

**Medworth ISH\_22 FEB\_PT2**

Created on: 2023-02-22 14:17:10

Project Length: 01:29:26

File Name: Medworth ISH\_22 FEB\_PT2

File Length: 01:29:26

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:29 - 00:00:20:03

Can I confirm with Mr. Stuart Avis that the Live stream is on? Please. Thank you very much. And can I confirm as well that everyone in the room can hear me

00:00:21:26 - 00:00:23:07

and virtually as well?

00:00:26:01 - 00:00:37:05

We are not I'm not receiving any notification that we have a problem with your or virtually. Okay. I will continue on that basis. So welcome back.

00:00:38:25 - 00:00:56:13

To address this issue specifically, number one on the of facility develop a purchase order granting development consent for the met with energy from waste combined heat and power facility.

00:00:58:19 - 00:01:16:02

We finished with item one of apologies. We finished with item three of the agenda, so we will now actually move us on to item four of the agenda, which is need for the proposed development.

00:01:18:23 - 00:01:21:10

Everyone okay with that? Yes.

00:01:21:27 - 00:01:22:12

Yes.

00:01:22:23 - 00:01:23:08

Thank you.

00:01:25:06 - 00:01:55:21

So similar to the previous item, I would like to just state that for the item in this agenda. My questions have been greatly informed by the following documents. That would be chapter three of the description of the proposed development. Reference App 030, which provides an overview of the proposed development and sets out the main components of the energy from Waste CHP Facility. CHP connection improvements with connection, water connections and timber Construction Compound.

00:01:56:20 - 00:02:27:04

Chapter three of the Yes as it makes reference to the works within the draft DCO and that would be AP 013 and as shown on the work plan app007. Statement of Reasons. Chapter 18 Cumulative Effects Assessment that will be AP 0545. Combined Heat and Power Assessment That would be AP 097 and Project Benefits reports. That would be AP 095.

00:02:29:18 - 00:02:48:16

So first of all, again, a very general question to set the tone and to get the discussion started on this specific topic. Could the applicant please talk us through the project benefits as they have been identified, particularly those around energy security and waste? Please. Thank you.

00:02:49:11 - 00:02:49:26

Yes.

00:02:51:10 - 00:03:09:08

We will do that in a moment. I'm going to ask Mr. Kerry to speak to project benefits, and I'm then going to potentially have Mr. KENYON speak to the other matters listed in the first bullet in.

00:03:11:00 - 00:03:53:02

Item four, that is to say, moving towards net zero while he and Mr. Carry between will do it. And also then Ms.. Brown and Mr. Turner online will address the issue in terms of need for waste. And so I should just say I'm grateful that you flagged that because waste needed wasn't one of the matters you'd identified in your agenda and of course you raised it. Now we think that's entirely appropriate because in terms of the need for this facility, that is to say this f w CHP facility, it isn't simply a question of energy security need or need for energy infrastructure.

00:03:53:04 - 00:04:24:13

It's also not even just a matter of need to move towards net zero. It is also a question of waste need because these various concepts, waste, need, energy, infrastructure need and so on. They are all elided in the context of an e, f w CHP facility, and we have that in spades set out in the n three and draft n three. And so I just want to flag for your reference paragraph 2.5. 18 of N three.

00:04:26:14 - 00:04:36:20

Which states that waste combustion plants are unlike other. Electricity generating power stations in that they have two rules. Treatment of waste and recovery of energy.

00:04:38:09 - 00:05:14:05

Yes. Just. Just one point. While you are clarifying that specific issue, it might be useful to know and to note that I have some questions on net zero further down that I'm going to ask as well. So in terms of what you are just setting out to know, you might want to hold on net zero, because I do have specific questions on that. I was thinking about talking about the project benefits in general, as I said, particularly energy security and waste. I my question relies heavily on the information that you have submitted as part of the project benefits report.

00:05:14:07 - 00:05:26:25

So I wanted us to basically go through that and actually get a general overview. So in light of what you just explained, I would hold off on going into too much detail on net zero.

00:05:27:08 - 00:06:13:06

So that's very helpful. What we'll do then is speak firstly to project benefits and in that context we'll reference energy security and then we'll move on to waste need. And in fact, before we go to before I turn to Mr. Carey and ask him to begin speaking about the project benefits, I am myself going to chip in my \$0.02 worth in relation to energy security and provide the examination with one or two references insofar as it is the applicant's position that in one national policy statement, anyone acknowledges in terms the ability of energy from waste technology to deliver predictable, controllable electricity.

00:06:14:01 - 00:06:37:04

And it acknowledges that that is increasingly important in securing energy supplies, i.e. energy security, and with that in mind. So we would ask you to have regard particularly to paragraphs two, spot to spot 20 and following of N1 and also paragraph 3.3.1 wire of N1.

00:06:41:23 - 00:07:15:23

Also we say that in five and also the draftee and five both recognize the need for baseload electricity inputs to the grid to meet the rising demand for electricity and balance the increasing proportion of generation from sources which are intermittent by nature. And that is to say, wind and solar. So we say that energy security and indeed national policy in the national policy statements relating to energy security is entirely aligned with this proposed bill.

00:07:16:01 - 00:07:27:20

But on that basis, I'm going to put down energy security and ask Mr. Kerry to speak to project benefits more generally before we come then, to the issue of waste need.

00:07:28:09 - 00:07:46:12

Thank you, Mr.. Both. Just to clarify, for those in the room that might not be familiar with N, those are the national policy statements for energy that have been mentioned. So that would be national level guidance. If I could then hand over to Mr. Kerry to reply on my question, please.

00:07:47:23 - 00:08:01:21

Thank you, sir. Paul Carey, managing director of the Africans. We believe this project has many benefits at many levels, both nationally, as we've just heard regionally and importantly for the local community

00:08:03:18 - 00:08:17:12

in particular. And I think our proposal will offer many benefits, including locally lower cost and more sustainable energy for local businesses. And on top of that, as we will demonstrate education and community benefits.

00:08:19:00 - 00:09:01:25

So national policy, we've heard, requires that these facilities should be able to supply heat as well as electricity, and that we can certainly do we do this in Germany. And as I've mentioned before, we do this in the UK, particularly in Plymouth, where we have a proud record of supplying the Royal Navy with heat. Now in Wisbech that possibility is even stronger than it is in Plymouth because there are a large number of industrial users in the area that could take heat and some of them are identified in the Government's own heat mapping work.

00:09:02:05 - 00:09:35:15

Others perhaps not. Why do we want to supply heat? Well, it's it's better use of the energy that's within the waste. Within the waste, there's a certain amount of energy and our job is to turn that into useful energy, either as electricity, which goes into the grid or can go to local businesses as well, or as heat in the form of either steam or hot water. As I said, this is commonly done in Germany, and it's also done in Plymouth.

00:09:37:23 - 00:10:17:00

It providing heat also provides a greater level of security for that steam supply. So a customer that might today be supplying steam from a gas boiler can keep that gas boiler and have us as a more reliable source of lower cost, more efficient steam. So it's all about reducing costs. It's all about increasing security. And also, as we will perhaps talk about later on, lowering the carbon footprint of everything. So we will always be open to discussions with prospective uses of steam or hot water now or after.

00:10:17:03 - 00:10:17:21

Should we be

00:10:19:20 - 00:10:21:29

lucky enough to get the DCO consent through?

00:10:23:15 - 00:11:00:19

Another benefit is what we would call license exempt supplies. Now, this is where I mentioned much earlier on today that we have our own electricity supply company. So if you buy electricity from the grid, you have to buy it through a licensed supplier. If you know anything about this system, the licensed suppliers are required to add on an awful lot of extra costs on top of the bear wholesale price of electricity. If you are able to supply electricity on a license exempt basis, you don't have to add those extras on and you can therefore offer a cheaper price for electricity.

00:11:00:27 - 00:11:07:00

So we can also offer what we call licence exempt supplies. And we would do that with a what we call a private wire cable.

00:11:08:23 - 00:11:36:18

The benefit we will come to this, I'm sure, is also that we will have the ability to install carbon capture and storage systems in the future and space has been reserved for that. We'll come to that shortly, I'm sure. And we as part of that is this is the challenge of taking the carbon dioxide away from the site and storing it in places where it was no longer in the in the environment. Again, I'll be happy to come back to that later.

00:11:39:06 - 00:12:09:17

But another big benefit, much more local than that and more important for some people is to be able to help out with employment and skills in the area. We've been doing this with our local authorities in Plymouth and Dundee. We do this through the local community. In this case we have already set out an outline employment and skills strategy on which we have worked with Norfolk County Council. So they've engaged with us on this and that's a document that can be looked at.

