

**Medworth ISH3\_16 May\_PT1**

Created on: 2023-05-16 10:09:46

Project Length: 02:10:46

File Name: Medworth ISH3\_16 May\_PT1

File Length: 02:10:46

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:01 - 00:00:08:13

Can I just confirm that everybody can hear me clearly now?

00:00:14:18 - 00:00:16:12

Yes. Began in London.

00:00:17:23 - 00:00:28:20

Thank you very much for that confirmation. And can also confirm with Mr. Glenn Bowerman that live streaming and recording of these events has commenced.

00:00:30:08 - 00:01:03:21

I see a hand raised on the back there. I'll take that as a yes. Thank you very much. And for those people watching, the live stream can also advise that should we at any point adjourn proceedings this morning, we will have to stop the live stream in order to give us clear recording files. As a result, it point at which we recommend the meeting and we start the live stream, you'll need to refresh your browser page to view the restarted stream. I will remind you of this again should we need to adjourn. It is now 10:00 and it's time for this hearing to begin.

00:01:03:28 - 00:01:39:15

I would like to welcome you all to the issue specific Hearing three on environment or environmental matters in relation to an application made by mid with limited who we will refer to as the applicant for an order granting development consent for the met with energy from waste combined heat and Power facility. The development proposed comprises the construction operation and maintenance of the energy from Waste combined Heat and Power facility with associated grid connections, connection, water connection, access improvements and temporary construction compound.

00:01:41:10 - 00:02:03:04

Thank you all for attending this hearing. My name is Andre Pinto. I am a Chatterton planner employed by the Planning Inspectorate, and I have been appointed by the Secretary of State of levelling up housing and communities to be the lead member of the panel to examine this application. I am now going to ask my fellow panel member to introduce herself.

00:02:04:29 - 00:02:18:14

Good morning, everyone. My name is Claire Morgenson. I'm a chartered town planner employed by the Planning Inspectorate, and I've been appointed by the Secretary of State for levelling up housing and communities to be part of the panel to examine this application.

00:02:20:26 - 00:02:52:14

Together, we constitute the examining authority. And will we be reporting to the secretary of State for energy security and at zero with the recommendation as to whether the development consent order should be made. The case manager for this project is Tracy Williams. Tracy is being supported today by Mr. Simon Ringwood, Miss Phoebe Charles and Miss Caroline Hopewell. If you have any queries

about the examination process or the technology we're using for virtual events, this should be your first point of contact.

00:02:52:16 - 00:03:06:29

The contact details can be found at the top of any letter you have received from us on the project page of the National Infrastructure website. I will now hand over to Mrs. Makinson, who will talk us through the rest of Item one of the agenda.

00:03:08:08 - 00:03:12:07

Thank you, Mr. Pinto. Can I just check that everyone can hear me clearly?

00:03:14:00 - 00:03:15:10

Yes, Mrs. Makinson.

00:03:15:24 - 00:03:48:01

Okay, that's great. Thank you for that. I'll now deal with a few housekeeping matters. Today is a virtual event being held on the Microsoft teams platform and live streamed for those people observing or participating through teams in order to minimize background noise. Can you please make sure that you stay muted unless you are speaking? If you are participating and you wish to speak at the relevant point in the proceedings, please use the hand up function. Please be patient as we may not get to you immediately, but we will invite you to speak at the appropriate time.

00:03:49:11 - 00:04:21:28

I would also like to remind people that the chat function on Microsoft teams has been deactivated, so please don't try to use this at any point. If you don't manage to ask your question or is your point at the relevant time, there will be an opportunity at the end of the meeting to raise this under agenda item seven. Any other business? I don't think we have any telephone participants today, but if we do, you should clearly state your name if you wish to make a comment. Once you have indicated that you wish to speak, please wait to be invited before making our contribution.

00:04:22:05 - 00:04:55:01

Please speak loudly and clearly, especially those on the telephone. We'll seek to allocate sufficient time to each issue to allow its proper consideration. We propose that the day will be split into 3 or 4 sessions according to need each of approximately an hour and a half to two hours. At the completion of this session at around 1130, we would have a break of approximately half an hour before resuming at 12 and continuing until 130. We will then have another session between 230 until 4 p.m.

