ii) the Commissioners being consulted further if any variation to the Draft DCO is proposed which could affect any other provisions of the Order which are subject to section 135(1) and 135(2) of the Act."*

6.23. The Commissioners confirmed, on this basis, their consent to Articles 3, 4, 5, 20, 34, 42 and 44 of the dDCO to the extent that they are included in the Order, applying in relation to the TCE Plots and the Assumed TCE Plots (to the extent that each of the Assumed TCE Plots form part of The Crown Estate) for the purpose of section 135(2) of the 2008 Act.

6.24. On 22 January 2025, the Applicant confirmed that it had entered into an Agreement of Undertaking on 3 December 2024 with the Commissioners, and following this, consent under section 135 of the 2008 Act was provided by TCE.

6.25. The Secretary of State has incorporated the minor change to Article 41 (Crown rights) requested by TCE (the addition of the words "lessee or" to paragraph (1)).

*Lincolnshire County Council*

6.26. On 8 January 2025, the Secretary of State requested LCC and the Applicant to provide an update on whether agreement has been reached over compulsory acquisition powers for the relevant plots of land in which LCC have an interest.

- 6.27. On 22 January 2025, LCC confirmed that it does not consider that it holds any land interest in the parcels identified by the Applicant, and these plots were removed from the Schedule of Negotiations at Examination Deadline 6. No lease is therefore required between LCC and the Applicant. On 22 January, the Applicant also responded corroborating this information.

#### *Lindsey Marsh Internal Drainage Board*

- 6.28. On 8 January 2025, the Secretary of State requested for Lindsey Marsh Internal Drainage Board (“LMIDB”) and the Applicant to provide an update on whether agreement has been reached over compulsory acquisition powers for the relevant plots of land in which LCC have an interest.
- 6.29. On 22 January 2025, LMIDB confirmed that they do not hold any land interests in the parcels identified by the Applicant and will therefore not require the Applicant to enter into any lease or other land agreement. On 22 January, the Applicant also responded corroborating this information.

#### *Special Category Land*

- 6.30. On 8 January 2025, in light of the information in section 10.3 of the Statement of Reasons (Revision D) the Secretary of State requested the Applicant to comment on whether any amendments to the wording in the dDCO regarding special category land were required, noting that at the time it only referred to open space land.
- 6.31. On 22 January 2025, the Applicant confirmed that it had reviewed the Statement of Reasons (Revision D) and agreed that additional wording should be included in the preamble of the DCO to reflect all forms of special category land included in the Order Limits. In particular, the Applicant advised that wording should be added to address that rights are sought through compulsory acquisition powers over common land. The Secretary of State has incorporated the additional wording suggested by the Applicant, with minor modifications to avoid repetition.

#### *The Secretary of State’s Conclusion*

- 6.32. The Secretary of State is satisfied that the outstanding agreements between the Applicant and SUs have been resolved and agrees with the ExA that the case for the requested compulsory acquisition powers has been made. The Secretary of State accordingly agrees with the inclusion of these powers in the DCO.
- 6.33. The Secretary of State has no reason to believe that the grant of the DCO would give rise to any unjustified interference with human rights so as to conflict with the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998.

### **7. Secretary of State’s Consideration of the Planning Balance and Conclusions**

- 7.1. The Secretary of State agrees with the ExA’s conclusions and the weight it has ascribed in the overall planning balance in respect of the following issues:
- The Principle of the Development – very great weight
  - Noise and Vibration – neutral weight
  - Major Accidents and Hazards – neutral weight

- Landscape and Visual Amenity and Good Design – minor negative weight
- Cultural Heritage – moderate negative
- Traffic and Transport – minor negative
- Flood Risk, Hydrology and Water Resources – neutral weight
- Air Quality – neutral weight
- Climate Change – minor negative weight
- Ecology and Biodiversity – neutral weight
- Geology and Land Use – minor negative weight
- Minerals and Waste – neutral weight
- Other Planning Matters – neutral weight

