

Schedule 4 – GLA comments on new relevant documents submitted by the Applicant

Document	Para / section	Applicant comment	GLA comment
<p>Analysis of Metropolitan Open Land</p> <p>Doc 8.02.41</p>	<p>1.1.1</p>	<p>Document prepared in response to a request by the ExA for the Applicant to provide a view on the weight to be attached to the inclusion of Metropolitan Open Land ("MOL") in the site. i.e the question is whether MOL has the same status as Green Belt with regard to an NSIP project; it would only have such status if the London Plan (Policy 7.17) and the Draft London Plan (Policy G3) that MOL should be treated as Green Belt apply.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This document was prepared in response to a request by the ExA for the Applicant to provide a view on the weight to be attached to the inclusion of Metropolitan Open Land ("MOL") in the site. i.e the question is whether MOL has the same status as Green Belt with regard to an NSIP project; it would only have such status if the London Plan (Policy 7.17) and the Draft London Plan (Policy G3) that MOL should be treated as Green Belt apply. 2. London Plan Policy 7.17 and draft London Plan Policy G3 are clear that MOL has the same level of protection as Green Belt, as enshrined within the NPPF. In this regard, the GLA would concur with paragraph 5.10.17 of the NPS which states that works on the MOL would comprise 'inappropriate development', as defined within the NPPF. In that regard, the GLA consider that the policies, seeking to preserve the openness and character of the MOL and set out within the London Plan, draft London Plan and MOL, are given due regard as the MOL is considered to be of equal weight as Green Belt for the purposes of determining NSIP applications.
<p>Anaerobic Digestion Facility</p>	<p>1.1.3</p>	<p>Since the DCO Application was submitted, the Applicant has made a commitment to invest in enhanced NOx abatement equipment through the implementation of a selective catalytic</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Since the DCO Application was submitted, the Applicant has made a commitment to invest in enhanced NOx abatement equipment through the implementation of a selective catalytic reduction (SCR) system on the CHP

Schedule 4 – GLA Deadline 5

<p>Emissions Mitigation Note Doc 8.02.42</p>		<p>reduction (SCR) system on the CHP engine. This enhanced mitigation will reduce the NOx emissions associated with the Anaerobic Digestion CHP engine. In this report the Applicant considers the consequences of that improved mitigation performance on the air quality assessment undertaken as part of the ES.</p>	<p>engine. This enhanced mitigation will reduce the NOx emissions associated with the Anaerobic Digestion CHP engine. In this report the Applicant considers the consequences of that improved mitigation performance on the air quality assessment undertaken as part of the ES.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The GLA has repeatedly stressed (for example in its Further Representations Deadline 4, paragraph 3.9) that on-site combustion of the biogas produced by the anaerobic digestion plant should not be the preferred option for reasons of both air quality and maximising low carbon generation performance and, despite appearing to agree, the Applicant has continued to pursue options for on-site combustion to the exclusion of other options. The rationale, that there are potential problems to solve or negotiations to be had with third parties, is insufficient to reassure us that on-site combustion is the only remaining option. 5. The pursuit of an environmental permit encompassing on-site combustion of the AD gas, and the additional commitment to expensive SCR equipment to secure the permit suggests that there is no real commitment from the operator to explore other options. 6. That said, the additional reduction of emissions, if the on-site combustion is pursued, is considered to be acceptable if this use of the gas is demonstrably unavoidable.
	<p>3.3.2</p>	<p>The Applicant has been advised by the EA that they will be issuing a Schedule 5 Request which will request that the Applicant further reviews the impact of REP upon the Crossness Nature Reserve.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. At paragraph 3.3.2 of document 8.02.42 the Applicant notes it has been advised by the EA that they will be issuing a Schedule 5 Request which will request that the Applicant further reviews the impact of REP upon the Crossness Nature Reserve.

Schedule 4 – GLA Deadline 5

			<p>8. The response to the expected Schedule 5 request is likely to contain information that is relevant to the DCO decision, particularly as various parties, including the GLA, have raised concerns about the effects of the proposed development on Crossness Nature Reserve and the potential increase in ammonia emissions described in the note.</p> <p>9. Any response to the EA schedule 5 request should be shared with the examining authority and other parties.</p>
	4.1.6	<p>The commitment with regard to AD emissions commitment will be secured through the introduction of a new requirement in the dDCO to be submitted at Deadline 5 and will also be secured by the EP.</p>	<p>10. At paragraph 4.1.6, the Applicant states that its proposed commitment with regard to AD emissions will be secured through the introduction of a new requirement in the dDCO to be submitted at Deadline 5 and will also be secured by the environmental permit.</p> <p>11. It is not clear what type of commitment is envisaged in the revised dDCO and how this could functionally differ from the kinds of commitment to emissions control that the GLA have requested for the main ERF.</p> <p>12. Clearly, if the Applicant is proposing that a DCO requirement is necessary to secure abatement of the much smaller impacts of the AD emissions, then the GLA would expect to see it accept similar commitments for the ERF.</p>