00:04:55:03 - 00:05:28:07

And following a short break, we may continue, if needed, until 5 p.m. We will, however, be flexible about these timings. As we are conducting this event virtually rather than as a physical, face to face event, The dynamics will be different for those participating and observing. And by this I mean you may see myself or Mr. Pinto looking away from the camera and not looking directly at the speaker. This is because we may be writing notes or looking at other material on screens, but we will be playing calls, attention to what is happening.

00:05:28:20 - 00:06:03:01

Thank you. In addition to the live stream, a recording of today's meeting will be made available on the Energy from Waste Combined Heat and Power Facility section of the National Infrastructure Planning website as soon as practicable after the meeting has finished. For our records. Please ensure that you speak clearly into your microphone stating your name and who you're representing each time before you speak. If you don't want your image to be recorded, please turn off your camera. Because the digital recordings that we make are retained and published.

00:06:03:03 - 00:06:41:00

They form a public record that can contain your personal information and to which the general data protection regulations apply. Only in the rarest of circumstances might we ask you to provide personal information of the type that most of us would prefer to be kept private or confidential. Therefore, to avoid the need to edit the digital recordings, please try your best not to add information to the public record that you wouldn't wish to be, that you would wish to be kept private or that is confidential. If you feel that personal information is necessary, please provide that this in a written document that we can redact before publication.

00:06:42:05 - 00:07:13:22

The planning Inspectorate's practice is to retain and publish recordings for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision. A link to the planning Inspectorate's Privacy Notice was provided in the Rule six letter. I assume that everybody here today has familiarise themselves with this document which establishes how the personal data of our customers is handled in accordance with the principles set out in the data protection laws. Please speak to the case team if you have any questions about this.

00:07:16:14 - 00:07:27:00

Looking on the screen. It looks like my camera may have stopped working. If you just bear with me one second. I'll just turn it off and turn it back on again in the usual fashion to see if I can get it to work again.

00:07:27:15 - 00:07:39:14

Mrs. Meghan son Andrew Pinto here just to confirm that that is the case. Um, yeah. So we will bear with you now while you do that, please. Thank you.

00:07:44:13 - 00:07:47:16

Is that working there? Think I can see some movement?

00:07:47:26 - 00:07:51:16

Yes, I can see some movement now. Thank you. Thank you, Mason.

00:07:51:26 - 00:08:08:03

No problem. Okay. Just to start again. This meeting will follow the agenda as published on the 2nd of May 2023. It would be helpful if you had a copy of this in front of you, either on paper or on your screen. Does anyone not have access to an agenda?

00:08:10:23 - 00:08:12:12

Can't see any hands raised.

00:08:15:29 - 00:08:51:22

I will just briefly summarize the agenda. Item one is welcoming introductions. Item two will cover the purpose of this issue specific hearing. Item three will cover Waste matters size of the proposal and need. Item four will cover alternatives and design options. Item five will cover relevant planning policy. Item six is a review of issues and actions arising. Item seven is any other business, and item eight is closure of the hearing. We will conclude the hearing as soon as all relevant contributions have been made and all questions asked and responded to.

00:08:52:00 - 00:09:19:18

But if the discussions can't be concluded, then it may be necessary for us to prioritize matters and to defer other matters to written questions. Likewise, if you cannot answer the questions being asked or require time to get the information requested, and please can you just indicate that you need to respond in writing and we will advise you when it will be best to submit your response or issue in writing to us. Does anyone have any questions on what we've just set out?

00:09:23:26 - 00:09:57:05

Okay, so now I'm just going to do introductions. I'm going to now ask those of you who are participating in today's meeting to introduce yourselves. When I state your organization's name, could you please introduce yourself stating your name and who you represent and which agenda item you wish to speak on. If you're not representing an organization, please confirm your name, Summarize your interest in the application and confirm the agenda item upon which you wish to speak. Please could everybody also state how you wish to be addressed, i.e.