00:12:10:07 - 00:12:20:00

I think it's document reference. AP 099. So that is something that we would be very pleased to engage in.

00:12:21:20 - 00:12:44:01

As a company, we strongly believe in giving as much benefit as possible to local companies on whose support and services we would require. So we will operate this facility ourselves, but we will need a lot of input from people. Supplying services could range from welding, scaffolding, electrical work, all manner of things. Civil engineering work. Of course,

00:12:45:16 - 00:12:51:04

during the construction of this site, this project, there will be up to 700 work

00:12:52:19 - 00:13:12:16

at its peak and online for about 500 workers on this site and they will bring a lot of money into the into the region. Will there be a huge demand on the local community for bed and breakfast and catering and other services? And although it is a relatively short window for three year period, that's a significant boost to the local economy. And we saw this in Plymouth when we built that too.

00:13:13:23 - 00:13:56:18

Mr. Kerry Can I just ask you a couple of questions on that point? I think it's appropriate for us to get into some of that detail you mentioned just now. Up to 700 workers in terms of the construction of the facility. Obviously, as we have heard before in this examination, that construction is actually going to have a time limit. And it's it's not going to be the permanent situation. So can you actually tell us a little bit more in terms of the employment and economic benefits that you were explaining, but considering what will be available for the local community once we are in operational mode rather than construction?

00:13:57:21 - 00:14:31:21

Indeed. So when we run one of these facilities, once it's built, it requires, like anything else, the large mechanical and electrical nature, a lot of maintenance, a lot of care, and a lot of constant modification that say there's always things that you want to change to improve. And so we would always look to employ subcontractors. We have 40 people within our staff that would be permanently employed by us. But on top of that, there's going to be a large number of other people that would benefit from job.

00:14:31:28 - 00:15:03:08

So that would be secondary, shall we say, to to to what we directly employ as a result of being employed by those who supply those services to us. So we're talking about scaffolding. It's a very simple things to do. We wouldn't go to Cornwall for a scaffolder, we would look for a scaffold in Wisbech and we require scaffolding on a more or less constant basis. So we're constantly moving things around, etc.. Welding is another point. Electrical works.

00:15:03:10 - 00:15:34:27

All of these skills are to be had locally. Now locally might not be necessarily Wisbech town centre itself, it might be the wider region, but it's local enough to be giving an economic benefit to to a lot of people over the lifetime of this project, which is, you know, the technical like this project is in the order of 40 years and that's an awful lot of time for someone to be able to depend on a reliable job from up through our services, if you like. Does that answer you?

00:15:35:24 - 00:15:45:24

It just to just to confirm then what I think Mr. Carey is saying is that in addition to the full time employment actually at the plant, there would be these in direct.

00:15:45:29 - 00:15:46:28

Yes. Jobs as well.

00:15:47:00 - 00:15:58:02

And I think that my question was, do we have any information, any numbers that you could actually happily share with us today in terms of what those numbers would be?

00:15:59:26 - 00:16:01:16

Yes, we have it. Yes, we do. Yes.

00:16:01:22 - 00:16:07:10

I mean, I have the number, but I want to make sure I've got it absolutely right. So I'm going to ask Mr. Mott to give you a number.

00:16:09:25 - 00:16:44:16

Tim Marks for the applicant. So in Environmental Statement Chapter three Description of developments. I'll provide the reference in due course. But we state there's 32 full time equivalent staff employed. They will be operating from the site and the purpose built administration building. So within the top planning, within environmental statement of Chapter three, there is a breakdown table,

which I will provide reference to, which keeps it, or a summary list within a bullet point which provides the types of job opportunities that will be available for full time staff.

00:16:45:03 - 00:16:57:03

And then it also goes on to discuss the the the matters that Mr. Carey mentioned in terms of add on staff for things like scaffolding catering.

00:16:57:17 - 00:17:20:10

And can I also ask in terms of just facilitating dissemination of these documents, is there a particular reason why those tables that you have mentioned are not actually in the documents that Mr. Kerry has mentioned before? Particularly documents, I think, reference a purpose 099, which is to outline an employment and skills strategy.

00:17:20:21 - 00:18:02:11

So the 810 marks for the applicants are the the the figures mentioned in the the overview description is in chapter three. The the Employment and Skills strategy is a separate document and that outlines our proposals to as well as if we were to receive a consent and construct the facility and be on site, we would have an employment and skills strategy to link into the local community and also things like schools and colleges to try and draw and draw in local employment opportunities and improve educational opportunities for for all for the kids at the colleges and schools in the area.

00:18:02:14 - 00:18:10:17

So this is a this is a wider strategy about the wider local area rather than just a strategy for the 32 full time equivalent staff.

00:18:12:09 - 00:18:24:09

Thank you very much for that information. Can I just ask Mr. Carey? I, I interjected in your answer, so I'm not sure if you are finished. So you'd like to continue.

00:18:28:23 - 00:19:06:11

So I was going to say, which is more about the outline of your pardon for Buhari managing director. And what I was going to go onto was about the buy. The benefits of having established a facility with our own workforce is that we would be spending a lot of time, as we have done in the time as we are doing in Dundee, of looking to support others, develop skills and experience in order to improve their employment prospects so that we do a lot of work in Plymouth with local colleges and the same in Dundee and we would imagine doing the same sort of thing here.

00:19:06:13 - 00:19:39:13

And that's what the Outline Employment and Skills Strategy offers. And we have a very good track record of doing that in Plymouth and Dundee. So for example, you know, we take in a lot of visitors at Devonport, a lot of people come to see us and understand what we do and through that become inspired to take up STEM subjects, for example. And we have schools and colleges visiting us and using us as an example of what sort of careers people could engage in and understanding how we do all that.

00:19:39:15 - 00:20:15:00

So that's the sort of employment skills and strategy we're talking about. So the the, the, the direct employment and the indirect employment through our various subcontractors is also set out in our application and we will continue to do exactly as we have done in Plymouth and in Dundee. If we were to get the teacher application here, we would have a full time member of staff dedicated to this. A community liaison manager would be appointed part of the team and they would be full time to employ ensure that we deliver on those obligations.

00:20:16:12 - 00:20:17:17

Thank you, Mr. Kerry.

00:20:19:14 - 00:20:26:01

Would anyone like to ask any questions following this intervention from Mr. Kerry?

00:20:28:08 - 00:20:30:22

Yes. Councillor Cheery.

00:20:31:18 - 00:21:00:00

Thank you. Councillor Steve Tierney For the people of Middle-Earth I don't know where you're going to put 700 people in the half dozen pubs you're going to find. But what that would mean is three years where tourists, families come in for weddings, people wanting to stay here will have absolutely nowhere to stay. And 700 additional call Jan is coming in and out of the town. I'm not sure you're making a stronger case, but thank you.

00:21:02:20 - 00:21:04:23

I will give the applicants a chance to reply.

00:21:05:00 - 00:21:37:20

I'll go to Mr. Marx in a moment. But just to be clear, I may be I may have misunderstood our own document, but it's not suggested that there will be a workforce of 700 people working at all times throughout the construction period. It is my understanding it is that it is 700 people. That is to say we anticipate a workforce of 700, although that will be staggered at point. In addition, it is not assumed that all members of that construction workforce would be needing to stay in temporary accommodation, of course.

00:21:38:08 - 00:21:56:27

That's to say whether it's hotels being bays and so on. Some of them may be living more locally. Nor is it, nor would it be necessary that all of them would be required to stay. It's not necessary that all of them live immediately on site.

00:21:57:16 - 00:21:58:24

Thank you very much for that.

00:21:59:15 - 00:22:02:01

I don't know if Mr. Marks has anything further to add on that point.

00:22:03:05 - 00:22:10:24

Tim Marks for the applicant. Just very briefly, in terms of the construction workforce numbers, this around up to 700

00:22:12:17 - 00:22:22:10

operatives required in different skills and in terms of a peak of on sites at any one time, that would be 500, around 500. 700.

00:22:22:16 - 00:22:50:14

Right. Thank you for that confirmation, Mr. Marks. I would like to ask the applicant for another question. It would be a secretary of state needs to be satisfied that there is a compelling case in the public interest for the land included in the DCO to be acquired compulsory. Can the applicant please explain how this development proposal presents a compelling case in the public interest?

00:22:54:10 - 00:23:26:03

So, I mean, obviously that is a matter I think we probably more anticipate dealing with at a compulsory acquisition hearing. And it's not an answer that I have of ready now. What I will say is that. In circumstances where there is an urgent need and it is demonstrated unequivocally in the relevant national policy statement as being an urgent need for renewable energy infrastructure such as this.

