

# TRANSCRIPT\_VIKING\_CAH1\_SESSION1\_27 012024

00:00

Good

00:11

morning everyone, and welcome back to, to to the hall.

00:19

It's now 9:30am. And I'm starting the first compulsory acquisition hearing to be held in respect to the application or from Crystal production UK Limited for an order for development consent for the Viking CCS pipeline project.

00:40

We'll introduce ourselves fully in a moment. Before we do that, please bear with me while we deal with a few housekeeping matters. Firstly, can everyone hear me in the room?

00:54

And Kim, in could the case team, please confirm that the meeting recordings and the live live streams have started getting the thumbs up. So that's a good start. Thank you.

01:05

Had there been a request for reasonable adjustments? Or arrangements? No, they haven't.

01:14

I'm sure there are no fire alarm drills today.

01:18

Though we did have a problem with a toaster earlier, which could have set one off but fortunately, I managed to avoid that.

01:25

So any alarm should be treated as real. The assembly point is outside the front of the building on the chapel lawn as per the notices. And if there was an alarm, please do not reenter the building until you're told it's safe to do so.

01:44

The toilets, a downer corridor there.

01:48

And this morning, we are starting a bit earlier as you are gathered at 930. So we'll be looking to take a break. Seeming we're still going at around 11am.

02:00

And looking to finish between 12 and 1230.

02:07

Moving on to introductions of the panel.

02:11

We did this yesterday but we'll do

02:14

against each meeting. My name is John Horst. And I've been appointed by Secretary of State for levelling up Housing and Communities as a member of the panel to carry out an examination for the above application. Mr. Wallace. Thank you. Yes, good morning. I'm David Wallace. And I've been appointed as the lead member of the panel by the secretary of state.

02:40

Good morning. My name is Alex Jack and I've been appointed by the Secretary of State as a member of this examining authority. I'll be taking the action points for today's hearing.

02:51

Thank you, both of you. I confirmed that all members of the panel have made a declaration of interests. Responding to the planning Inspectorate conflict of interest policy, none of us have a declarable interest in relation to this appointment.

03:09

Also present and members of the case team sitting near the front door case manager is Mrs. Caroline Hopewell and she's supported by Jessica Weatherby who are both here at the venue and by Joe Shanks online. Your any questions or concerns about today's event, please contact a member of the case team.

03:33

And the audio visual and Internet services today is provided by production 78 Grove, they're in the corner and will give us a wave.

03:42

Thank you very much, chaps. Very efficient. Thank you for your for your help.

03:47

So that's the team from our end. If I can move on to introductions of attendees. First of all, welcome to those who are attending, either in person or watching the live stream. Thank you very much for joining us.

04:03

There's a number of individuals and organisations who have indicated that they will be attending today's hearing. I'd like to take introductions from them and also hear whether or not they would like to speak this morning. So please can I hear and I'll call you out as I get to each of the organisations. First of all starting with the applicant. Good morning.

04:29

Good morning, sir. Good morning. My name is Craig Welton. Or to summon solicitors we are instructed by the applicant I'll ask those around me to introduce themselves if that's okay.

04:42

Good morning and my name is Patrick Munro, Senior Associate Burgess salmon representing the applicant.

04:49

Good morning. My name is Rob Brown from Gately Hamer, Senior Associate and instructed by the applicant.

04:56

Morning, sir, my name's Paul Davis. We're close up production

05:00

trim, and I'm the onshore development manager

05:05

Manisa Nigel Pilkington have a calm, technical director

05:15

Adam Wilson from a comp representing the applicant.

05:24

Thank you very much for that. And just to reminder to everyone that when you do come to speak, if you could give you a name, and also your organisation who you're representing,

05:36

turn now to the local authorities

05:41

like to introduce yourself, please.

05:43

Yes, my name is Martin Dixon, northeast Lincolnshire Council. I don't intend to speak this morning unless anything's raised that you asked me about. Thank you.

05:56

Thank you for that. We don't have any of the local authorities in the room. I'm just wondering if there's any one on the virtual

06:07

looking at it virtually, who would like to just identify themselves at this stage?

06:14

Know not getting any indication of that.

06:20

And there's a few a number of other organisations that

06:25

they were expecting.

06:30

Start with national highways.

06:35

Yeah, good morning, sir. My name is Paul welling. And I'm an in house lawyer at national highways.

06:39

Our asset is affected by the by the by the proposed development. So obviously we have an interest in it. Don't propose to make any submissions or speak at all today. Generally, it's more of a case of observing and understanding the project a bit better. I do have two very minor points to make, which I believe are uncontroversial. And we take about a minute or two at most, not sure the now will be an appropriate time to say or whether should do so later.

07:07

So how long do you anticipate they'll take Mr. Bellingham?

07:11

A minute, maybe two at most. Okay, well, they are in contradiction controversial. So, but yeah, I'm happy. We'll finish with the introductions, but we'll we'll we'll come back to you.

07:24

And Anglian Water. Thank you, Mr. Bellingham. Thanks for joining us. Anglian Water.

07:29

Dial Sweetland. Morning panel da sorry, you're in the room. Hello there.

07:34

Good morning found us Wheatland Anglian Water, fairly uncontroversial points. We've agreed most points already with the applicant. So I think this is something we should probably kind of resolved before deadline one.

07:45

Do you wish to send him today Mr. Sweetland? Because I think I got a message you are leaving it had to leave at 12 o'clock or all around then I won't be attending the afternoon session. Like that's correct. Thank you.

07:58

Phillips 66.

08:03

Yes, good morning. I'm Paul on a senior associate from town legal. I've been representing two parties today. So as you as you already said, Phillips 66, who owns and operates that Humber oil refinery and also associated petroleum terminals, eminent aiming and limited and humble oil terminals trustee limited. So a PT and H O TT is probably is representing both parties. I would propose to make a few comments today won't won't take too long, but just on the looking at the agenda in relation to negotiations with landowners and turning to the sort of options to accept the ending and facility link to any change application. But I shouldn't need too long more than a couple of minutes or so.

08:52

Okay, that's helpful. Mr. Arnett. And I think you're coming along to the DCO. This afternoon. Is that correct? Yes, that's right, sir. To talk primarily about protective provisions in the audit. Yes. Down to attend this afternoon as well.

09:08

Right. Okay. Well, thank you for coming. Mr. Arnett. And it's a long time since we last met. So good to see you again. Hope you keeping well, likewise. Thank you. So thank you.

09:20

Moving on to Air Products. Rachel Davidson.

09:26

Good morning, Rachel Davidson senior associate at Charles Russell speechlys acting for a product. It products has operate in the area and has a number of assets that are likely to be affected by the project.

