Consents given under the Petroleum Act 1998 and Reviews under the Assessment of Environmental Effects Regulations 1999

Shell UK Exploration and Production Limited

GOLDENEYE DEVELOPMENT

Pursuant to Regulation 5(8) of the above Regulations, the Secretary of State for Trade and Industry gives notice that she is content that the requirements of the above Regulations have been satisfied. Pursuant to Licence P257, a consent has been granted to Shell UK Exploration and Production Limited for the getting of petroleum and the construction of installations in relation to the development of the Goldeneye field in accordance with the environmental statement, received 18th January 2002. The consent for the Goldeneye field took effect from 12/03/02 and shall last until 31/12/14.

Background

Shell U.K. Exploration and Production intend to develop the Goldeneye field, which lies 100 km north-east of Aberdeen. The project involves the installation of a normally unattended installation (NUI) and 101 km, 20” export pipeline that will carry reservoir fluids from the NUI to the gas processing plant at St. Fergus. A 4” MEG service line will transport Methanol and other chemicals from St Fergus to the NUI. All processing will take place at St Fergus. Five wells will be drilled from a jack-up. The 20” export line will be placed on the seabed and the 4” MEG line will be trenched and buried. Jacket installation and the commencement of drilling are planned for mid 2003 onwards, with first gas Q3 2004. The Goldeneye reservoir will produce gas and a small amount of condensate over an expected field life of ten years.

Sensitivities

The location of the field is not in a particularly sensitive area and the drilling of five wells using both water based mud and oil based mud will not have a significant environmental impact. The use of an NUI, with no processing facilities greatly reduces offshore emissions and discharges. The laying of a 20” pipeline and the trenching of a 4” MEG line will have a short-term environmental impact, but it is predicted that the seabed will recover relatively quickly. The environmental statement (ES) covers in detail the option selection process and presents a case for not using existing infrastructure. Data were presented comparing the predicted energy usage and CO₂ emissions for each of the main options and suggests that the selected option has the lowest usage and emissions. A detailed impact assessment has been undertaken and where the assessment has identified any issues of potential significance mitigation measures are in place to ensure that impacts are kept to a minimum and details of the management systems in place were presented.

Recommendation

Overall the environmental statement is satisfactory and adequately assesses the potential environmental impacts of the proposed development. It is recommend that consent is given to the project.