00:23:26:05 - 00:24:06:05

And of course it is expressly identified as renewable energy infrastructure and in circumstances where the national policy statement directs that substantial weight must be accorded in the decision making process to provision of this infrastructure for which there is an urgent need. We are well on the way towards demonstrating a very special circumstances case. Mr. Kerry has spoken to various project benefits and this is everything from the ability to provide heat and electricity to the local community and also the provision of skills and jobs and so on.

00:24:06:14 - 00:24:19:17

Quite apart from the national tier of provision, that is to say the infrastructure we are providing for which there is no need to, which substantial weight must be added. We say that looked at in the round.

00:24:21:04 - 00:24:52:04

There is manifestly a compelling case in the public interest so as to justify the compulsory acquisition of land. We will certainly we anticipate putting in a written document in the context of the compulsory acquisition hearing which speaks to that particular issue. I am not sure that at this point in time, say unless Mr. Brodrick wishes to direct you to any particular references or say anything further, that we would look to address it and close that point off at this time.

00:24:52:06 - 00:24:56:23

Given that we do have eight hearings in the schedule that perhaps are just past an appropriate.

00:24:57:21 - 00:25:31:13

Clip of the applicant as well as Mr. B was speaking, I was able to find the relevant references. So the statement of reasons, which is document number AP, Dash 017 at section 5.5, sets out the compelling case in the public interest and why the applicant believes that the tests set out in Section 1223 of the Planning Act 2008 have been satisfied. Mr. Boost has already mentioned the key points that demonstrate that compelling case in the public interest relating to energy security and managing waste.

00:25:31:15 - 00:25:39:02

Further up the waste hierarchy for the full detail of the applicant's case is set out in those sections of the statement of reasons.

00:25:39:17 - 00:25:46:13

Right. Okay. Thank you very much for that intervention. Would anyone like to comment on this specific point?

00:25:49:06 - 00:25:51:07

Yes, Mr. Ballot.

00:25:52:05 - 00:26:32:17

I thought I'd just like to comment on the sort of management of waste. It also kind of relates to moving towards carbon neutral, which I'm not sure if the applicant is going to say more about in this section, but in the in the documentation that we've seen so far, there's been a conclusion that there's less carbon impact than than is seen with traditional landfill. But that's largely based on a kind of mathematical modelling approach. There are certainly several studies in the literature which would



contradict that and suggest that it's equivalent or worse than landfill in terms of the sort of environmental impact.

00:26:33:28 - 00:27:07:19

And from a parallel area in health where we've worked a lot with modelling. What I do know is that the assumptions that you put in any of these mathematical models hugely determine the outcome. And therefore it's very important that the the parameters of discounted set very robust and independently. And also that there are a number of sensitivity analyses slightly changing those assumptions to make sure that if you if you make marginal changes in assumptions, it doesn't change the answer. Otherwise, it's very easy to cherry pick the assumptions to come up with the answer that you want.

00:27:08:11 - 00:27:25:26

So I think the the reason that I raise this is because I would be worried from the modelling that's been done so far that it doesn't necessarily align with the literature and that it doesn't necessarily very convincingly suggest that this is a more efficient approach for waste management than current landfill.

00:27:26:23 - 00:27:51:03

Thank you for that intervention, Mr. Bart. I from my understanding of what you have just explained to us, it seems to me to be quite technical and quite complex because it will actually implied reviewing of, I think, quite recent technical and scientific standards in that case.

00:27:52:15 - 00:28:05:01

I mean, I did read some of this literature, but I think the point that I'd like to make is that what was in the documentation was very superficial, how the modelling was conducted, very transparent, and it potentially contradicts other things.

00:28:05:04 - 00:28:05:21

Thank you for that.

00:28:05:23 - 00:28:08:08

I think it was just making the assumption that that was absolute.

00:28:08:19 - 00:28:15:16

That's helpful. To clarify in terms of the angle of the question, Thank you very much. Thank you, sir. And ask for the applicants reply please.

00:28:15:18 - 00:28:54:25

Certainly by way of initial response, what I do say is that Dr. Barron, I mean, I'm sure with the intention of being helpful, is referring to documents and studies and literature and suggesting that our modelling and analysis does not align with that, of course. And Dr. Bard, I don't think has yet put into the examination any evidence. And of course, if he wishes to put material in, then we can consider it and respond. But I can't knock it out. And it might seem Reddy's joust with him in relation to studies that we have not seen and have not been referred to, which he says may undermine our analysis.

00:28:54:27 - 00:29:17:25

Now, I don't accept for a moment that our analysis is anything other than entirely robust. But if Dr. Barnard rather doesn't wish to make a substantive contribution, then we would invite him at deadline one to put in the material and the reasoning, which he says justifies a critique of our approach, because then we can consider it and potentially respond to it.

00:29:18:05 - 00:29:51:27

Mr. Ballard Well, I think two points. One, I'm very happy to put in something in writing to present some of those other studies. But I think the main point that I was making wasn't so much that the main point I was making is that there isn't enough information in the original documentation to understand how that modelling was undertaken and whether it was robust. So I think the onus should be on the applicant to actually present the model in such a way that it's transparent and we can understand the assumptions that have been made and coming to the conclusion they came to.

00:29:52:18 - 00:29:55:05

If I, if I may intervene on this point, Mr. Barr's.

00:29:57:05 - 00:30:18:01

It appears, if I am understanding the point that you are trying to make incorrectly. It appears to me that there might be some there might be some conclusions that the applicant has submitted as part of their evidence that you are not behind 100%. Is that is that the case?

00:30:18:12 - 00:30:25:11

Well, it's not so much that I am not behind 100%. It's more that I have not presented the methodology of how they've come to those. Right.

00:30:25:20 - 00:30:26:29

So it's a question of doesn't.

00:30:27:01 - 00:30:29:04

Help you understand why it's reversed.

00:30:29:06 - 00:30:37:24

Thank you. Thank you for that, Mr. Bartlett. Can I ask the applicant to actually reply on the methodology used in order to make those calculations?

00:30:38:04 - 00:31:06:23

Yes. I mean, certainly before I do that, I think what we'd invite to be allowed to do is when he makes his submission to identify the particular aspects in which he says that our methodology is unclear. In addition to to his providing the studies or the literature, which he says justifies his critique of what we have done. But I think that's probably all I'd say at this point. And what I do is pass the ball down the line to Mr. KENYON, and he will respond.

00:31:08:03 - 00:31:09:03

Mr. KENYON, please.

00:31:10:11 - 00:31:14:15

Thank you, sir. David KENYON. And for the applicant and.

00:31:17:09 - 00:31:54:13

Couple of points have been raised. One around the assumptions and their own sensitivities, part of the wider methodology point and to help and not to bail out. I think first and foremost, the guidance that was followed. So the the guidance that inform the methodology that can be found in the environmental statement. Chapter 14 Climates and Application Reference zero 41 So for example, table 14.8 sets out to take or guidance for the greenhouse gas emissions assessment.

00:31:54:15 - 00:32:26:10

So that sets out the the guidance from Guiding Environmental Impacts assessment publicly available standards. The greenhouse gas protocol methodology is embodied carbon. So a whole range of different guidance that we used in the methodology. Furthermore, the assumptions were all discussed

and agreed with Cambridgeshire County Councils sold since as well. So Cambridge County Council employed their own consultants to cover this area is quite a technical area

00:32:28:07 - 00:32:40:11

and discussions and assumptions, but work were taken forward with those. And just a final point about sensitivity testing. So the main chapter looks at a

00:32:41:26 - 00:33:13:00

compact, compares the proposed development and the emissions that would be admitted or saved from that proposed development versus a without proposed development case. But a number of sensitivity analysis also been wrong, and they are in Appendix A 14 A to the chapter as well. So sensitive this was undertaken again, that was undertaken in consultation with Cambridgeshire County Council's climate consultant.

00:33:13:09 - 00:33:44:15

Thank you for that. Mr. KELLY In the interest of brevity and as a pushing forward to the automotive agenda, I would suggest that I would request Mr. Ballot if AFT after considering Mr. Kieran's response in terms of the methodology and where the methodology is, if you could then as part of your written submission of today's oral submission at DEADLINE one, if you could actually provide us with some further information, if you think it's relevant

00:33:46:01 - 00:33:50:22

in relation to the methodology used, then that then we would look at that issue in writing.

00:33:51:07 - 00:34:01:21

Is that happy to highlight perhaps where the methods are described as in top line and more detail would be helpful, but also happy to highlight some of the other evidence.

00:34:02:15 - 00:34:16:05

Thank you. Thank you. Mr.. Thank you, Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Darwin. I believe that we have a raised hand from actual. Would you like to comment on this point?