09:39

I'm not intending to speak today. And I'm really here just to keep watching brief.

09:45

Unless that changes, but I don't anticipate having anything to set the stage.

09:51

Thank you very much for that and thank you for joining us.

09:55

PD port services, John Webster.

10:00

Good morning Sir John Webster peering path of PD port Services Limited. We've been instructed to observe proceedings this morning. Do not intend to make submissions. My clients have submitted obviously, relevant representation concerning land within order limits. So which PD ports has benefit restrictive covenant? And if the panel has any questions on that, I'd be more than happy to assist.

10:25

Thank you very much. And thank you for joining

10:28

BPI immingham Miss. Mr. Francis. Good morning, sir. Mark Francis from VPI. immingham. I do not intend to speak in this morning session, but I will do in the afternoon session.

10:41

Right. Thank you. Mr. Francis, thank you for coming along. You were here yesterday as well. So you

10:50

are our ad Unsworth farms and new Dale?

11:02

Right, I think that's run through the people who we were

11:06

expecting to to come along either virtually or in person. I am aware of a number of other individuals and organisations who aren't interested parties

11:18

who have indicated they might be attending. We will not at this hearing be discussing their individual concerns, as we will be concentrating on the strategic issues relating to compulsory acquisition and temporary possession

11:34

from a more strategic viewpoint, but the opportunity to do this will arise at subsequent meetings.

11:42

Have I missed anyone clearly not either in the room or virtually? Who would like to

11:50

particularly make a point or say we'd like to speak later?

11:57

Right, I'm not

11:59

getting any indication. So we'll move on to the next section. I'll pass back to Mr. Wallace. Thank you very much.

12:08

Thank you.

12:10

I've just got a few points to make today about the procedure for the running of today's hearing. Apologies, you'll hear this at the beginning of every hearing that we're doing but it's so that any new persons will be familiar with what we're going to do today.

12:24

This is a blended event. It allows attendance both in person and virtually through Microsoft Teams. We are attending this meeting, of course from Starling Bruh. As I said from the attendees, for those attending virtually, please rest assured you do have our full attention at all times. Even if we're not looking directly at the camera. We have monitors here, which will our eyes will be cast down towards.

12:49

Please keep your microphones and cameras off unless you wish to speak, you may use the usual hand function to draw something to our attention. And for those in the room likely if you can catch her I will come to you if you wish to speak on something

13:05

unless absolutely required, we're likely to continue this morning's business with a 15 minute break around 11 o'clock, I mean to finish no later than around 1230 to allow participants a lunch break prior to this afternoon's hearing, we will keep timings under review. And if there are questions that we cannot get to in today's morning session, they will hang over until written questions when and if we issue them.

13:32

For virtual attendees. If you decide to leave during the break, or if you lose connection, please rejoin via the same link you are provided by the case team.

13:42

Secondly, I'd like to remind everyone that this event today is being both streamed and recorded. The digital recordings that we make are retained and published. And they form part of a public record that

can contain your personal information to which the general data protection regulations apply. The planning inspectorates practice is to retain recordings for a period of five years from the date of the Secretary of State's decision. If you do participate in today's hearing, it is important that you understand that you will be recorded and therefore you consent to the retention and publication of the recording. It is unlikely we will ask you to disclose any personal information. Indeed, we'd encourage you not to do that. But if for some reason, it was necessary to declare any sensitive personal information, we would encourage you to speak to the case team in the first instance, that can be submitted in a written form and subsequently redacted.

14:38

The third point is about the substantive matter for today. This is the first compulsory acquisition hearing and it's going to be focused on this applicant strategic case. An agenda for this hearing was published on our national infrastructure website that can be found in our exam Library Reference ev 2001. And though

15:00

so that only matters for discussion for today,

15:03

there will be an opportunity for individuals to make their forts known about their own individual cases. Later in this examination, the draft examination timetable, ask that you register for such a hearing by deadline one, which is the 26th of April 2024. And such a hearing will be held in the week commencing the 24th of June 2024 as an if required. The final point that I'd like to make about the procedure is regarding post hearing actions should they arise during this hearing, Mr. Jack will be taking notes of those as they emerge. And at the close of the meeting, we intend to go through the entire list of hearing actions corroborated with those in the room, and then we will issue those as soon as possible. And that the assumption is unless we discuss otherwise, the assumption is that the post hearing actions will be submitted at the next deadline, deadline one, which I've said is the 26th of April. However, we do acknowledge that there are resourcing constraints for people. So if you feel that meeting, the next deadline is not achievable, then by all means, raise it here today. And we can discuss how best those submissions can be made. Are there any questions either in the room or virtually about the procedure for today?

16:25

Right, none virtually either. Which goes hand back to Mr. Ghost for the next item, please.

16:34

Thank you, Mr. Wallace.

16:41

Before we move on to the topics in the agenda, it was mentioned at yesterday's primary meeting that a change application had been made to the planning Inspectorate. And this is currently being considered and the will decide over the next couple of weeks or so whether or not this change application can be accepted.



17:03

But at the outset, can the applicant briefly outline the proposals together with the plots of land involved?  
Thank you.

17:15

Thank you, sir Craig Welton, for the applicant.

17:26

So I think the

17:28

the change request, is thinking the best to for this.

17:41

So we've the change request notification is set out in the letter of 26. February, I think is document es 037. And the change application itself and document es 038, dated 19th of March. And this followed engagement with p 66. And Eminem.

18:10

In terms of the bot numbers themselves.

18:18

Okay, the best place to

18:20

find the sorry, these are set out in the change request application.

18:28

There's two changes proposed.

18:32

The change the first change is to reduce the area of land required for what is called the Birmingham facility.

18:42

And this was the result of further engagement with the landowners which allowed the extent video to be refined.

18:54

The second change is to remove what was called option, option two for the rest of the pipeline through the

19:04

humble oil refinery. And to remove that

19:09  
entirely.

19:13  
Add that were that were two sets out the plots involved. Do you want me to read those out or you've got you've got a record of them? Sorry, because it's it's quite lengthy. There's

19:27  
guys looking at it here. We could be here for this might take me to 11 o'clock. And it's a combination of permanent acquisition and temporary possession plot that it's proposed to be removed and reduced

19:41  
as are set out in the letter.

19:46  
Okay, that's fine. And we've obviously got 28 days from the the application to determine whether or not that can be accepted

19:58  
and it

20:00  
Maybe when we turn to Mr. On it, we might hear a bit more

20:06  
about that. But that that that's, that's absolutely fine.