00:09:57:07 - 00:10:03:14

Mr.. Mrs.. Ms. or Ms.. Can we start with the applicant, please, and any of their advisors?

00:10:06:07 - 00:10:39:15

Good morning, ma'am. My name is Gary McGovern. I'm a partner with solicitors Pinsent Masons LLP, appearing today on behalf of the applicant. And there are seven other people who may speak to some of the agenda items in the room with me, and I'll ask them to introduce themselves momentarily. But just to flag highlight before I do that, that we're also joined by Mr. David Hume who is joining separately by Tim's. And Mr. Hume may speak to items under agenda item four. I will now hand over to the others in the room to introduce themselves.

00:10:40:00 - 00:10:40:21

Thank you.

00:10:41:04 - 00:10:41:28

Thank you. Thank you.

00:10:44:22 - 00:10:51:05

Good morning. My name is Clare Broderick. I'm a legal director at Pinsent Masons for the applicant.

00:10:53:21 - 00:10:59:03

Good morning. My name is Tim Marks and I am head of planning for the applicant.

00:11:01:19 - 00:11:09:00

Good morning. My name is Paul Carey, managing director of MVV environment and of the applicant.

00:11:10:23 - 00:11:11:09

Thank you.

00:11:14:19 - 00:11:29:29

Good morning. My name is Claire Brown. I'm here on behalf of the applicant. I work for WSP and I'm technical director at WSP and I'm here today to talk about issues in relation to the waste fuel availability assessments. Thank you.

00:11:34:09 - 00:11:47:16

Good morning. My name is David Kenyon. I'm also a technical director, and I'm here to answer questions regarding planning policy primarily, but also alternatives as well. Thank you.

00:11:51:05 - 00:11:55:26

Good morning. My name is James Ashton. I'm head of engineering for the applicants.

00:11:58:22 - 00:12:05:05

Good morning. My name is Dr. Bower, head of innovation and proposals for the applicant.

00:12:09:03 - 00:12:09:20

Thank you.

00:12:11:09 - 00:12:14:02

Ma'am. That concludes the introductions for the applicant.

00:12:15:19 - 00:12:29:19

Thank you. And good morning to you all. Can we now move on to the organizations and individuals that have given notice of their intention to speak? If I can start with Cambridgeshire County Council and District Council, please.

00:12:31:03 - 00:12:59:01

Okay. Good morning, ma'am. My name is Andrew Fraser, Urquhart King's counsel. I'm representing both Cambridgeshire County Council and Fenland District Council, which I'll try and refer to collectively, collectively together now as the councils. Um, from my team who are gathered, we are all gathered here in Cambridgeshire Shire Hall. I'll first of all introduce Mr. Matthew Breeze, who will be speaking on the Waste Matters agenda item.

00:13:02:14 - 00:13:03:09

Hello? Hello.

00:13:06:19 - 00:13:07:09

You might say.

00:13:09:12 - 00:13:13:01

Hello. Hello? Oh, bear with me one second.

00:13:18:17 - 00:13:20:20

We've got a bit of an echo. Mr. Breeze.

00:13:23:24 - 00:13:24:24

Can you hear me now? Okay.

00:13:25:00 - 00:13:26:25

Yes, That's perfect. Thank you.

00:13:27:25 - 00:13:40:13

Hello. My name is Matthew Breeze. I am the principal policy officer for Minerals and Waste at Cambridgeshire County Council. My apologies for the issues there. If the mic stays on and you turn your camera on. Mr. Nick, Darling.

00:13:41:00 - 00:13:49:21

Hello. I'm Mr. Nick Harding. I'm head of planning at Fenland District Council, and I'm here in respect of item five. Thank you.

00:13:50:16 - 00:13:53:15

Thank you. Thank you, ma'am. That concludes the introductions from the council's.

00:13:55:02 - 00:13:55:20

Okay.

00:13:56:28 - 00:14:03:26

Have a representative from Wisbech Town council here today. You can introduce yourself, please.

00:14:04:18 - 00:14:12:24

Hello, I'm Emma Barnett. I'm representing Wisbech Town Council and I'm a planner from Adam Century. Thank you.

