

From: Case Administration
Subject: FW: Viking CCS Pipeline.

From: David Spilman [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 13, 2024 4:02 PM
To: Viking CCS Pipeline <Vikingccspipeline@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Viking CCS Pipeline.

You don't often get email from [REDACTED].

Dear Planning Inspectorate (PINS)

I registered to be included on the written representations for the Viking CCS Pipeline before the deadline, and I submitted my own written representation through the website portal alongside my fathers 'J Spilman', 'The Spilman family' and 'Aylesby Manor Farms'; all of which you have published via DDM. However you have not published my own comments which I submitted correctly. These are for David Spilman, a Landowner at [REDACTED] situated on the north side of the A18 Barton Road, and I am therefore an affected party.

I will understand if this is simply an admin error / IT related and trust that you will be able to include the below written representation on my behalf please as the proposed application is still at the pre examination stage?

I also own land at [REDACTED] (where the block valve is to be situated) and so my comments are of the upmost importance to the consideration of the suitability of the scheme in this section.

My name is David Spilman,

Mobile [REDACTED]

- My comments are as follows:
- No attempt to meet to discuss commercial terms whatsoever and a lack of meaningful consultation with the landowners and their agents.
- No attempt to discuss a methodology for the pipeline construction with the landowner.
- No attempt to negotiate a development clause to mitigate a potential loss of income, leading to concerns of statutory blight.
- A lack of integrity by the acquiring authority on the width of the option area corridor, construction width, depth, and time frames of the pipeline.
- No consultation regarding the implementation of a haul road or means to work over differing land types during the construction period, in line with Soil Association and AHDB guidance for construction sites.
- No consultation on land drainage, and mitigation for potential contamination of a large pond area containing protected species.
- No consultation on the loss of income from diversification environmental stewardship schemes/shoots etc; Lack of integrity/disingenuous conversations regarding the option area, **a 100m option corridor was never mentioned and it was proposed that instead 10m would be suitable due to proposed suitable alternative development.**
- Block valve -location of it is not the location the landowner was informed it would be. Potential loss or land and sterilized land around it which can no longer be farmed. what are the terms on offer and what is the basis of valuation for this item?
- No attempt to provide any information to the landowner beyond indicative location.

- The landowner has expressed a willingness to work with the acquiring authority but is not being listened to or kept informed on progress of the scheme, considering the proposed
- route corridor affects the family considerably across their landownership.
- An option area consisting of approximately 78 Acres of land is currently the subject and this goes through the centre of several fields and the heart of the farm, blighting future prospects and development until we know the easement corridor. It is not clear why it is reasonable to blight 100m of land for the sake of the limits of deviation, **for such an unreasonably long period of time, seemingly whilst the acquiring authority undertake the surveys they should have undertaken before submitting their application to PINS.**
- **The application seems rushed and unprepared and I would urge PINS to insist on the applicant undertaking the required statutory consultation with landowners in a timely manner and with integrity, rather than pretending to tick a box by having consulted with member at village halls and similar in 2021. The proposed route has changed considerably since its first proposal and no longer affects consultees that were initially affected and consulted with in 2021. We only became an affected party in February 2023 and met with the Viking CCS team once to discuss the route and how it may affect our Solar Farm. We have not had any consultation on the scheme since.** S.42 Planning Act 2008 Duty to Consult – this obligation has not been met. There has not been a reasonable level of engagement with us as is required by the Planning Act 2008.

I look forward to hearing from you to confirm my written representation has been accepted.

Many thanks

Kind regards

David

Please note that the contents of this email and any attachments are privileged and/or confidential and intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this email and its attachments, you must take no action based upon them, nor must you copy or show them to anyone. Please contact the sender if you believe you have received this email in error and then delete this email from your system.

Recipients should note that e-mail traffic on Planning Inspectorate systems is subject to monitoring, recording and auditing to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The Planning Inspectorate has taken steps to keep this e-mail and any attachments free from viruses. It accepts no liability for any loss or damage caused as a result of any virus being passed on. It is the responsibility of the recipient to perform all necessary checks.

The statements expressed in this e-mail are personal and do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of the Inspectorate.

DPC:76616c646f72



Please consider the environment before printing this email