00:34:16:22 - 00:34:52:09

Thank you very much, sir. This is Mr. Shlomo doing on behalf of UK. When I just wanted in the interest of the examination to point out that some nine days ago UK Wind wrote to the applicant and requested an electronic copy of the climate Change modelling data spreadsheets as per ap p041 and app 088, including both the central case model than the various sensitivity years.

00:34:53:07 - 00:35:24:21

We asked for this and it would be useful, I think, for all parties to see it. Perhaps it could be published that deadline one. We asked to see this in such a way that we can see the full details of how the various results were derived from the source data, the assumptions and modelling processes used, and to be able to assess the outcome of adopting additional or alternative sensitivity scenarios. In other words, yes, they've run some sensitivities.

00:35:24:26 - 00:35:44:04

We would like to run some in parallel, but we don't have sufficient data from the applicant yet to be able to do so. If these were made available like Walden, then UK Wind and others could respond within our written representation. Thank you very much, sir.

00:35:44:24 - 00:36:15:12

Thank you. Thank you for that intervention, Mr. Darwin. I fear that we are getting slightly sidetracked from the item which is actually the need for development in some of these discussion is actually very

helpful in terms of just defined needs. I am mindful that I do not want to get into a detailed discussion about this point. So what I would suggest Mr. Darwin is as part of your oral submission to us now, which I very much welcome. Can I please request you to submit a.

00:36:15:17 - 00:36:16:02

It's

00:36:17:15 - 00:36:27:18

a written submission as well in DEADLINE one. We is highlighting those points so that the applicant can then come back to you in writing

00:36:29:12 - 00:36:42:13

in more detail and in relation to those topics specifically because I do feel that we are going off track here in terms of needs for development. Would you be would that be agreeable to you, Mr. Zone?

00:36:45:12 - 00:37:09:00

Thank you, sir. Mr. Fleming, doing on behalf of UK Wind? Yes, we will certainly submit a copy of those bits of our communications with the applicant that sets out the request and the associated rationale for that line one as part of our summary of the contribution that we've made at age three.

00:37:10:27 - 00:37:12:18

Thank you very much for that confirmation.

00:37:14:11 - 00:37:16:07

Yes. Mr.. Okay.

00:37:17:08 - 00:37:39:00

Thank you. Andrew Fraser, acting for the county in the district. So you will appreciate that in our relevant representations in Section ten, we set out various points. And notwithstanding the cooperation that there's been between our authority and the applicants today, we set out certain points.  
Page 29

00:37:41:03 - 00:38:11:14

Heading ten Climate change and in particular Para 10.6 10.7. And following we set out various points concerning the sensitivities of the level of emissions to various components of the waste feed and so forth. I'm appreciate it very much. This is a high level discussion. My climate change officer is on virtually and is chomping at the bit to go into more detail.

00:38:11:16 - 00:38:36:23

But I'm going to suggest that we note for the purposes of this phase of the examination, that we have these concerns. They're obviously being worked up in greater detail in the draft and I and of course will be finally summarised in our written representation in due course. But I just put down here a marker, if I may. Yes. This is an issue on which we're going to make relatively extensive contributions in due course.

00:38:37:06 - 00:39:04:25

Thank you. That's extremely helpful. Thank you very much. And I support that proposed course of action. Thank you. A. I am going to move on to the next question. In that case, it's actually it's linked with net zero, as we discussed earlier. So could the applicant please explain its journey to net zero, particularly in relation to the net zero strategy? 2021.

00:39:06:00 - 00:39:29:15

So I just want to check when we started out, I think you wanted to talk about project benefits and then you said you wanted us to talk about what it was need in terms of project benefits and need in terms of what we haven't yet talked about and waste need. And I have Mr. Turner online and I have Ms.. Brown here to talk to those matters. Right. Are we intending to address that?

00:39:30:08 - 00:39:40:24

We are intending to address that. Do those two those two advisers that you have mentioned to have time constraints? Is that why we are raising this issue now?

00:39:40:26 - 00:39:54:10

No, never said I raise it now because I understood when we started this section of the examination that you wanted to speak to that now, and you said Park net zero, because I want to talk about energy security and waste. Need a question of understand like.

00:39:55:29 - 00:40:07:10

Okay. That was my first questions to both. And I asked the applicant to reply on that. If there are other people that I need to hear from on that specific question, please join me now. Please.

00:40:07:14 - 00:40:29:27

Thank you. Well, on that basis. So we will deal with waste need now. Now I'm going to ask perhaps that Mr. KENYON, step back and Mr. Brown, step forward. And I mean, in terms of. The need for this facility. We do say and do we say loudly that there is a need for this facility.

00:40:31:23 - 00:40:40:12

As you are aware, the waste hierarchy is a fundamental principle of waste management policy in England. Disposing of waste to landfill

00:40:42:06 - 00:41:22:29

or incineration without energy recovery is the least preferred option. Disposing of energy recovery. With energy recovery rather further up, the hierarchy is preferable. And we say, and indeed Broderick alluded to this in the context of a summary really compelling case. We say that that is a fundamental benefit of the proposal and it forms part of our compelling case for the proposed development to be located in an area where a considerable amount of waste are either sent by authorities to landfill or are exported and they could be treated up higher up the waste hierarchy, as we propose to do, and generate electricity and heat.

00:41:23:13 - 00:41:24:29

On that basis, I'm going to ask.

00:41:26:18 - 00:41:41:27

Mrs. Brown and Mr. Turner to perform something of a double act. And I apologize if this is a little less than straightforward, because, as I say, Mr. Turner's condition means he's not able to attend. So he is going to be participating virtually.

00:41:42:13 - 00:41:45:06

Can I just confirm, Mr. Turner, that you are with us? Virtually.

00:41:46:21 - 00:41:47:25

Yes, You hear me?

00:41:49:05 - 00:41:52:00

If you could potentially turn your camera on now, I think.

00:41:53:27 - 00:41:54:12

It's on.

00:41:57:03 - 00:41:57:18

Why?

00:42:02:09 - 00:42:19:09

And he and Mr. Turner, we I'm afraid that we still cannot see you in the room. Can I ask you to please just try and maybe try to turn off and turn back on your camera? We have been able to see other people, so I don't think that we actually have an issue with our feet.

00:42:20:24 - 00:42:24:19

Yes. He's saying I can access my camera. It's broken.

00:42:27:28 - 00:42:39:14

Okay. In that case, we can hear you clearly. And on that basis, I perhaps suggest that we. We proceed. So, Mrs. Brown, first, if I could turn to you.

00:42:41:16 - 00:42:44:18

Thank you, sir. And clap round for the applicants.

00:42:46:15 - 00:43:20:08

As part of this development proposal, so was a standalone waste fuel availability assessment is being prepared and this assessment has sought to look at how much fuel there is available at a localised and national level to the proposed development and fuel that would allow that development to be able to be managed in accordance with the principle of moving that waste up the waste hierarchy. And the assessment itself is sort of three key features to the assessment.

00:43:20:18 - 00:43:54:09

First up, it's based on a publicly available waste data from a range of sources. This includes DEFRA data from an agency data and evidence basis from relevant local plans. As I said, we've looked at a nationally under a more localised position, and importantly for both analyses we have considered the availability of only those waste streams that would be suitable for treatment at the proposed project, and that is currently disposed of by either landfill or export.

00:43:57:21 - 00:44:05:06

Just going to give a high level summary of the the two analyses that we've looked at, the national and the local analysis.

00:44:10:13 - 00:44:32:12

The national analysis of fuel availability has been carried out using nationally collated writings and disposals data. And we've also sought to draw upon the conclusions of independent research by Toll VAC and Market review papers, as well as from regional bodies such as the regional technical advisory body, etc..

00:44:34:17 - 00:45:16:02

The work that we've carried out has concluded that in 2019 a 12 million tonnes of what we term residual suitable household and industrial commercial waste was disposed off to landfill and 2.8 million tonnes was exported from the UK as a refuse derived fuel. Now that position has improved marginally up to 2020, where we're looking at 11 million tonnes of residual material, suitable residual material being disposed up to landfill and around 1.6 exported as RDF to Europe.

00:45:20:19 - 00:45:57:05

Looking looking ahead on the national pack figure, it is predicted that by 2030 we have included assumptions around the goal of ambitious recycling targets. Current recycling target of 65% by 2030. And to that end, to our assessment of future fuel availability. But even with that factored in, we're still looking at nationally a minimum shortfall of around 2.8 million tonnes of residual capacity required, rising to over 6 million tonnes.