20:14  
Perhaps I could ask for the agenda for this hearing to to be placed upon screen, if you could please.

20:22  
As Mr. Mr. Wallace earlier mentioned, this was posted on on the website on the 15th of February.

20:31  
Anyway, while we're there it is agenda item three a the case for compulsory acquisition and temporary possession.

20:41  
So, we'll be, we'll be raising written questions which we published over the next couple of weeks.

20:49

But we also have a number of primary questions that we would like to raise at this hearing. So we can get a clearer understanding of the applicants position at this early stage.

21:00

Before we move on to to these, perhaps, you could briefly set out your case for compulsory acquisition, temporary possession. Thank you.

21:13

Thank you, sir Craig Welton, for the applicant. I'll give a brief overview of that position and without assist.

21:21

Section 122 of the Planning Act allows development consent orders to be granted with powers to compulsorily acquire land, and rights in land. These powers can only be included with the Secretary of State as satisfied at the conditions of section 122 have been met. And these conditions are in essence, our 2am test. The first one is that the land for which the powers are granted is either required for the development required to facilitate or is incidental to the development or the wound is replacement one for columns or open space.

21:55

The second one is that there is a compelling case in the public interest for one to be acquired compulsorily.

22:03

Turning to the first one, the applicant statement of reasons and I think for this heating document as 13 and associated land plans as 16 detail the land and rights in the land, the applicant seeks to acquire through compulsory acquisition. In the event the voluntary agreement cannot be reached all plots of land rather needed for the development or to facilitate the development, there are no proposals to acquire land as replacement land.

22:31

Consistent with the dclg guidance on compulsory purchase process, the need and proposed use for each area of land is set out in the statement and reason statement of reasons sorry. And in particular, Section nine.

22:44

Table two sets out the purpose for permanent acquisition of surface sites, table three for permanent acquisition for the pipeline table for for permanent acquisition of rights only. And table five sets out temporary possession. And we make time to these in more detail later. I appreciate appreciate there's a further question on these in respect to the second one. The second that so the Secretary of State must be satisfied that there's a compelling case in the public interest for one to be acquired compulsorily. The dclg guidance paragraphs 12 and 13 expand on this as requiring compelling evidence that the public benefits outweigh private loss. The recently adopted National Policy Statement en one identifies that there isn't quote, an urgent need for new carbon capture and storage infrastructure to support the

transition to a net zero economy. And as was identified yesterday, the new MPs is an important consideration. In this examination.

23:43

The Case for the development is set out in the planning design and access statement which is document EPP 129 and the need case for the scheme EPP 131 The set out the substantial benefits of the proposed development, which would contribute towards the urgent need identified a government and parliament new carbon capture and storage infrastructure. In the UK.

24:07

The majority of the pipeline is to be situated in agricultural land, and once the pipeline is installed, the land would be returned to its original use. This will minimise the long term impact on affected landowners.

24:23

The applicant has had regard to representations from landowners when retaining the pipeline and citing the above ground infrastructure and continues to engage with landowners with a view to minimising impacts on them. And I would suggest that the change requests are submitted is an example of this. Ultimately, the applicants position is that there is a compelling case in the public interest for the use of compulsory purchase powers in terms of section 122 and that the relevant statutory and policy tests have been met. Thank you.

24:55

Thank you for that.

24:58

Perhaps you could just

25:00

touch on the way the applicant strategy that you've taken as to whether or not to seek compulsory acquisition, or compulsory acquisition of rights or temporary possession just so members of the public can understand a little better

25:19

as to how you you've approached this. Thank you.

25:24

Thank you. So quick welcome for the for the applicant.

25:28

The applicant strategy to this has been to look at the various components of the proposed development by reference to the permanent above ground infrastructure, the pipeline itself, and then the the rights needed for the for the construction phase. And if I could break it down into those components and explain explain our approach to each one. So turning first to the above ground infrastructure.

25:59

The applicant is seeking the freehold acquisition of land needed for

26:05

the infrastructure, both ends of the pipeline, namely the Birmingham and federal thought facilities and the three block valve locations. And he's also proposing the permanent acquisition of the June valve site, which you may have seen on your on your site visit.

26:21

These sites will be fenced premises to which the applicant will require to have exclusive possession.

26:28

And in the case of the bulk valves, they will be located in what is currently agricultural land. And the nature of the works would preclude agricultural use from resuming.

26:39

And

26:42

I would say that detail on the land that is to be permanently acquired is set out in table two of the statement of reasons for reference. And I'd flag there just that table includes both options at the federal Thor pen, so only one of those would come forward ultimately, so the the extent of permanent line take and table two appears more than ultimately would be the case.

27:07

In respect of the pipeline route itself, the applicant is seeking compulsory purchase powers and temporary possession over a corridor of land within which to cite the pipeline.

27:18

The corridor for the majority of the route will be 100 metres wide, which is required for flexibility at the detailed design stage. And having regard to further investigations of wind and seeking to minimise impacts and ecology. Within that corridor, the working corridor for the pipeline will be generally 30 metres and 50 metres across some points, and the exact location within the 100 metre corridor will be determined by the location of the pipeline in the ground.

27:48

New rates and restrictive covenants are also sought for access to inspect and maintain the pipeline.

27:55

On the pipeline sections, permanent acquisition of a strata of subsurface of wind is sought, and a set out a statement of reasons. The applicant is seeking to agree long leases over that strata of subsurface for the pipeline, to the extent necessary to construct to construct, operate and maintain it. It is not possible, however, through the compulsory purchase process to acquire a lease. And it's for that

reason that the applicant is seeking compulsive powers over the subs the strata sub surface as freehold in the event that an agreement for release or lease cannot be reached.

28:35

As I said that, there's also powers being sought to acquire rights and oppose restrictive covenants on the surface of the land. The need for these over each port is set out in Table three of the statement of reasons. And these restrictions are to protect the pipe. But they've been framed so that they would not impact on the resumption of agricultural use, over which the vast majority of the pipeline will be.

29:00

The applicant is also seeking compulsory purchase powers to create rights over land. And these are set out in Table four. And these are to allow for access for inspection and maintenance. And finally, in this section M permanent rates are also sought over the area of wind will the Lincolnshire offshore gas gathering system, which is the vlogs commonly referred to as logs pipeline is situated to ensure that the applicant has the necessary rights to operate and maintain this for the purposes of the proposed development. These rights are in substance the same as the rights that currently exist over that pipeline and reflect its original use.

29:39

In terms of temporary possession, there's perhaps two elements to this. I'd like to talk to the first relates to the the construction of the pipeline itself.