00:14:13:12 - 00:14:19:04

Thank you very much. For can move on to the Borough Council of Kingsland in West Norfolk, please.

00:14:20:29 - 00:14:30:09

Hello, my name is Hannah Wood, Handy planning control manager at the Borough Council. I'm here today principally to talk about item five policy update. Thank you.

00:14:31:24 - 00:14:36:28

Thank you. And welcome. If I can move on to Norfolk Council, please.

00:14:44:12 - 00:14:47:10

Do we have Mr. Schakowsky on the line?

00:14:56:23 - 00:15:05:28

Nope. Okay. If I can move on, please. To win representatives. I believe you have two representatives.

00:15:08:21 - 00:15:36:25

Good morning. Yes, that's correct. Good morning. My name is Mr. Shlomo Dhawan. I am the national coordinator of the United Kingdom Without Incineration Network or UK win. And my colleague and I am Josh Darwin, the associate coordinator of the United Kingdom Guidance making network win. And the primary item that will be addressing will be waste matters, size and need. But we'll hang on for agenda items four and five in case there's anything that we can contribute.

00:15:38:22 - 00:15:39:28

Okay. Thank you.

00:15:41:20 - 00:15:44:18

And do we have a representative from Wiz Wynn here today?

00:15:46:14 - 00:15:46:29

But.

00:15:50:19 - 00:15:55:06

Yes, we do. My name is Joseph Howlett, representing Wizz Wind.

00:15:56:25 - 00:15:57:19

Good morning.

00:15:58:00 - 00:16:08:06

Good morning. And my task today is to talk to you about alternatives and specifically the lack of steam customers for envy. Thank you.

00:16:08:15 - 00:16:09:28

Thank you, Mr. Howlett.

00:16:11:15 - 00:16:14:06

That's it. I also have a mr. Diwali.

00:16:16:11 - 00:16:18:03

You can introduce yourself, please.

00:16:18:23 - 00:16:38:16

Hello. I'm Mr. Wally. I'm a West Norfolk and or Kingsland and West Norfolk Borough councillor for Gayton and Grimstone. However, I'm here on a personal capacity and I'm interested particularly in gender. Item three Waste Matters, Size and Need. Thank you.

00:16:39:19 - 00:16:57:03

Thank you very much and welcome, everyone. Now, is there anyone else here today who wishes to speak that I have not called to this point? If yes, please, could you raise a virtual hand? And again, please introduce yourself and let us know the agenda item on which on which you wish to speak.

00:17:02:09 - 00:17:18:12

I can't see any additional hands up. Obviously, if you do wish to speak during the hearing, if you can raise your virtual hand, that'd be great. Thank you, everyone. I'll now hand over to Mr. Pinto, who will lead on agenda item two.

00:17:28:14 - 00:17:59:06

Thank you very much, Mrs. Morgenson. Um, let me briefly explain the purpose of this issue specific hearing. So the purpose of this issue specifically here is to and it's to undertake the examination on, in fact, on environmental matters in relation to waste size, need alternatives, the design of the proposed development and compliance with relevant planning policies. As previously mentioned, an agenda for this meeting was published on the 2nd of May of 2023.

00:17:59:09 - 00:18:17:08

Today's hearing will be a structured discussion led by the Examining Authority. Please be sure that we are familiar with what you have already submitted to us so you don't have to repeat in length anything that you have already put to us in writing. Submissions carry equal weight regardless of the format in which they are put to us.

00:18:18:24 - 00:18:45:00

If you do refer to any documents this morning, it would be helpful if you could give us the correct examination library reference number. Please do try to avoid using any acronyms as people who might be watching today might not be as familiar with those terms as you are. Are there any comments that anyone would like to make on item two of the agenda?