00:45:57:07 - 00:46:19:27

If the national target of 65% is shot by over 50 by only 5%. So there's clearly a availability of material and a void suspect to fill in terms of capacity. Just a couple of minutes to just refer to the local assessment.

00:46:22:08 - 00:46:55:11

In terms of the local analysis, we first will have to ask ourselves what what's meant by local and clearly waste markets in the UK that are influenced by a range of factors waste type of polluting, waste management capacity, fiscal measures, planning measures, etc.. The bottom line of this is that waste moves across county boundaries and across regional boundaries. So it's important we felt to recognise that actually a simply Cambridgeshire is not an appropriate local

00:46:57:14 - 00:47:36:06

study area to consider. Instead, the local analysis of need has actually been based on a an area where the facilities most likely to draw waste from. And this has been defined very broadly, very objectively. It's not a hard and fast mash up, but very indicative of an approximate two hour drive time from the proposed development. And this pulls in a study area which broadly covers the east of England, plus parts, small parts of the East Midlands, Lincolnshire, Leicestershire, Northamptonshire and Woodlands.

00:47:37:23 - 00:48:09:07

The reason for applying that sort of two hour drive time is, is that is generally the distance for which transportation of material to facilities is commercially viable. Beyond that, it becomes increasingly expect more expensive. But as I say, it's a very general indicative measure that we've applied. So just to summarize in terms of what that's meant for numbers in the need assessment, and I'm very, very almost finished here.

00:48:09:23 - 00:49:09:20

Absolutely. Looking ahead. They are the study area currently disposes of almost two and a half million tonnes of suitable household industrial commercial waste to landfill, with a small portion of that around 100,000 tonnes exported to the bulk of it in study area is actually sent to landfill at the moment. Looking ahead, we've done this by consulting and drawing evidence from the publicly available evidence basis of local plans, as well as validating the evidence base with more up to date information from east of England to spatial technical advisory body studies and independent research papers, which are telling us that as between 1.4 and 2.7 billion tonnes per annum shortfall in residual waste management capacity in the east of England alone.

00:49:10:24 - 00:49:32:22

So both at the local level and the national level, the work we've carried out indicates that this proposed development could offer a capacity of up to 625,000 tonnes to move that waste that is currently disposed off to landfill, up the waste hierarchy and into a recovery treatment option.

00:49:34:24 - 00:49:41:14

I'd just like to pause there. I'm not sure if my colleague online has any further points to make, but I will ask that three years.

00:49:43:27 - 00:49:52:05

Apologies. Thank you, Mrs. Brown. Mr. Tanner, would you have anything to add to Mrs. Brown intervention just now?

00:49:52:28 - 00:49:54:15

No, thank you. I'd.

00:49:56:25 - 00:49:57:21

Thank you, Mr. Tanner.

00:50:00:09 - 00:50:03:13

Would you like to continue? Ms.. Mrs. Brown? No.

00:50:05:02 - 00:50:12:09

That's all I had to say. For the moment, certainly, in terms of the need positioned both nationally and locally.

00:50:12:11 - 00:50:25:12

Right. You mentioned at the end of your intervention, you mentioned how it matches, well, how it looks at the waste hierarchy and actually reduces the amount of waste in terms of landfill.

00:50:27:13 - 00:50:46:22

How how is it in your in your view and how does that actually link and match other objectives that might be considered within just cut the waste your particular in terms of reduction of waste. So how do you think that this facility actually encourages the reduction of waste waste?

00:50:48:06 - 00:51:23:17

So the first point I would make is that the study that we've done focuses entirely on the availability of residual waste that is currently sent to landfill. So in that in that regard, no waste that is currently being recycled would be diverted through to the recovery facility. And also in terms of the residual waste available to the facility. And by that I mean the material that is currently sent to landfill, suitable material that's currently sent to landfill.

00:51:24:08 - 00:51:53:12

We have factored into our narrative in the fuel availability assessment assumptions around future recycling scenarios right up to the the government's aspirational target of 65% at 2030 and even applying those recycling aspect, very ambitious recycling levels. I should just add that currently

00:51:54:27 - 00:52:12:17

in England the recycling levels are at 43%, so quite a significant increase over the next 20 years is required to meet that. But nonetheless, the fuel availability assessment has included in its narrative a discussion around

00:52:14:24 - 00:52:22:25

whether there would be the fuel out there if those recycling targets were met. And the answer is yes, that the fuel would be available. Thank you.

00:52:24:03 - 00:52:34:18

Thank you, Mrs. Brown. I believe that, Mr. Darwin, you have raised your hand virtually, and you would like to come in and intervene on this point. So if I could bring you in place.

00:52:36:22 - 00:52:59:17



Thank you very much, sir. Shlomo Dough in for you. Came in in the same email message that we sent to the applicant nine days ago. We also asked them for confirmation that we understood would be offered as part of what we've just heard. But. But we haven't.

00:53:01:03 - 00:53:32:21

As I said at the beginning, we listened closely, but we didn't hear what we were listening out for. We asked if the applicant's revised waste fuel availability assessment. And the reason I say revised is because in reply the applicant said that they are currently proposing to submit an updated version of their waste fuel availability assessment at deadline one. Obviously, we are keen to see this so that we can begin to respond to it.

00:53:33:04 - 00:54:27:17

But in particular we are concerned and we are looking for confirmation now from the applicant that that updated version will take account of the Government's environmental target for residual waste reduction. Both their interim 2027 target and their 2042 target to halve residual waste relative to the 2019 base year. Additionally, to update both the historic levels of waste arising in light of the 2019 starting point, the base year, which could impact on the estimated historic levels of waste arising and updating the forecast future residual levels that would be available for feedstock, assuming that the Government's targets are met.

00:54:27:19 - 00:55:02:04

The the revised target from the Government implies a recycling rate of more than 70%. So that obviously is above what they've modelled so far. And finally, a confirmation that the updated waste fuel availability assessment will also take account of the UK government's jet zero strategy associated with sustainable aviation fuels, including between two and 3 million tonnes of waste.

00:55:02:16 - 00:55:27:27

That residual waste, the same waste that the applicant is referring to earlier that would be used to produce what the government calls sustainable aviation fuels. So this 2 to 3 million tonne figure is based only on three sustainable aviation fuel projects that have received government funding.

00:55:30:20 - 00:55:32:22

Thank you, Mr.. Mr. Darwin.

00:55:34:24 - 00:56:05:22

I would suggest that because you have raised some very valid but extremely detailed points in your submission. I was going to, just as per my previous request, if you could actually submit the points that you have just made and all of the legislation that to you, would that that you are requesting information from the applicant in terms of its consideration is part of their assessment. If you could actually submit that in writing by deadline one, that would be beneficial as well.

00:56:06:04 - 00:56:21:18

I am going to ask the applicant if the applicant would like to comment on this. But I suspect that due to the nature of the very detailed submission, maybe it might be best to have a response in writing, if I may suggest, consider time as well.

00:56:21:20 - 00:56:47:01

Yes. So I'm not proposing to deal with all of the matter is that you won't have raised. There's a lot to unpack in there, but what I can confirm at high level is that, yes, it's an as has been represented to the examination, we are updating the waste fuel availability assessment for we are updating that that assessments can only have regard to

00:56:48:20 - 00:57:24:17

the most recent data. And when we prepared the current draft, more recent data wasn't yet available. It is now available and we are having regard to what we're going to provide you with an updated assessment as part of the offer. We will have regard to what we say are relevant policy changes and updates as regards waste arising and waste objectives. We will certainly engage with those in the offer and likewise we will make clear our position in relation to aviation fuel that we wait to see quite what Mr..

00:57:25:12 - 00:57:26:04

Mr. Darwin.

00:57:28:06 - 00:57:29:23

Yes. I believe it's Mr. Darwin.

00:57:29:25 - 00:57:30:10

Mr. Darwin

00:57:32:01 - 00:57:41:20

what? His representations are at deadline one, but certainly we anticipate providing an updated welfare to the examination along the lines that I've explained.

00:57:42:10 - 00:58:00:03

Thank you very much. I also have another hand up virtually. I can't actually fully see the name on my screen, but I believe. Yes, Mr. Barnett. Emma Barnett, is that correct?

00:58:00:09 - 00:58:06:27

Yes. Thank you. So I just wanted to make a statement, which was now's the appropriate time. But I certainly pick up on some of the points raised by Mr. Darwin.

00:58:09:13 - 00:58:19:15

And I would ask you if the statement is not directly related with the need for development, which actually is the item that.

00:58:19:26 - 00:58:20:21

Well, it.

00:58:20:23 - 00:58:21:15

Is focusing on.

00:58:21:21 - 00:58:26:07

It is because it's it's relating to the calculation of residual waste and the.