29:50

The the the extent of temporary possession I want I want to know but the extent of temporary possession for pipeline construction is

30:00

Perhaps best understood by reference to the construction schedule time table, which is table three five of the project description chapter of the ES, which is page three dash 60 of document EPP 045 that lists the various activities associated with installation of the pipeline. But in summary,

30:23

from works commencing on site on site for months commencing on a section of the pipeline, which would be the fencing off of that area, and beginning to strip off topsoil, to where the wind was reinstated and the fence removed would be a period of seven would generally be expected to be a period of seven months. And that's the period of time that the landowner would the the applicant would have temporary possession of a section of any one section of pipeline.

30:55

The other form of temporary possession is temporary possession of what I've acquired and construction, but not an operation more generally, the approach here has been to take temporary positions possession to minimise the wound over which rights are acquired, and as an alternative to permanent possession. And these are set out in Table five of the statement of reasons.

31:22

And the use of these powers is quite common, as you all know, in development consents, or, sorry, Dragon development consent orders,

31:32

and includes the ability to use land for access during construction. And in this case, the majority of land identified in Table five is needed to allow for access to the pipeline construction corridor.

31:46

Most of these access points are expected to be reinstated and the period of possession will generally align with the period of possession of the corridor itself. So the seven month period I just referenced, there are a number of plots where the applicant would be using an existing access. And in those cases, the applicant is not intending to take access exclusively. And as such, the proposals to use temporary powers to create that temporary rate of access rather than rather than a permanent rate.

32:18

Temporary possession is also required for the three construction compounds. And we're working areas associated with the m&m and settled for facilities. Although as I mentioned at the outset, the change requests we'll see two areas of temporary possession being removed, which reflect the constrained nature of having to work through the oil refinery with option two, those are not needed, or there's not an equivalent need for them with option one. And possession of the construction component is expected for a period of 14 months, as additional time is needed for mobilisation works. So, so see, it's almost like a there's like a hierarchy or a sequencing the era of permanent acquisition of land for the above ground infrastructure. There's a permanent acquisition of a sub strata for the paper itself. And then for the construction phase, various different types of temporary possession.

33:17

Thank you very much for that explanation. And I think that's, that's helpful for us to understand the

33:23

the the parameters, which you're you're addressing the proposal, you did say about a width of 100 metres and this stage to be interested here if Mr. Sweetland wants to say anything, because I know there is a

33:45

around their land, you're looking for 200 metres. So Mr. Sweetland, do you want to comment on that at all?

33:53

Thank you, sir. Yes, we have some concerns in one particular location on the roof system Louth where there will potentially be a need for an expansion of that site in the next 10 years. It's not something that's certain at the moment, because it's pending founder determination by off what are pending proposals for the next five years. So that's where we might see greater certainty on the root of the pipeline at that point. Ideally, we hadn't any objection to the route itself going through one side of the

land, but it would be ideal if it would be certainly it would be to the east of the site, and therefore not sterilising the air of land where we're looking to expand that site.

34:29

Think that so we did

34:32

look around the facility when we did our incomplete site inspection. It's certainly one of the sites that we would want to go back to on the accompany site inspection when that takes place. And hopefully you are or member of your team would be there to join with us. But I think we do want to try understand why you need the 200 metres there. And yeah, I don't know if you want to give a brief answer now or whether you want to

35:00

deal with that in writing.

35:03

Sir, I

35:05

I think it is a product as Mr. Sweetman has indicated of discussions between the applicant and Anglian Water. And I think it may be better to come back to you in writing on that point if we meet deadline one, in part because as Mr. Sweet, you indicated earlier, discussions are at a very advanced stage. Right. And it may be that matters have moved on and this particular issue is overtaken by events, that would be acceptable. Yeah, I mean, that that is acceptable. All I would say is that the proposal is taking a huge land take. It was about 150,000 square metres from from a particular farmer.

35:48

And it did seem a considerable take. So I think we are looking for quite a bit more explanation to try and just find out

35:57

the Thank you. So, secret welcome for the applicant forgotten already sorry, no, no, no, I will absolutely do that. In headline terms.

36:08

There is, as you'll be aware of with linear projects, such as there's always something of a balance that needs to be struck between

36:16

the amount of free consent work that is done

36:21



to ascertain the root. And the allowing sufficient flexibility at this stage, the to narrow it down would require quite significant would require significant cost and intrusive work on one end,

36:40

at a stage where the project doesn't doesn't have approval,

36:46

the the intention is with

36:50

once consent is granted, it will be that the amount of warranty will ultimately

36:57

be reduced as more detail comes forward. So it will be

37:02

a significantly lower figure than than that i Okay, I don't think we need to talk about it anymore at the moment. Just just repeat the point that 200 metres and the land take from that farmer does seem a very considerable amount. So I'm looking for, you know, quite a justification

37:22

to explain this. And thank you for coming along today. Mr. Sweetland. And hopefully, the discussions will will will will will will continue.

37:34

If we can move on now. Yep. Thank you.

37:37

As far as alternatives are concerned, that's next on the agenda and consider a consideration of other alternatives. I don't really want to

37:50

stray on this

37:53

for too long, because statement of reasons give the gives an indication about this elsewhere in the in the application documents as well. But can you very briefly just touch on, you know, the alternatives that you did think about for two compulsory acquisition.

38:10

Thank you Sorry, Craig Welton, for the the applicant.

38:15

We've we've looked at the question of alternatives and in in two, sort of broad categories. One is practical solutions, alternative practical solutions, and the other is alternative legal mechanism. And,

38:30

you know, as I set out in the in the design evolution chapter of the IES, the routing of the pipeline is determined by its underpinning objective, which is to create a linkage between the carbon emitters and the Humber region and the existing walx pipeline at federal thought. So given the distances involved,

38:51

it's inevitable that this project would require the applicant to access third party ones to enable the project to achieve its objectives. Somebody doesn't have the land itself.

39:03

And as you've said, as I set out in the statement of reasons the applicant has explored alternatives with landowners and occupiers through the pre application process, and is continuing to work with landowners to try and minimise impacts on them.

39:19

The applicant is of the view that

39:22

compulsory acquisition is in this context,

39:27

a proportion unnecessarily inconsistent with the approach that has been taken elsewhere. In terms of practical solutions, in terms of alternative legal mechanisms,

39:39

sort of a treat to see this perhaps but the the alternative mechanism was to reach agreement with parties, and that remains very much the applicants preferred approach and as we might be here later, the applicants are continuing to work with landowners to try and reach agreement but as the dclg guidance says, It is sensible to

40:00

initiate, it can be sensible to initiate to see the CPL process and run that in parallel with Lando negotiations, which is, which is what the applicant is doing. Alright. Oh, thanks. Thanks very much for that.