00:18:50:14 - 00:19:26:16

I can't see any hands raised, so I will then move us on to item three, which is waste mattress size need. So item three, in this item, what we want to explore ensues linked with waist size in it, principally the waist fuel availability assessment which you will hear being referred to as Wafa and that would be rep to dash 009 and Rep 2-010, including waist availability, composition and compliance with the West hierarchy

00:19:28:05 - 00:20:05:27

will then the examining authority will then explore issues around needs, particularly in light of the information supplied in the West, fuel availability, assessment, type and scale so as not prejudiced achievement of local or national waste management targets. At least two of the key written submissions on this topic. What particular focus was supplied with the agenda is this is quite a long

list. I don't propose to go through it all now, but can I please can I please confirm that you have had a chance to review this and if you have any comments on that list.

00:20:07:18 - 00:20:09:24

From anyone present today.

00:20:15:01 - 00:20:46:20

Again, can't see any hands raised. So I'll take that is no comment. So in that case, I propose that I move on to my questioning today. So my first question is to the applicant and can the applicant please explain in broad terms the purpose of the waste fuel availability assessment to offer rep to 009 or rep 2010, particularly in relation to addressing need and how it was developed in accordance with the waste hierarchy?

00:20:50:18 - 00:20:58:03

Yes. Yes, sir. That will be myself. Claire Brown, on behalf of the applicant, I don't know if you can. Can you hear me okay?

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

I can hear you. Okay. Thank you very much. You can hopefully.

00:21:00:25 - 00:21:41:14

See me shortly as well. Okay. Great stuff. We just had to wait for the camera to turn around. Um, yes. So to essentially to comply with the provisions of national planning policy, a standard woofler or waste fuel availability assessments being prepared which seeks to establish that sufficient fuel is available to the proposed development. Um, you've already referenced that we've produced two versions to the of the fuel availability assessment and original version app Dash 094, which was produced with the application was submitted, which has since been updated.

00:21:41:16 - 00:22:11:24

So we're talking specifically now about the updated versions which were submitted at deadline to REP 009 and attract change version rep to 010. The primary reason for preparing an updated version of the fuel availability assessment was to reflect a number of matters. First of all, to reflect that data had been published since the first version of the fuel availability assessment was produced.

00:22:12:13 - 00:22:45:04

Data is constantly being updated and refreshed. So most notably, the updated version of the fuel availability assessment took account of the latest statistics published by DEFRA UK statistics, which were published in May this year. Um, statistics published by 12 on the Energy from Waste Statistics, which were published in May last year. And we are aware that this information has since been updated as of last week.

00:22:45:06 - 00:23:09:26

But we can come to that later and then Defra um, local authority collected waste which was produced the the day that which was produced since the first version of the fuel availability was prepared. So there's been a number of data sources, um which have necessitated the updated document being prepared.

00:23:11:26 - 00:23:28:16

On that specific point. Can I just ask Mrs. Brown? Um, considering the data sources that you have mentioned that have recently been updated. Does the applicant have any plans in order to provide us with a further appetite?

00:23:29:00 - 00:24:16:22



Yes, we do. So specifically, there are two. There are two data sources. One, I've already mentioned a study on energy from waste statistics, an updated version of which was published last week, um, which we are aware of. And then there's some further local authority collected waste data that was published on the day that we submitted the version two of the fuel availability assessment to you. So what we were looking to propose today is that we work has already is already underway on this to prepare an updated, further updated fuel availability assessment to reflect these new data sources for submission at Deadline five.

00:24:17:24 - 00:24:51:01

The mission at deadline five, which would be Friday the 16th of June 2023. Yeah. Um, okay. My, um, I'm happy for us to actually pick this up. Um, perhaps, um, lighting the hearing. Um, but just to say that my immediate concerns is that obviously that is after, um, the date for the publication of the second round of written questions by DXY.

00:24:51:09 - 00:25:25:00

So obviously we would, um, the second round of questions then would not be able to reflect that information. So I will just, I'll just raise that is just a concern that we have, but obviously do understand that doing those updates will take some time. So I accept that. But I just think it would be fair to actually raise that as a concern at this point in time and and linked with that point, can I just ask, um, I'm assuming that you have said that you have started to work for that update already.

00:25:25:14 - 00:25:38:03

Um, can I ask if you anticipate significant changes in terms of the waste fuel availability assessment based on that item? Is it significantly different?

