

Application by Chrysaor Production (UK) Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Viking response CCS

Comments on submissions received at Deadline 2 from Lincolnshire County Council

Archaeology Comments

For the most part we are pleased with the progression and general direction of the ongoing archaeological work for this scheme.

The geophysical survey has been undertaken and along with the desk based assessment has been used as the basis for an adequate programme of trenching which is currently ongoing. The geo-archaeological WSI from Wessex Archaeology is forthcoming. The applicant states that the field evaluation results will be produced during the examination stage. It is to be hoped that this will inform an effective and robust mitigation strategy which can be agreed before the determination.

A few of the issues which have been identified in the documentation have been resolved elsewhere. For example the AECOM Outline WSI ([REP2-016](#)) states that in their green areas there will not be trenching evaluation for ground truthing so-called 'blank' areas where previous phases of evaluation have not identified archaeological features. This is not acceptable but Wessex WSI which has been appended to the document does include sufficient trenching across these areas.

There are other issues in the Draft CEMP in the Environmental Statement Volume IV – Appendix 3-1 Draft CEMP Revision B ([REP2-012](#)).

In **Table 2: Environmental Control Plans** on p15:

The Control Plan is *'Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for archaeological mitigation'*

The description is :*'To be developed by the Contractor post consent based on the Outline WSI (to be provided in the ES) to fully describe the additional mitigation measures to be implemented to preserve in situ and protect, or archaeologically excavate and record heritage assets, including upstanding earthworks and buried archaeological remains. This will be informed by the by the results of the archaeological evaluation surveys. '*

The answer under the final column headed *'Outline version contained within the DCO application'* is *'Yes (ES Volume IV Appendix 8-3: Outline WSI Trial Trenching (Application Document 6.4.8.3)).'* ([REP2-016](#))

This is incorrect as that is the evaluation trenching WSI, indeed one of the stated aims of the outline trenching WSI is to *'inform the strategy for any required mitigation via recording, preservation and/or management of identified assets.'* (section 3.1.2) More importantly while the WSI for archaeological mitigation does not yet exist it will need to be agreed before any groundworks commence, will need to be adhered to throughout the project and should be agreed pre-determination. The National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure ([EN-3](#)) states that ***'The results of pre-determination archaeological***

evaluation inform the design of the scheme and related archaeological planning conditions. (footnote 94)

In the same document we are for the most part very pleased to see the commitments in **Table 3: Draft Mitigation Register (Construction Phase)** in terms of the Historic Environment section D (pp37-40). We are however concerned about D3 which states that *'Targeted archaeological monitoring would be undertaken in areas where prior archaeological evaluation indicates this approach is appropriate, and/or in areas where archaeological investigation and recording in advance of construction are not feasible due to safety or logistical considerations, or undesirable due to environmental or engineering constraints. The works contractor's preferred method of working would be controlled as necessary by the supervising archaeologist to allow archaeological recording to take place to the required standard.'*

Targeted archaeological monitoring is part of a suite of standard archaeological mitigation techniques which also include set piece excavation and strip map and record which needs to be undertaken in advance of the commencement of groundworks or any associated activity such as plant movement across these mitigation areas. The use of targeted archaeological monitoring should occur only where that would be a reasonable archaeological mitigation response. This will need to be informed by the results of the trial trenching and an understanding of the developmental impacts along with the above mentioned archaeological fieldwork mitigation techniques and preservation in situ areas will be deployed as part of an agreed appropriate mitigation strategy across the redline boundary.

D2 includes the development and implementation of a detailed archaeological mitigation strategy which includes *'protection of remains within working areas and preservation of archaeological remains in situ.'*

The Draft CEMP does not include full details of the required measures for preservation in situ mitigation. The full extent of the archaeological areas must be determined and each area must be fenced off and subject to a programme of monitoring throughout the construction, operation and the decommissioning phases, and there will be no ground disturbance whatsoever which may disturb or affect the archaeological remains, including plant movement or storage. The fencing will need to remain in place and be maintained throughout the lifetime of the scheme. They need an Archaeological Clerk of Works and the management strategy for the preservation in situ areas will need to be included in their CEMP to ensure the protection measures stay in place throughout the development including any necessary remedial groundworks throughout the lifetime of the scheme.

D12 is *'Limiting stripping for construction compounds, laydown, welfare and parking areas, haul roads and other associated works in areas where archaeology is recorded to avoid disturbance, and instead using geotextile and stone over topsoil.'*

Again while this is very positive as a commitment it would depend on the nature, significance and depth of archaeology whether this would be an appropriate mitigation measure, for example human skeletal remains may be found at no great depth in agricultural landscapes and they would be damaged and destroyed by this mitigation response. Again

the appropriate level and type of mitigation will need to be informed by the trenching results.

The provision of sufficient baseline information to identify and assess the impact on known and potential heritage assets is required by Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (Regulation 5 (2d)), National Planning Statement Policy EN1 (Section 5.8), and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The EIA will need to contain sufficient information on the archaeological potential and must include evidential information on the depth, extent and significance of the archaeological deposits which will be impacted by the development. The results will inform a fit for purpose mitigation strategy which will identify what measures are to be taken to minimise or adequately record the impact of the proposal on archaeological remains.

This is in accordance with The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 which states "***The EIA must identify, describe and assess in an appropriate manner...the direct and indirect significant impacts of the proposed development on...material assets, cultural heritage and the landscape.***" (Regulation 5 (2d))

Ecology Comments

Habitats Regulations Assessment Report Revision B (REP2-024) - LCC welcomes the additional consideration of potential in-combination effects. LCC defers to Natural England on matters relating to the Habitats Regulations Assessment and has no further comments to make at this stage.

Draft Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) Revision A (REP-026) - LCC notes the changes made to the Applicant's and has no further comments to make at this stage.

LCC welcomes the additional commitment relating to acoustic screening to mitigate disturbance of non-breeding birds included in the updated Draft CEMP (REP2 012 page26).

LCC notes the Applicant's response to comments relating to Biodiversity Net Gain in the Local Impact Report (REP2-031: 5.49 and 5.58). LCC maintains its opinion that the Applicant should seek to deliver in excess of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain.

Traffic and Transport Comments

Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport - Revision A (REP2-006 /007) - The revisions to the chapter amends some of the HGV routings and now no HGVs are predicted along 59 Little Grimsby Lane, 66 Red Leas Lane and 67 Pick Hill Lane. However, HGVs are still forecast to use 35 Thacker Bank and 10 Thoroughfare – both of these are single track and unsuitable for HGVs (Para 12.5.52 of the TA states as much). If HGVs are to use the routes in the numbers predicted then passing places need to be provided – these are not proposed in the mitigation.

Quantitative Cumulative Assessment for Traffic and Transport (REP2-033) - The assessment includes approved schemes, however it is likely that other NSIP proposals in the area, in particular the National Grid Grimsby to Walpole upgrade proposal would also generate significant traffic on the highway network in this area.

The draft CEMP - Revision B (REP2-012, page 61), states that Thoroughfare will only be used for traffic to the Block Valve Station, however no other mitigation is proposed. LCC consider that passing places will be required.

Applicant's comments in response to LCC's response to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions (REP2-030) (Q's. 1.7.6, 1.7.11, 1.7.12, 1.7.13, 1.7.14) are noted. However, the answers provided do not address our concerns relating to powers the draft DCO gives the applicant in the public highway.