40:13

And moving on, or actually, while we're on that very point, I don't know if Mr. Arnot is is still with us, because this might be the relevant point or appropriate point for you to come back through on it. Hello. Yes, thank you. So just a brief comment. So obviously, I'm representing two parties on behalf of Phillips 66. Yes, negotiations are ongoing with with the applicant, good progress is being made a suite of agreements consisting broadly of a lease, and a deed of easement are being negotiated alongside an

agreement, which is intended to sort of sit above that. So. So good progress has been made on that. I mean, I think the point I was going to make is, I'm also representing the, what it's probably easy to call a PT and ha TT, who are the operators of the the terminal jetty. And that day would welcome technical discussions with with the applicants team to explore the interrelationship between the proposed DCO scheme and their operation so that they would sort of welcome specific engagement on that,

41:30

because they are a sort of separate related but separate party to to to Phillips 66.

41:42

Right, thank you very much Mr. Arnett.

41:47

And that's helpful to get your input there.

41:53

Okay, if we can move on now that thank you.

41:58

I'm going to turn now to

42:02

Item D on the agenda the extent of land sought to be subjected to

42:09

TP which

42:13

is obviously temporary possession. If I can just

42:17

refer back to the guidance the compulsory acquisition guidance for for CA, under the Planning Act 2008, paragraph 1919, one nine, so it will be helpful for applicants to be able to demonstrate that their application is firmly rooted in any relevant national policy statement. In addition, applicants will need to be able to demonstrate that any potential risks or impediments to implementation of the scheme have been properly managed. And therefore, bearing this in mind, the examining authority will want to be reassured about the steps which have been taken to minimise any risks or or impediments.

43:04

So moving on to

43:07

D, three D and D eight and the agenda.

43:12

And this does build on something you were saying earlier, as well. And quite a number of farming businesses have raised concerns as to the duration of operations on their land. How long will the construction last? So where temporary possession is sought?

43:30

A number of them are asking how long it's likely to last? And I know you touched on this. But they're very concerned that when Will their businesses be able to use the land again, for farming purposes? So I don't know if you can briefly come back on that. I know you've touched on it already.

43:47

Yeah, so it really would be to go back to the point I made earlier, which is that the the the

43:55

the general expectation is an estimate, but I'd stress it's not a best case estimate it is the sort of realistic general estimate of the project team is that occupation of a piece of,

44:09

of a parcel of land, agricultural land for pipeline,

44:15

installation, and then site restoration would generally be seven months. And

44:22

I think one way of looking at this, if it assesses that would be for a pipeline inspection of up to five kilometres at a time. So it's sort of a rolling seven month programme. This is set out in more detail and application documents but in essence that are as you'll see in three construction compounds proposed northern centre Southern and

44:46

these will be worked from simultaneously so that it's not simply going north to south or vice versa. There's an element of work going on along the whole route during the wider construction combined, but if you

45:00

are a farming business.

45:03

And just to see we're not but if the pipeline was going in front of that window there, and that was your field, it would be fenced off for seven months. And you get it back at the end of the seven months.

45:17

Mr. Wallace? So yes, yeah. You said that it'd be seven months for both installation and restoration. Is that correct? When in terms of restoration, what what condition? Is that to just push the soil back and

leave it there? Or have you negotiated with the landowner to reach the required sort of restoration place?

45:57

Thank you, sir. Craig, welcome for the for the applicant. The intention is that the land would be restored back to the condition it was in before or so it can be used for his previous use, which in the vast majority of the case is agricultural land. And that's what I'm referring to. They are

46:15

there would be the Construction Management Plan and the soil management plan are the two documents that we propose are used to secure that requirement.

46:30

Thanks for that.

46:35

One of the documents that was submitted,

46:39

we haven't got it per, we haven't asked for it to be produced today, but it's the app 130, which is the consents and agreements position statement.

46:49

And paragraph 1131 point 1.3 of APT 130 provides that the purpose of this document is to identify the necessary consents and agreements for the implementation of the proposed development.

47:06

And the process for obtaining these consents subject to the proposed development gaming development concerned.

47:16

However, there's there's no reference at all in this document to the offshore elements, and the various consents required.

47:24

Wonder if you'd like to comment on that.

47:43

prequel to the applicant. So the this document is focused on this development consent order application, and the other consents that would be required for for the works that would be authorised by the DCO. And that's why it doesn't deal with the offshore document, offshore consents that are subject to a separate process, you're seen. So there's a document called the bridging document, which provides more information on the offshore consenting process.

48:17

That is something we can expand upon if that would assist in terms of the the relationship between the DCO application and the offshore infrastructure in terms of the the relationship between the two? Well, I'm going to come on to the bridging document in a moment, but as I say, paragraph, one point 1.3 says, is to identify the necessary consents rooms for implementation.

48:45

And I'm not taking that as implementation under the Town and Country Planning Act. I'm taking that as to actually use the pipeline, and you will need the offshore consents for that. So yes, please, could you update that document?

49:03

A deadline one, because without its consent, I don't think the pipeline will ever be used.

49:09

It can't be used

49:12

pretty well for the applicant. And yes, I take the point in the distinction between the use of it and what's needed to construct the onshore pipeline, but I take the points on will will make sure I address that for deadline one. Okay. Now, moving on to the bridging document, which is AP p 131.

49:37

Paragraph 2.3. And we do have this I think available. So, if you could bring up paragraph 2.3. Please

49:52

this does cover as you said earlier, the offshore consenting regime

49:58

and the

50:00

As the current state lease, which we'll come back to later, but it refers to consent required from the North Sea transition authority and the marine licences required.

50:11

Paragraph two point 3.5

50:15

refers to the reduction of an environmental statement, which will aim to demonstrate how the biking CCS project will align with the relevant marine plan policies.

50:31

Any idea when this environmental statement will be provided? Because I know you're saying it's not going to be it's not part of this

50:40

examination, it goes to a to a different consenting body. But I think it is relevant for this examination, and we would like to see it so Have you any idea when that yes will be available

50:53

by Patrick Monroe for the applicant. The applicant is currently preparing the environmental statement for submission to operate, which is the offshore petroleum regulator for environment and decommissioning.

51:05

My understanding is that not going to be submitted within the timescales of this examination. However, it is a separate team, were not instructed on the offshore elements. And I could take instructions on that and perhaps respond in writing.

51:23

Right, I'm referring to Section 104 of the Planning Act, the Secretary of State must have regard to the appropriate Malia marine policy documents.