- 7.2. All NSIPs will have some potential adverse impacts. In the case of the Proposed Development, most of the potential impacts have been assessed by the ExA as having not breached 2011 NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-4 or 2024 NPS EN-1 and EN-4, subject in some cases to suitable mitigation measures being put in place to minimise or avoid them completely as required by NPS policy. The Secretary of State considers that these mitigation measures have been appropriately secured.
- 7.3. For the reasons given in this letter, the Secretary of State concludes that the benefits of the Proposed Development outweigh its adverse impacts. Furthermore, the Secretary of State considers there is a compelling case in the public interest for the compulsory acquisition and temporary possession powers sought.
- 7.4. The Secretary of State concludes that development consent should be granted for the Viking CCS Carbon Dioxide Pipeline Project. The Secretary of State does not consider that the national need for the Proposed Development as set out in the relevant NPSs is outweighed by its potential adverse impacts, as mitigated by the proposed terms of the Order.
- 7.5. In reaching this decision, the Secretary of State confirms that regard has been given to the ExA's Report, the LIRs submitted by ELDC, LCC, NLDC, NELC and WLDC, the 2011 and 2024 designated NPSs, draft NPSs, and to all other matters which are considered important and relevant to the Secretary of State's decision as required by section 105 of the 2008 Act. The Secretary of State confirms for the purposes of regulation 4(2) of the EIA Regulations that the environmental information as defined in regulation 3(1) of those Regulations has been taken into consideration.
- 7.6. The Secretary of State has therefore decided to accept the ExA's recommendation to make the Order granting development consent, including the modifications set out in section 9 of this document.

## **8. Other Matters**

### Equality Act 2010

- 8.1. The Equality Act 2010 includes a public sector "general equality duty" ("PSED"). This requires public authorities to have due regard in the exercise of their functions to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct



prohibited under the Equality Act 2010; advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not; and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not in respect of the following “protected characteristics”: age; gender; gender reassignment; disability; marriage and civil partnerships<sup>3</sup>; pregnancy and maternity; religion and belief; and race.

- 8.2. In considering this matter, the Secretary of State (as decision-maker) must pay due regard to the aims of the PSED. This must include consideration of all potential equality impacts highlighted during the Examination. There can be detriment to affected parties but, if there is, it must be acknowledged and the impacts on equality must be considered.
- 8.3. The Secretary of State has had due regard to this duty and has not identified any parties with a protected characteristic that might be discriminated against as a result of the decision to grant consent to the proposed Development.
- 8.4. The Secretary of State is confident that, in taking the recommended decision, the Secretary of State has paid due regard to the above aims when considering the potential impacts of granting or refusing consent and can conclude that the Proposed Development will not result in any differential impacts on people sharing any of the protected characteristics. The Secretary of State concludes, therefore, that granting consent is not likely to result in a substantial impact on equality of opportunity or relations between those who share a protected characteristic and others or unlawfully discriminate against any particular protected characteristics.

#### Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006

- 8.5. The Secretary of State notes the “general biodiversity objective” to conserve and enhance biodiversity in England, section 40(A1) of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 and considers the application consistent with furthering that objective, having also had regard to the United Nations Environment Programme Convention on Biological Diversity of 1992, when making this decision.
- 8.6. The Secretary of State is of the view that the ExA’s Report, together with the Environmental Impact Assessment, considers biodiversity sufficiently to inform the Secretary of State in this respect. In reaching the decision to give consent to the Proposed Development, the Secretary of State has had due regard to conserving biodiversity.

### **9. Modifications to the draft Order**

- 9.1. Following consideration of the draft Order provided by the ExA and taking into account the post-examination representations received from the Applicant and other relevant parties, the Secretary of State has made the following modifications to the draft Order provided by the ExA:
  - a. The addition of wording relating to common land to the preamble, as referred to in paragraph 6.31 of this letter.

---

<sup>3</sup> In respect of the first statutory objective (eliminating unlawful discrimination etc.) only.