00:58:26:09 - 00:58:27:14

That case, please. Yes.

00:58:27:23 - 00:58:51:27

Okay. Thank you. So I'm up on it on behalf of Wisbech Town council. So it is generally Wisbech town council's contention that the development proposal is not in accordance to the waste hierarchy and is not of an appropriate type and scale. And as the applicant's team have said a number of times this morning, that the compliance with the NPS is absolutely critical and that is the document.

00:58:52:24 - 00:58:53:19

Might I just ask.

00:58:53:27 - 00:58:59:10

Excuse me, Miss Bartlett, can I just ask you to hold on for just one second? Yes.

00:58:59:12 - 00:59:12:18

Yes. So I was just struggling to hear if Ms. Barnett could speak ever so slightly more slowly. Because being on line, the audio isn't quite as ideal as it might be if you go a little slower. That would be helpful.

00:59:12:24 - 00:59:16:18

If you could please Mr. Barnett, if you could actually just take us played more clearly.

00:59:16:20 - 00:59:47:05

Thank you. Yeah, no problem. So conformity of the scheme with the waste hierarchy and its effect on relevant waste plans is a requirement of the NPS renewable energy. And I think that's a point that's been made by the applicant a number of times this morning, the emerging NPS that was a draft and which I think was published in 2021, goes further by requiring to be demonstrated that the facility supports long term recycling targets, taking into account existing and residual waste treatment capacity and that or that already in development.

00:59:48:10 - 00:59:55:28

It also confirms that the proposed plant must not result in overcapacity of energy from waste treatment at a national or local level.

00:59:57:25 - 01:00:29:24

So in order to assess conformity with the waste hierarchy and effects on waste plans, the waste catchment area must be defined. So I understand the applicant do not want the proposed development to be tied to a specific catchment area and I think that's referenced in the waste fuel availability assessment at paragraph 2.3. However, my point is if you don't if you don't stick to the impact, it's not possible to consider the impact on relevant waste plans or assess conformity with the waste hierarchy. Then the requirement for assessment would be meaningless.

01:00:29:26 - 01:00:33:15

If you can just accept waste anyway, then what's the point of doing the assessment in the first place?

01:00:35:00 - 01:01:08:05

So as as the article just pointed out, the waste fuel availability assessment, which is AP 094, is based on a two hour travel time as that's generally considered to be commercially viable. So the implication being that anything beyond 2 hours is certainly less commercially viable and is unsustainable and is certainly contrary to the proximity principle. So when you actually look at the figures that's been produced and the waste forecasts, a fuel availability assessment, it relies on a significant proportion of the available waste being transported beyond the two hour travel time.

01:01:10:06 - 01:01:45:07

So in terms of h i c arising in table 4.2, if you take those authorities are outside the two hour of travel time. It goes from 17 billion to under. 17.9 billion to under 7.9 billion is a reduction of over 10 million tons per annum. Similarly, in terms of local authority collected waste in table 4.1, you immediately reduce the figure by 1.3 million times just by actually sticking to that waste catchment area. And what is what is really interesting is when you look at the reference to the waste available for assessment in the East chapter for.

01:01:51:14 - 01:01:58:20

Ms.. Barnett. Apologies, but I. We stopped hearing your. I think that you might have inadvertently muted yourself.

01:02:01:07 - 01:02:04:04

Apologies. Apologies. Sorry about that. I just feel that.

01:02:04:06 - 01:02:05:15

I can hear you clearly now. Thank you.

01:02:05:19 - 01:02:15:11

So sorry. So I don't know where I got to, but I was talking about the. Did you get the reference to the S chapter 14 app 041?

01:02:16:01 - 01:02:20:07

So I think that that was the moment that you might have been cut off from us.

01:02:20:17 - 01:02:38:16

Apologies. So, yes, I'm referring to the assessment on climate in s chapter 14, which is app 041. And in that there's a table table 40.28. And I have the that's basically explaining how they've assessed the transport movements from the.

01:02:40:28 - 01:03:16:02

Waste the future waste procedure requirements. And they specifically say that they've looked at the proportion of residual waste by origin and distance to the town center of the largest settlement in each waste planning area. And then they go through each of those waste planning areas and there's, I think, ten of them. And I think so the first one in Central Bedfordshire, the large settlement is Luton, is that within the two hour catchment, no lecturer, Basildon not within a two hour catchment then. Watford Not within the two hour catchment. Norfolk But Norwich is on the very, very edge of the two hour catchment.

01:03:16:04 - 01:03:49:10

Thurrock is not. That's 164 kilometres away. Leicester is not. Loughborough is not, Lincoln is not, Northampton is not. So the only two are within the two hour catchment on Norfolk, which is on the very, very edge and still 91.9 kilometres away and Oakham which is 71.5 kilometres away, so well over an hour away from the facility. So it just seems it's not, it's slightly surprising that there's nothing from Cambridge, Cambridgeshire they went, that's the host authority I don't really quite understand because they've got a.

01:03:49:21 - 01:04:17:16

And this is something that maybe the applicant can explain. They've got the percentage share of overall shortfall of residual waste in 2025 and they've got Norwich as having 33% of the place requirements that that does not come through in. And the waste and fuel available. Availability assessment. I'm not sure where that's come from. Where those percentages must come from because I can't see anything in the waste fuel availability assessment. So perhaps something that the applicant could explain.

01:04:19:03 - 01:04:27:12

Thank you, Mr. Barnett. I'm going to ask the applicant to accept some of the points that Mr. Biden has raised, if at all possible.

01:04:28:01 - 01:04:37:03

Yes, I will. And in a moment, I'm going to pass to Mrs. Brown. I mean, there was obviously quite a lot in that submission,

01:04:39:01 - 01:04:43:19

and I don't think it's we can deal with all the detailed point.

01:04:43:21 - 01:04:44:10

Absolutely.

01:04:44:12 - 01:04:44:27

I feel.

01:04:44:29 - 01:05:01:21

That. Absolutely. If I can just if I can just ask Ms.. Barnett in terms considering the substantive item that we're under, which is needs, you know, obviously you have put forward a very detailed case in terms of what you are stating.

01:05:03:23 - 01:05:18:04

In terms of waste, your key and catchment area. And could you actually just provide us with a clear indication in terms of what is the point of need if it's you would really like answer today.

01:05:18:21 - 01:05:58:14

Sorry, if I may, just before we get back to Mr. Bond, if I may just say pick up on the two sort of higher themes which I think govern at least part of what's being said. I don't understand what's being said by I was beach town council or on their behalf is that this proposal is not in accordance with the waste hierarchy. That was the very first point made. You'll appreciate that. We don't accept that. We say that all of this is residual waste. That is to say the feedstock for this facility is residual waste and will be it will be secured by requirement that only residual waste and its waste codes 19 and 20 will be coming to this facility.

01:05:59:00 - 01:06:11:26

Mr. BOOTH. I understand that, but I think that it will be really useful if we could actually get a steer from respondents terms of a question related with need. I understand that other points were raised, right?

01:06:11:28 - 01:06:19:29

Yes. Okay. In which case I'll move to a more straight need point. I suppose I'm instinctively trying to respond to the various things that.

01:06:20:05 - 01:06:35:15

I can just and appreciate that, but I'm conscious of the unknown. And if we could concentrate on the need and to answer and answer his Barnett's question from a needs perspective, then I think that that probably is going to be the easiest way of.

01:06:35:17 - 01:06:36:02

Yes.

01:06:36:04 - 01:06:36:22

When forward.

01:06:36:24 - 01:06:50:08

What I can say in relation to that is that insofar as there is a complaint leveled by Ms. Barnett in relation to the, if you like, the study area that we have drawn from in terms of waste arising.

01:06:53:03 - 01:07:37:08

Ms.. Brown sought to explain earlier this afternoon that the two hour travel time for which Mr. Barnett is very keen to hold on was precisely to. We do not see that as a boundary and rather we think it's wholly inappropriate and artificial to regard it as a hard and fast boundary. And it is on that basis that we have a something of a disagreement as to what is the appropriate area to have regard to in terms of waste arising. What I can say is that in our response to the Wisbech Town Council representation and when we look to put in a revised offer and it may be, well, I'm going to leave that to Ms.

01:07:37:10 - 01:08:12:28

Broderick in a moment as to precisely when that comes. We will seek to clarify in so far as necessary the basis of the area we have identified as being suitable to draw from. So there is a dispute, it seems, between ourselves and Wisbech town council as to what is the appropriate area. We will set out our position in a response to the relevant rep and also in terms of the updated woofers. But in terms of arguing detailed points as to why have you had regard to this settlement and why have we not had regard to that settlement? So I simply don't think it's appropriate to get into that.