51:35

So I think we were expecting or we are expecting to have sight of it at some stage, because that's something that the Secretary of State

51:45

is going to have to take into account in reaching his decision. Now, we may have a discussion as to whether it's section 104 or 105. That applies, but I don't I don't think that gives you an escape route. I think.

52:03

Yeah, that's a little bit of an academic point.

52:09

But I think bearing in mind section 104 says that very clearly, I think we were expecting to have sight of the this environmental statement. But you may well come back to me and say, well, not under Section 105. Yeah, Patrick window for the applicant. Firstly, I agree is our position is there is section 105, that would apply to the determination. And for the reasons, say, within the planning and design and access statement.

52:37

It is not considered that, at that point of submission, the national policy statements enforced at that time, correctly apply to the proposed development. I think on the wider point of the application of marine planning policy, the applicant isn't seeking

52:54

a deemed marine licence, for example, for this DCO because it's not intending for the proposed development of this dcl covers to do any work in the marine environment.

53:05

So there are no licensable activities for which authorizations sought under the marine and coastal access act 2009. Those would be covered by a separate consenting process for the offshore elements of the scheme. So the extent of the DCO, and the proposed development is

53:25

up to that the actual work that will be undertaken is effectively up to the June valve. And there are rights sought over the existing logs pipeline down to mineral water springs, but there would be no works undertaken in that area through the authorizations granted in the DCO. And so on that basis,

53:45

the applicants position is that the Marine Corps planning statements wouldn't be relevant to this application.

53:53

All right, thank you for that, Mr. Monroe. And

53:57

but if I, if I look back, and I've looked back to the net zero T side application, this study by the Secretary of State last month 16 to February,

54:09

and their application documents.

54:13

They they actually included a draft marine licence.

54:19

And they said the scope and scope in terms of the draft marine licence have been discussed and agreed with the marine management organisation. So he did that before start examination in any examination in the application documents.

54:36

In this application, the MMO have confirmed and it was their representation Our Oh 60. And as you said that no draft deemed marine licence has been submitted.

54:49

So they're not making any comments. So very recently decided decision that zero T side. A draft marine licence went in with the applique



55:00

Question. And here, I think you're saying you're not making any application

55:06

for the foreseeable future.

55:08

Part one Oh, for the applicant, they're

55:13

not familiar with the net zero t site application in any detail.

55:20

We could review that and respond to the concern. So we can better understand that. I think the point, the wider point is that the applicants position is that the offshore development works, we'll be concerned if there's a separate project to this onshore pipeline, the purpose of the DCO works, that the only true pipeline covers is to create a new pipeline from the emitters lingam area to the logs pipeline connection, and to also get authorization for the reuse of logs or carbon dioxide transport, up to the point of mineral water springs, the offshore development that would be undertaken is 118 kilometres along the logs pipeline, out sea. And those applications would be submitted under a separate process with consents obtained from the MMO at that time, as well as from the North Sea transition authority in respect of the carbon dioxide appraisal and storage licences and the storage pyramid. So they are they do have separate consenting regimes and will be authorised and works, different works that do have a distance between them of 118 kilometres. And so, for the works that the DCO covers, and that the proposed development will include, there is no need for a marine licence, which is why the African hasn't included it within the DCO.

56:48

Okay, thank you, Mr. Monroe, if we turn to

56:52

page five of the bridging document, which is on screen at the moment.

57:06

Yep, that's fine.

57:08

So they're figure 2.1

57:12

shows what's being proposed. First, you say there's 55 kilometres

57:19

onshore,

57:21

and 180 and 120 kilometres offshore,

57:25

leading out to

57:29

the reservoir and other new infrastructure which will will be constructed.

57:36

Now, as I said earlier, at the moment, we've had no evidence as to whether or not the consents or the consents that you're that you'll need for that offshore construction.

57:48

We've had, we've had no

57:51

information as yet.

57:54

I read out a few moments ago, about

57:59

half an hour or so ago about impediments to the scheme under the CEA guidance. Now, if these consents are not forthcoming for the offshore elements,

58:11

you're not, you're not going to be able to use the onshore pipeline.

58:17

is in your view that an impediment?

58:24

I think so that the secret wealth of the applicant,

58:28

it's not necessarily to have all the consents in your hand, before the DCO is granted in terms of compulsory purchase powers. You don't need to have them all.

58:41

The polls, they don't influence me, but it is, as you see that an impediment I mean, granted,

58:46

we can come back in writing to explain the offshore consenting process, and why we don't regard not having them as of today as an impediment, because that process has been dealt with separately. So

59:01

the answer now would be no, I don't regard it as an impediment because

59:06

we have good reason reasonable reason to believe that those those consents will be forthcoming.

59:14

Right, thank you for that. Mr. Well, I hear what you say. I would like you to come back and and having looked at the net zero T side decision, and I emphasise again, that the draft marine licence was actually submitted with the application documents. So discussions were really well underway there. So when the Secretary of State when the examining authority and the Secretary of State looked at it, they had a pretty good idea that the things were well underway.

59:44

Absolutely accept that you don't need to have the consent. But the idea that we're not You're not making an application for a marine licence for some time yet, is you?

59:57

It doesn't sort of sit

1:00:00

all together? Well in in answering the question I've raised about an impediment. So I would like specifically for you to come back, having looked at the net zero T side decision, it's it's a carbon capture pipeline.

1:00:17

There aren't many of those that have been around. We've got the high net at the moment, but it's a very recent decision. So I think I think it is worth you are looking at it and explaining why they were so far progressed with the draft marine licence. And why we aren't here, because I think there is a bit of a discrepancy.

1:00:43

Yeah, Mr. Wallace would like to come in. Gosh, yeah, no, just a quick sort of clarification as such.

1:00:51

It seems silly if you'd like to start building the onshore side without the offshore side, first of all consented, because otherwise, you'll go into nowhere as such,

1:01:01

would you? Or is it necessary for the DCO to contain an article requirement, basically saying, you know, Thou shalt not commence the onshore until the offshore is consented? What are your views on that, please?

1:01:14

Thank you. So click Wellington, for the for the applicant. And

1:01:18

for the

1:01:23

for the first point you put there, our position would be that that's not strictly necessary, because the the commercial reality would be that the applicant would not would not want to incur the costs of developing the onshore element, trying to instal a pipeline, which as you see would take them two logs, but they wouldn't thereafter built it to access the Viking storage facility. So our position is that sort of common sense would, would prevail in the sense that it's not needed to include that sort of requirement?