- b. The deletion of Article 22 (removal of human remains) and consequent renumbering of the other Articles, as it is the Secretary of State's preference to remove this Article if there are no known human remains within the proposed authorised development's boundaries.
- c. The amendment of Articles 23 (time limit for exercise of authority to acquire land compulsorily), 28 (application of the 1981 Act) and 30 (modification of Part 1 of the 1965 Act) to reflect that the wording in previous orders from the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965 and the Compulsory Purchase (Vesting Declarations) Act 1981 has been deleted by section 185 of the Levelling-Up and Regeneration Act 2023, such that the 3-year period is no longer a hard cap on the notice to treat or general vesting declaration procedures. The updated wording reflects that included in more recently made orders.
- d. The addition of the wording requested by TCE in Article 41 (Crown rights), as referred to in paragraph 6.25 of this letter.
- e. The deletion of Article 43(6) (planning legislation), to reflect concerns raised by the Secretary of State in the second information request. The Secretary of State has had regard to the responses from the Applicant and Lincolnshire County Council. Section 160 of the 2008 Act makes it an offence to carry out development for which development consent is required if no development consent is in force. The Applicant states in its response to the second information request that a lawful planning permission under the TCPA 1990 could not be granted for development that requires development consent. It follows that carrying out development under a lawful planning permission could not result in an offence being committed under section 160. Section 161 of the 2008 Act makes it an offence to carry out development in breach of a DCO, or to otherwise fail to comply with the terms of a DCO, without reasonable excuse. The Applicant notes in its response that paragraph (6) is concerned with development that can be carried out "without impact on the Proposed Development". That being the case, the carrying out of such development should not result in a breach of the DCO. In any event however, the Secretary of State does not consider it appropriate to include a term in the DCO the effect of which is to disapply section 161 in respect of unspecified future breaches of the DCO. The Secretary of State notes that Article 43 was added to the DCO in response to concerns raised by Lincolnshire County Council [ER 3.13.25 et seq.] and that Lincolnshire County Council does not object to the deletion of this paragraph. To ensure confidence in the infrastructure planning process it is important that DCOs are complied with. For these reasons, the Secretary of State has deleted paragraph (6) from the Order.
- f. The amendment of Article 47 (requirements, appeals, etc.) to reflect the precedent established by previous orders (including orders cited by the Applicant in the Explanatory Memorandum) and to avoid potential conflict between the provisions of this article and those in Part 2 of Schedule 2.
- g. The addition of Requirement 21 (biodiversity net gain), using the wording provided by the Applicant on a without prejudice basis (ER 3.11.41). The Secretary of State has considered the ExA's comments on the need for such a requirement (ER 3.11.39 - 3.11.46) but considers that a requirement to secure BNG is desirable, noting the

comments from Natural England and local authorities, the content of the OLEMP and having regard to other recently made orders.

- h. The amendment of Requirement 23 (applications made under requirements) to insert a deemed refusal provision where applications to discharge requirements give rise, or are likely to give rise, to materially new or materially different environmental effects compared to those assessed in the environmental statement. This is consistent with recently made orders.
  - i. The amendment of paragraph 27(2) (appeals) of Part 2 of Schedule 2 to insert a 42-day time limit for appeals by the undertaker, consistent with recently made orders.
  - j. Amendments to the protective provisions in favour of NGT in Part 4 of Schedule 9, as referred to in section 6 of this letter.
  - k. Amendments to the protective provisions in favour of Network Rail in Part 6 of Schedule 9, as referred to in section 6 of this letter.
  - l. Amendments to the protective provisions in favour of Immingham Oil Terminal operators in Part 12 of Schedule 9, as referred to in section 6 of this letter.
  - m. Amendments to the protective provisions in favour of Air Products (BR) Limited in Part 13 of Schedule 9, as referred to in section 6 of this letter.
  - n. The amendment of paragraph 7 (confidentiality) of Schedule 10 (arbitration rules), to make arbitration hearings and documentation open to the public except in limited circumstances. This is to ensure procedural transparency and consistency with recently made orders.
  - o. The incorporation of the Applicant's suggested changes to the definition of 'pipeline' and consequential amendments, together with other minor drafting points captured in the updated DCO submitted by the Applicant on 21 March 2025.
- 9.2. In addition to the above, the Secretary of State has made various changes to the draft Order which do not materially alter its effect, including changes to conform with the current practice for statutory instruments, changes made in the interests of clarity and consistency, changes made for the purposes of correcting and standardising grammar and spelling, changes to reflect the responses to the information requests, and changes to ensure that the Order has its intended effect. The Order, including the modifications referred to above, is being published with this letter.