01:08:13:00 - 01:08:19:02

Level of granularity. I absolutely agree. But I just think that we needed another centre of needs.

01:08:19:28 - 01:08:20:17

Mrs. Brown.

01:08:23:03 - 01:08:46:12

I think the only point I would add to that is its effect. Effectively, the fuel availability assessment very much has its feeds in and is based upon publicly available data. So that data published by the Regional Technical Advisory Body and also data that published by the based local planning authorities

01:08:49:11 - 01:09:26:20

within a sort of at an indicative two hour area of the proposed site. And this is data that's been rigorously tested to examination. So we have sought to look at those whilst local plans validate that data using the up of a publicly available documentation. But of course when we applied the tip, this really indicative to our study area that will that will draw in say, part of Essex. But of course waste planning and all the planning for future requirements takes place and a waste local planning authority basis, which is the whole of Essex.

01:09:27:01 - 01:09:43:12

So that is why on the face of it, some of these where the line is drawn, it it's not intended ever to be a hard and fast to our catchment area. It's a tool to indicate which of those waste local plan evidence basis we need to draw on to inform the need assessment.

01:09:43:22 - 01:09:46:04

One Thank you for that answer, Mr. Brown.

01:09:48:03 - 01:10:25:13

Mr. Barton. I'm mindful of the time. So again, to request that perhaps you have heard that I have made to other people, if you could please submit a written representation of your representation by deadline one. That would be very helpful and that would be another action. Mr. Darwin, I am conscious that you have put your hand up again, but I am also very conscious of the time. So can I ask if you have any further questions or points that you would like to come on this specific item? Put them in white Pink.

01:10:25:24 - 01:10:31:10

As for the other items that I have requested you to do by deadline one, please. Thank you.

01:10:32:19 - 01:10:33:06

Thank you, sir.

01:10:34:04 - 01:11:04:13

I am very mindful that on two points on my first question again, that we get this to both has mentioned before we have still covered energy. Therefore, I would actually ask if we want to if there is any further information that you would like to submit orally in terms of need from an energy perspective or from an energy security perspective, or if we are.

01:11:04:15 - 01:11:09:11

If we move on, could we just have a say on this matter?

01:11:10:09 - 01:11:12:17

Yes. Yes, please.

01:11:12:24 - 01:11:24:26

Andrew Fraser Record for the county district. So again, as I've said before, you will see that from our relevant representation, Section 14, that we have considerable concern

01:11:26:25 - 01:12:02:27

about the possibility, particularly in the context of the extent permission for the PDL project in Peterborough. We have considerable concerns about the possibility of a considerable overcapacity developing in this area. Again, I'm not going to go into any detail now. Simply to flag up those concerns and to inform you that we will be developing further in the local impact report, obviously, and in our written representation.

01:12:03:09 - 01:12:25:08

I would also note that if there is to be a revised waste availability statement coming in deadline, one that will actually be after the local impact report has been prepared and submitted, so will need an opportunity through the process to comment on that. I'm sure that's not going to provide any difficulties. But just to flag up there, is that.

01:12:25:21 - 01:12:27:14

Yes. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Rickards.

01:12:27:24 - 01:12:40:11

So just just respond very briefly on those point. In terms of PPG, given that this is the East edge which is dealing with waste need and the reference underground is just made to PPG. Well,

01:12:41:28 - 01:13:14:25

I am going to ask Mr. Turner to address that. The issue briefly in all submissions because it's our position and you may well have seen this from the documentation that that facility was consented. Many, many, many moons ago. And it is wholly unnecessary and inappropriate to have regard to it because there is simply no material prospect of it coming forward. I'll leave that, though, to Mr. Turner. So far as the woofer and when it comes forward is concerned, we are seeking to provide the examination with an up to date position, but we can only update.

01:13:15:06 - 01:13:28:21

Add on when new data becomes available to us. And of course, new data has only very recently become available to us. In terms of when that comes in, I'm just going to turn to Ms.. Brodrick, who was more intimately involved with its preparation.

01:13:30:00 - 01:14:01:24

Collaboratively. Atkins and we had previously been intending on submitting an updated waste food availability assessment at at line one. But in light of the fact that the local impact report is likely to deal with matters relating to waste fuel availability, we'll have the written representations and the written summaries of the oral submissions made today. Our feeling is that it may be of more assistance to the examination if we submit it for deadline to in order to take into account any points that have been raised in these documents submitted at deadline one.

01:14:02:16 - 01:14:07:25

However, we are happy to proceed in whichever way you would consider to be most helpful.

01:14:07:27 - 01:14:19:24

Okay. First of all, let me go to Mr. Chris Urquhart. Excuse me if I'm pronouncing that correctly again. Would that be acceptable for you or would you have an objection with that?

01:14:20:04 - 01:14:31:27

No, I mean, clearly, the the more comprehensive the document can be and the more based on up to date data it can be, the better it will inform you. All I say is that we will need an appropriate opportunity to respond.

01:14:31:29 - 01:14:43:16

To that new information. Yeah, that must be right. And so if we provide a document at deadline to then Mr. Fraser Urquhart and those he represents must have the opportunity to respond at a subsequent deadline.

01:14:46:27 - 01:14:57:15

Can I ask if any of the other local authorities that are represented here would have any objections to that? If you are preparing local impact reports as well.

01:14:58:00 - 01:15:02:03

No. I'm Lorna Gilbert. Kingston, West Norfolk. No, we would have no objection.

01:15:04:05 - 01:15:06:22

I see. We have one hand raised. Would you like to come in at this point?

01:15:06:25 - 01:15:07:12

Thank you, sir.

01:15:07:25 - 01:15:10:08

Can I ask you very quickly, please?

01:15:11:21 - 01:15:46:03

I've come for this particular point. It's Michael to Wally. I'm an interested party. I'd like to speak a little bit on this, if I may, because I feel like it can inform the operation of the waste fuel availability, availability assessment. Now, further to Wisbech town Council's points. Waste rising is a function of population density. I'd asked for a graphic to on page 22 of the waste assessment to be put up, if I may, please.

01:15:47:04 - 01:15:50:20

I think that will help inform this discussion. But

01:15:52:13 - 01:16:04:26



Wisbech is a long way from any such significant concentration of population, so it would be helpful to potentially have an overlay of population.

01:16:06:15 - 01:16:21:16

Concentration to show where the waste rising is coming from. So we've got North Sea to the north east and it's very, very difficult to describe Wisbech as a centre of gravity for waste risings in the east.

01:16:23:20 - 01:16:50:29

In the event it is determined that additional capacity is needed, any such facility would be better located further to the south or possibly west in close proximity to more densely populated areas. Now, if you did a population density diagram or map, you would see that that light some very much more to the south or to the west of this area.

01:16:53:03 - 01:17:12:15

But equally, if if we could then have a nother overlay to show existing and proposed waste incineration sites and capacity. We can then see where we're effectively encroaching upon other catchment areas.

01:17:14:03 - 01:17:28:12

I know there's been some discussion of the two hour HGV radius. And from my perspective, it has been already touched upon. We are transporting the waste from the periphery of.

01:17:30:05 - 01:17:36:28

Of the catchment area towards Wisbech, which is a little bit lower.

01:17:39:26 - 01:17:40:11

So.

01:17:42:24 - 01:17:44:01

Mr. Wiley, I'll.

01:17:44:12 - 01:17:46:16

I'll let you have time.

01:17:47:00 - 01:17:56:12

And I'm. Absolutely. But can I just ask you to, in terms of your oral representation, if you could just focus on needs? I mean, for.

01:17:56:27 - 01:17:57:25

Myself, I think. Yes.

01:17:58:25 - 01:17:59:10

Thank you.

01:18:00:15 - 01:18:06:28

It does come down to need because we have different folks, different grasp of proximity.

01:18:08:25 - 01:18:39:21

And this proposal says that it will deny waste dry fuel going to the continent. But in the waste fuel available assessment, they say that the majority of this is coming from Norfolk. Things have changed. It's not. The Norfolk sends 180,000 tonnes to Veolia in Bedford and 20,000 tonnes to two seater in Suffolk.

01:18:40:03 - 01:18:44:04

There is no export waste from Norfolk other than to these two sites.

01:18:46:24 - 01:18:49:23

So really the.

01:18:52:06 - 01:18:57:16

I think it's worth pointing out that the continent, the continent has incinerated important waste as an

01:19:00:15 - 01:19:41:26

important waste because the regions where they serve have reached incineration overcapacity due to high recycling rate. And it should be noted that I think we're at about 48% incineration capacity at the moment and expanding recycling at 43%. We have 50. So 53% of residual waste is actually easily recyclable if we chose to do so. So it makes sense that the waste rising from low population density areas to go to age of existing energy from waste facilities and.