1:01:59

I think we, if we may, we may pick that up in terms of our response to the questions that have been raised around the marine licencing. And the stage things have reached in the offshore element

1:02:10

to see if that information is sufficient to address the concern. But I do recognise that a requirement. If the concern was to was still there a requirement would be one option to to address that. And you

1:02:28

Thank you.

1:02:30

Can we move to the statement of reasons and section 7.2 of the statement of reasons.

1:02:39

And paragraph 7.2. Point five

1:02:44

of the SLR

1:02:46

acknowledges that the revised en one will be, quote, important and relevant, unquote, to the Secretary of State's decision.

1:02:58

To what extent is the applicant taken account of the relevant provisions of en one, so far as they relate to carbon capture projects?

1:03:18

Big loads of the applicant.

1:03:21

Sir, there is a

1:03:24

within the planning statement, there's a section that deals with compliance with en one which sets out the position as at the time the applicants position at the time the application was submitted, we would very much intend to update that for deadline one.

1:03:40

And an update that sort of like the the updated en one.

1:03:49

In the change application, there was an updated statement and reasons.

1:03:56

Think it's a ISO 42 and 43.

1:04:01

But I noticed that hadn't been updated in any way. You know, the the en one came to force on the 17th of January the change application was made on the 19th of March, I would expected that same two reasons would have taken into account of the end one

1:04:22

big odds of the outcome. Yes. So that's a

1:04:26

that's a fair comment and I can understand why you would have expected that.

1:04:33

It may be that we should also look at the statement of reasons for the for the change request and reflect relevant updates to that so not simply deal with this in the update to the planning statement, but deal with it in the statement of reasons as well.

1:04:54

Right Thank you. Thank you for that.

1:05:01

The there was a bit of change from the draft, en one to version which actually came into force on the on the 17th of February.

1:05:12

And

1:05:17

I've got paragraph four 919 of the en one, which says,

1:05:23

development consent applications for power CCS project should include details of how the captured co2 is intended to be transported and stored, how cumulative impacts will be assessed, and whether any necessary consents permits. And licences have been obtained. paragraph four, nine 4.9 point 19. So I won't ask you about it now. But I would hope I would expect it deadline one that that you will come back and say how the application is consistent with what's required for 919.

1:06:01

And while we're on en one,

1:06:06

we had a little exchange earlier about sections 104105.

1:06:16

But I noticed that again, en one paragraph, or 510

1:06:23

expects the Secretary of State to

1:06:27

to have regard to the marine plan,

1:06:32

in effect to the relevant area or areas where the project crosses the boundary between plan areas.

1:06:41

Now, I think if you're going out to the mean, line,

1:06:45

it is crossing the boundary.

1:06:49

So I would like you to come back on paragraph four 510 as well.

1:06:56

Because

1:06:58

I think there's an argument for saying the Secretary of State, whether it's section 104, or 105, has to have regard to marine plan.

1:07:07

But that's not a question that you need to think about now. But I'm hoping I'm expecting your comeback on on that point by deadline one, paragraph four 510. That, in general, I really am looking for us it come back in detail

1:07:28

as to you the application and the position in relation to the the en one fully understand that it's not policy for this application.

1:07:41

Because very clearly the application was made beforehand. And therefore this is in effect if you'd like guidance, but it is important and relevant. And therefore, I'd like you to come back in detail in relation to what's contained in in en one.

1:08:07

rights if we go back to the agenda

1:08:12

sorry about jumping around a bit. We can move on to a E negotiations with with with landowners.

1:08:23

In this item, we want to understand the applicants overall approach in seeking to gain voluntary agreements over land, rather than relying on compulsory acquisition powers being granted. We we've got the sheduled negotiations, and the compulsory acquisition tracker, which has been submitted to the examination. But I just wonder if you could set out briefly the strategy

1:08:49

that the applicants had and progress towards obtaining voluntary agreements, as a significant number of the representations received refer to a lack of negotiations having taken place. So from briefly set out the position there. Thank you. Thank you very much Rob Brown for the applicant. As you rightly referred, we'd completed and updated pins in January of 24. With the progress with regard to the acquisition of land interests using the colour coded compulsory acquisition tracker, this is document as 030. Since that update, we've reached agreement with an additional five parties bringing the total number to six whereby heads of terms have been entered into. There'll be an additional seven parties that will appear in the update that's to be provided at the first deadline in April. And this brings the total number of parties to 190 where we expect there will be 97 agreements covering these parties. There 97 agreements, as many of the agreements involve more than one effective party due to the nature of the land ownership.

1:09:48

These seven new parties I'm sorry, can I just interrupt that when you accept expecting the 97 agreement, so you've already had one you were up to six heads of terms

1:10:00

And then we went on to the 96. Sorry, can you just say that again as to when where you were with that?

1:10:06

With the 97 agreements? Sorry, 97. Sorry, of those six sign into this five of those heads of terms with six parties.

1:10:17

So it's 90 to two to enter into

1:10:21

the seven new parties. Do you want the details of those now or no? No, that can be mine. Thank you. Yep. Just to update as well that the vast majority of the interest that appeared is orange, which is no objection, and heads of terms negotiation is not commenced in January, will be updated to yellow, which is no objection and has determined negotiations ongoing. Once we provide that update.

1:10:44

Off the 190 parties. 130 of these are represented by a land interest group. This is broadly 68% of the affected parties. But an interest group also represents 69 of those 97 agreements. For those not familiar, and I'll set this out for those listening with land interest group or LIG. This is whereby a number of the land agents within the area work together to agree a common set of terms for their clients. They work to negotiate with the applicant on a collective basis with the intention of streamlining the process for reaching a consensus agreement. We've been engaging with those parties within the league since early July of 2023, whereby we shared a templated version of heads of terms, we then issued heads of terms populated to their clients, and along with the other parties on the scheme in August of 2023. There have been a number of iterations of these terms since that date, is my belief that we're close to agreeing to final remaining points with the various agents that formed the league, then we're close to completing that negotiation. It's our hope that once those final points are agreed that heads of terms will be entered into in Quick, quick succession Soon after, the general approach to negotiations, the applicant is seeking to enter into consented agreements with all the affected parties as soon as possible. And we will continue to engage with all affected parties, and their agents were appointed to reach an agreement before the close of the examination. We intend to provide an update on the negotiations throughout the examination will provide an update on each of the deadlines or is directed.

1:12:12

That's very helpful. Thank you. Thank you for that. And obviously, as far as the panel are concerned, we're looking for comfort that proper efforts have been made to seek land by by a voucher by voluntary agreement. And that have taken place prior to the application being submitted and will continue to take place. So you've set that out. And that will be updated at deadline one ICM route without going Yes, deadline one and each of the deadlines will update you.