## **10. Challenge to decision**

- 10.1. The circumstances in which the Secretary of State's decision may be challenged are set out in the Annex to this letter.

## **11. Publicity for decision**

- 11.1. The Secretary of State's decision on this Application is being publicised as required by section 116 of the 2008 Act and regulation 31 of the EIA Regulations.
- 11.2. Section 134(6A) of the 2008 Act provides that a compulsory acquisition notice shall be a local land charge. Section 134(6A) also requires the compulsory acquisition notice to be sent to the Chief Land Registrar, and this will be the case where the Order is situated in an area for which the Chief Land Registrar has given notice that they now keep the local land charges register following changes made by Schedule 5 to the Infrastructure Act 2015. However, where land in the Order is situated in an area for which the local authority remains the registering authority for local land charges (because the changes made by the Infrastructure Act 2015 have not yet taken effect), the prospective purchaser should comply with the steps required by section 5 of the Local Land Charges Act 1975 (prior to it being amended by the Infrastructure Act 2015) to ensure that the charge is registered by the local authority.

Yours sincerely,



David Wagstaff OBE

Head of Energy Infrastructure Development

## **ANNEX A: LEGAL CHALLENGES RELATING TO APPLICATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDERS**

Under section 118 of the Planning Act 2008, an Order **granting development consent**, or anything done, or omitted to be done, by the Secretary of State in relation to an application for such an Order, can be challenged only by means of a claim for judicial review. A claim for judicial review must be made to the Planning Court during the period of 6 weeks beginning with the day after the day on which the Order or decision is published. The decision documents are being published on the date of this letter on the Planning Inspectorate website at the following address:

<https://national-infrastructure-consenting.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/EN070008>

**These notes are provided for guidance only. A person who thinks they may have grounds for challenging the decision to make the Order referred to in this letter is advised to seek legal advice before taking any action. If you require advice on the process for making any challenge you should contact the Administrative Court Office at the Royal Courts of Justice, Strand, London, WC2A 2LL (0207 947 6655).**

## ANNEX B: LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Reference
AA	Appropriate Assessment
AEoI	Adverse Effects on Integrity
BESS	British Energy Security Strategy
BVS	Block Valve Stations
CA	Compulsory Acquisition
CCS	Carbon Capture Storage
CEMP	Construction Environmental Management Plan
CNP	Critical National Priority
CO <sub>2</sub>	Carbon Dioxide
CTMP	Construction Traffic Management Plan
DCO	Development Consent Order
dDCO	draft Development Consent Order
ELDC	East Lindsey District Council
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ER	Reference to ExA Report
ES	Environmental Statement
ExA	The Examining Authority
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
IOT	Immingham Oil Terminal
IP	Interested Party
IROPI	Imperative Reasons of Overriding Public Interest
LCC	Lincolnshire County Council
LIR	Local Impact Report
LMIDB	Lindsey Marsh Internal Drainage Board
LSE	Likely Significant Effect
MLWS	Mean Low Water Spring
Mt	Million Tonnes
MW	Megawatt
NE	Natural England
NELC	North East Lincolnshire Council
NGT	National Gas Transmission PLC
NH	National Highways
NLC	North Lincolnshire Council
NPPF	The National Planning Policy Framework
NPS	National Policy Statement
NPS EN-1	National Policy Statement for Energy
NPS EN-3	National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure
NRIL	Network Rail Infrastructure Limited
NRSL	Network Road Safety Limited
NSN	National Site Network

<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Reference</b>
NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
OLEMP	Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan
2008 Act	The Planning Act 2008
PSED	Public Sector Equality Duty
R	Requirement
rDCO	recommended DCO
RIES	Report on the Implications for European Sites
RR	Relevant Representation
RSA-S1	Road Safety Audit Stage 1
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
SPA	Special Protection Area
SRN	Strategic Road Network
SU	Statutory Undertakers
TAGI	Theddlethorpe Above Ground Infrastructure
TCE	The Crown Estate
TGT	Theddlethorpe Gas Terminal
TP	Temporary Possession
WLDC	West Lindsey District Council