01:19:43:10 - 01:19:55:14

Where they are situated in high population centers. And that brings very much into the question the need and the scale of the proposed facility in this location. Thank you, sir.

01:19:57:10 - 01:20:02:13

Thank you, Mrs. Walley. Would you like to comment on the scale of the facility?

01:20:04:00 - 01:20:34:19

Yes, sir. Very briefly. I mean, obviously, there was a great deal again to unpack in terms of point of detail, in terms of what counter to what I was saying, and I hope you'll understand. I don't respond to those points of detail now. I simply can't do that in the time available and orally, though I do note in passing by way of example, that what is said is why what what is said. As regards Norfolk, for example, in terms of criticism of our proposal is that the 180,000 tonnes of waste from Norfolk is going to Bedfordshire. And of course.

01:20:35:22 - 01:21:09:06

The Covanta facility operated by the area in Central Bedfordshire, is far, far, far more distant from Norfolk than is our old and will be our facility if constructed. I make that point by way of observation in passing in terms of why we are in Wisbech and why it is that the need for the facility we say is established as being appropriate for this location. That is a matter that I think probably falls to be considered in the context of your agenda item five.

01:21:09:13 - 01:21:14:11

So I don't really think we need to delay lunch any further by looking to deal with it now.

01:21:14:13 - 01:21:21:20

Thank you. I yes, I would agree with that. Would that be acceptable, Wally? I think so, yes. Thank you.

01:21:22:11 - 01:21:46:02

Attendance for the final point that I would make is that I indicated I wanted Mr. Turner to speak. So in circumstances where we are going to hear effectively, we are going to see the ADR from then from Mr. Fraser rocket science at deadline one, and we're going to be providing our offer at deadline, too. I don't see there's any need to call on Mr. Turner to speak to PG. I'll now

01:21:47:26 - 01:22:00:12

go. Nope, sorry. They do want to apologies. I was I was looking to truncate my intent, but if we could just have one moment, one minute to have Mr. Turner just speak to that issue, then I think we on this side of the room would be done and dusted on this topic.

01:22:00:24 - 01:22:01:29

Okay. Thank you very much.

01:22:02:08 - 01:22:04:12

Mr. Turner, you've waited too long for us.

01:22:04:27 - 01:22:31:13

Good afternoon. Good afternoon, Mike. Mike Turner. On behalf of the applicant regarding fees for Green Energy Ltd, just a response on that particular point. Any facility which has acquired state residual waste has been included in the study so that it is included. It hasn't been discounted as capacity. That is the first point. However, I would say that we've a consent. Is it unlikely that that facility will be developed

01:22:32:28 - 01:22:53:08

excuse me primarily because it has not been started since it was approved in 2009 and it actually uses advanced combustion technology and the UK funding market currently is very reluctant to fund that type of technology. So to clarify, is considered in terms of the tonnage

01:22:54:24 - 01:23:00:12

in the waste fuel availability assessment, but we also consider it unlikely to be developed.

01:23:02:00 - 01:23:30:04

Yes. Just to pick up on that point, I mean, Mr. Turner makes the point that we have had regard to Pgl in terms of our fuel availability assessment because it is a consented scheme notwithstanding, we consider it will never see the light of day. We haven't just had our Garbo to consented schemes. We have had regard to schemes to which are currently in planning as well. So our assessment is we say extremely robust in that regard. Thank you, sir.

01:23:30:15 - 01:23:32:18

Thank you, Mr. Roberts, as well.

01:23:35:16 - 01:24:09:15

And thank you, Mr. Tanner, as well for your contribution. Um, point of order that I was just thinking. Obviously, I did mention that if we have got that we the foods go past significantly 1:30. Well, around 1:00 actually I would consider a break. I think that we are past that point. So I am considering a break now. But before we do, I am mindful that we still have a lot of items to go through our agenda. And I do have some significant questions that I would like to ask the applicant.

01:24:09:17 - 01:24:20:01

And item six land plans plus requisition of land and book of reference. I'm mindful that we also have item five in the meantime in terms of alternatives.

01:24:22:17 - 01:24:57:01

Can I perhaps propose before our break that any questions? On item five, I revert back to written questions that we actually have. If people are willing to then submit any sort of issues that they would like. Today in deadline one and after we come back from break, we will perhaps finish item four and then go straight into item six. I would ask if anyone in the room has any objection to that specifically.

01:24:59:09 - 01:25:09:03

Can ask if anyone virtually has an objection to that. If we skip item five alternatives and go and deal with that item by and which representations?

01:25:11:16 - 01:25:13:20

So could I just ask. Sorry. Andrew Fraser?

01:25:14:03 - 01:25:14:21

Yes, please.

01:25:14:23 - 01:25:22:18

District. What items do you consider still need to be dealt with under agenda item four? I'm not. So I'm still have to deal with.

01:25:25:25 - 01:25:29:29

I wanted to give just a quick opportunity to to

01:25:32:06 - 01:25:58:24

the applicant to actually explain further if they wish the energy situation, because I'm still not very clear in terms of where we are with that. Obviously, we had the very useful testimony of Mrs. Brown in terms of where I asked, but that was going to be my next question was going to be, you know, do you actually want to help come back from an energy security perspective? All I your content with the evidence that you have submitted.

01:25:59:06 - 01:26:30:05

Well, if I may, we might consider that over the short luncheon adjournment in terms of we think there's anything more useful, anything useful, more we can say as opposed to put in writing. On energy security, we've obviously dealt with waste need at some length, and we think we've agreed a position and a way forward in relation to a revised waste fuel availability assessment. But we haven't dealt with the third bullet point in terms of item four or I an expert and I can I will do that after lunch.

01:26:30:07 - 01:26:54:15

An explanation of how we say the development proposal is in accordance with the waste hierarchy, so we can do that. So we've dealt with waste need, we've dealt with project benefits. We can I'll take some instructions over the break as to whether or not we want to speak further in relation to energy security. And then in terms of anything else under item for that you wish to deal with.

01:26:54:17 - 01:26:55:02

So

01:26:56:23 - 01:27:05:01

I also wanted to actually touch in a little bit more detail in terms of net zero, but I am happy to actually defer that to written questions.

01:27:06:00 - 01:27:20:26

Okay. So I will let me defer net zero to written questions and then we'll deal with energy security if there are further points that we need to make in relation to that. And then we come back off to the break and deal with five and six and item five.

01:27:21:07 - 01:27:24:00

Will be written with written.

01:27:24:02 - 01:27:28:29

Submissions in written submissions. Yeah. Yes. Yes.

01:27:29:06 - 01:27:29:21

Is that.

01:27:29:23 - 01:27:37:22

Acceptable yet? Unless. Item six, we dealt with them sufficiently quickly that they were time to deal with alternatives. But otherwise.

01:27:38:06 - 01:27:44:26

And I can revisit that. I'm also very mindful that this room is where we are going to have the open floor hearings for.

01:27:44:28 - 01:27:45:29

That difficult break.

01:27:46:01 - 01:27:57:12

Between the has to ensure compliance so that the room can be organized for that. Therefore, I am mindful of that situation. And do I have any objections from anyone on this? No.

01:27:59:16 - 01:28:06:16

Yes. Sorry. I'm going to have to ask you to either come to the table to use one of the mikes or.

01:28:09:08 - 01:28:19:20

And if they're going to be done in writing, where do the lay people find all this information? You know, if you hear you hear it, but where do people do? You ask somebody else?

01:28:19:23 - 01:28:46:20

So in terms of the in terms of the all of the information that will be submitted and is available in writing is actually available on the website. Yeah. On the on the Midwest page. But if you have any difficulties in accessing that page, then anyone from the case team. So any one of my colleagues that I have on site typos and trace the entries will be able to help you with that.

01:28:46:26 - 01:28:47:24

Right. Right.

01:28:48:05 - 01:28:56:17

That's right. We're happy to assist with that and give you a steer in terms of where precisely it is to be found. It's actually not as complicated yet as it sounds.

01:28:56:23 - 01:28:57:08

Because.

01:28:57:27 - 01:29:02:26

It's one of those things that that actually from the outside, it looks impenetrable. But actually, once you know how it works, it's not.

01:29:02:28 - 01:29:06:29

And do they all go to the same place? Yes. Yeah. That's great. Thank you.

01:29:07:08 - 01:29:20:01

Thank you very much for your contribution. Thank you. Right. In that case, I am going to adjourn shortly for half an hour and I propose that we gather back at a 2:15, please. Thank you.