1:12:44

Right, thank you for that.

1:12:46

You did refer to the CA tracker, which was submitted in January 2024. And in that ca tracker, there were 186 interest, I think you're now saying there's 190.

1:12:59

Rob Brown for the afternoon. I think there's 183. And that tracker

1:13:03

can be incorrect. These 190 for the update. Right? And it mentioned, as you've just said that there was one heads of terms that's now gone up to six or seven. So So that's moving in the right direction. However, the tracker does say, if you the natural conclusion, if you look down the front of the tracker is that there are no objections.

1:13:29

Now, can I press you on that? Because that doesn't seem quite right. Rob Brown, the applicant? I believe there's probably one where it's objectively stated. And that was an error on our part. And that will be updated and reflected in the update that's provided that I want.

1:13:47

Right, I think I think there are a few objections actually, if you go through all the relevant representations.

1:13:56

And see

1:13:59

where people are saying that they're objecting there are about

1:14:05

that there are several I mean, Phillips 66 are obviously one and clearly that they're still objecting because the change application hasn't been accepted yet.

1:14:15

But there were there were, I think four or five. There are a couple that said, we think this might be a blank claim. No, I think that's really an objection.

1:14:26

So I would urge you to to look carefully at that because to say there are no objections is is not the case. There are a number of objections and if you want I'll run through them and tell you who are objecting. But there are four or five plus a couple of blight claims. And therefore, I think it's a CA trackers coming

in. It's very important that it that it's correct and the public. When they read it they they get a proper open, transparent

1:15:00

A report of what's happening?

1:15:03

Because there aren't, it's not the case that there are no objections. There are a few. Not many, but a few.

1:15:12

Rubber Africa. Thank you, I,

1:15:15

if I could speak to you separately around the classification of some of those objections, just given the code and the wording that's used, because I believe even where there are objections that we will reach agreement with them. And I'm not sure there's a category that would come well, you might reach agreement to them over the next few weeks and months. But as of January 2024, when that was submitted, there are a number of rejections. Not very many, but there are four or five. And that that may well be the case that deadline one. So what we're concerned about is the position. When the tracker is submitted to the planning Inspectorate. We're not really concerned about what might happen over the next few weeks, or what you hope might happen. We're concerned with what the position is on the ground, when that's submitted. So as I say, by deadline, when if you could have a look at that, and please, please make sure it's updated. We will do thank you very much. Thank you.

1:16:16

I'm going back to the agenda, which is still helpfully on the screen. So thank you for that.

1:16:22

The funding statement.

1:16:27

So we want to look at the purpose and adequacy of the funding statement.

1:16:34

And I think the question we had here is,

1:16:38

there's a lot of money in this overall

1:16:43

company structure,

1:16:45

you've got the Harper energy PLC, obviously a major PLC.

1:16:55

If we could put up page four of the funding statement,

1:17:00

we'll see the company structure

1:17:03

and harbour energy are at the top. And then we come down through several layers to get to the applicant.

1:17:14

And the applicant.

1:17:17

Looking at the balance sheet, which has been submitted with about the funding statement has relatively limited assets, the balance sheet showed several 112,000 pounds

1:17:29

Thank you, that's what I wanted. So we've got harbour energy PLC at the top

1:17:35

the applicant

1:17:37

to five down there's a number two is a Cayman Islands company.

1:17:43

And then various other UK companies until you get to the applicant

1:17:48

who whose five removed

1:17:51

now as say their balance sheet is 712,000 pounds in September 23.

1:17:57

So I'd like to ask you how examining authority can be confident that the applicant has sufficient assets to implement or complete this project.

1:18:22

Sorry, sorry, click out the application and

1:18:26

we can provide more information on this. In writing just explain the company structure and how the parent company meets the liabilities of the applicant company that would assist. The overall position is as set out in the in the funding statement, which is that the cost of the project set 60% within the harbour group, which is the harbour Energy Group and 40% with with BP. And that is more than sufficient funds available to meet the the estimated costs for the land acquisition, which I think is approximately 17 Just over 17 million. So 20 million and the rounded out to 20 million in the funding statement, but we can provide more information on the relationship between the applicant company and the parent

1:19:23

and writer.

1:19:26

Yes, thanks. Thanks. You can provide more information but the fact is the applicant is a company with very limited assets. BP is a partner but I don't think at the present time either they or harbour energy PLC have got any actual financial obligation or commitment to the costs. Is that the case?

1:20:03

Question for the applicant.

1:20:07

So, on the balance sheet of the applicant,

1:20:12

I just like to take instructions and asked if I may, on the on the figure that's quoted, just to make sure we've understood that correctly, figure quoted 712,928?

1:20:56

Great, well, some of the applicants are you're gathered, I have no accountant at the time it took me to do that.

1:21:02

The figure in the balance sheet,

1:21:07

page 16

1:21:09

is actually expressed in millions. Right? So it's not 700. And that's the confusion that you're probably seeing in my eyes. It's not 712,000 it's 712 million. We can tell I'm not an accountant.

1:21:25

You and me both suck. So

1:21:28

hopefully I said we can the other question. I understand the terms of relationship and company structure, we can provide more information on that. But sorry for not being able to well, to come to that point. If that's the 712 million, then it's not an issue. Is it? Because we're talking about

1:21:46

240 million pounds for the for the development costs. So yeah, as I say, apologies, I'm not an accountant. And

1:21:57

yeah, it's got a few notes on the end. But perhaps you could emphasise that point when a deadline one just to do a one line statement that that'd be very helpful thank you.

1:22:11

But return to previous query, do we know who the applicant for the offshore scheme is going to be?

1:22:32

Pink welcome for the applicant, sir. Can we double check that was with our clients at the regional confirm when we come back if they confirm today or deadline deadline one would be fine.

1:22:45

So wouldn't have a problem with with that. And perhaps or in the context of what you just said it is not not really too much of an issue. Perhaps you could just come back where you are with the 240 million overall costs, obviously within inflation uncertainties and contingencies

1:23:08

whether or not that's still the

1:23:13

the appropriate figure or whether you might want to revise that that that's a bit of low paid from what you just said not not a not a great deal um, turns on that

1:23:34

obviously, we're going to move on to to a few other issues in particularly in relation to human rights and statue Undertaker's but it might be an appropriate moment just to take a break now. So it's five to 11 Can we reconvene it water past so take a break of 20 minutes so thank you very much to to everyone.

1:23:56

There is now only German for a period of 20 minutes till quarter past 11 Thank you