00:25:42:10 - 00:26:07:09

Gary McGovern for the applicant. So just before I pass back to Ms.. Brown to answer your second question around the data and looking at the program for the examination, and I'm sure you're aware of this, sir, but the program does allow for questions for the round of questions to be issued on the 21st of July, which would be after deadline five and submission of revision three of the woofers.

00:26:08:27 - 00:26:36:11

I'm aware of that, Mr. McGovern, But my point is still in relation to the further round, the next round of written questions, I'm just putting a marker that obviously the second round of written questions would not reflect that, which obviously will have implications to the whole of the timetable. But I do understand that we anticipated that situations like this could happen and we actually do have another provision for further written questions. Um.

00:26:38:03 - 00:26:53:21

Uh, perhaps if I could then ask Mrs. Brown to actually continue on that point, particularly in terms of them, particularly in terms of the differences in the data.

00:26:55:00 - 00:26:57:03

And before we before we move on.

00:26:57:15 - 00:27:09:07

Okay. I was going to say, I can see your hand is up, but can I just ask Mrs. Brown to actually answer that question and then I'll come to you immediately after that, if that's acceptable.

00:27:10:27 - 00:27:48:05

Yeah, no problem in in terms of the local authority collected waste data, we have had an opportunity to consider that in some detail. And the data is, is is very it's really not dissimilar at all. In actual fact, the data is showing that there's a marginal increase in the amount of waste produced and a marginal

increase in the amount of waste that is dealt with at the bottom end of the hierarchy. But but not vastly dissimilar to previous data that's recorded in the fuel availability assessment.

00:27:48:14 - 00:28:06:18

In terms of the Total Vic report, in all honesty, it was only published at the end of towards the end of last week, and I haven't had the opportunity to review that in any detail yet, So I can't comment at this stage on how different that is. Um, yeah. So that's really where we're at with the data.

00:28:07:03 - 00:28:11:01

That's fine. Thank you very much, Mrs. Brown. Uh, Mr. Andrew Fraser.

00:28:12:23 - 00:28:24:02

So, yes, just to put down a similar marker that we would as as waste authority, we want the ability to comment on any changes that may occur when that submissions made at deadline five.

00:28:25:22 - 00:28:27:09

And thank you. Noted.

00:28:30:14 - 00:28:50:18

Uh, Mrs. Brown, then. Apologies for that. If you would then like to continue. My question, just to recap was in terms of addressing need and how the offer has now been updated and it has been developed in accordance with the West hierarchy. If you'd like to continue, please.

00:28:52:02 - 00:29:33:21

Thank you. Yes. Claire Brown for the applicant. Um, so in terms of how the new Wafa, the updated Wafa has changed. So the applicant we have considered comments made in respect of the, the overall methodology. And our position in terms of the overall methodology is one that we consider It's robust and it represents a worst case scenario in respect of fuel availability at the local and national level. So whilst the sort of we haven't changed the methodology as such, we've maintained that, but we have made some additions to the, to the woofers in response to comments previously made by Consultees.

00:29:33:23 - 00:30:16:21

So for example, the key changes there are the achievement of the Government's aspirational target of halving residual waste by 2042, which was a target set out in a recently produced UM, while the Government's Environmental Improvement Plan, which was published earlier this year, we've sought to provide some narrative and assessment around what that does to the overall assessment of need. Similarly, additionally, we've also looked at um, the potential for residual waste to be directed to alternative management needs.

00:30:16:23 - 00:30:53:12

So specifically in response to consider comments around what residual waste could go to to other forms of treatment, emerging treatments such as sustainable aviation, fuel and fuel for cement kilns. Plus, you know what proportion is dealt with through mechanical biological treatments. Um, they're also there also additions in the updated fuel availability assessment, sort of consideration around the extent to which those alternative management means could contribute to meeting additional sort of future capacity requirements.

00:30:53:25 - 00:31:22:24

So they are the main changes to the, to the, to the, to the fuel availability assessment. Um, I can just finish by saying could key conclusions on the revised assessment is that at a national level we've seen a slight increase in total waste generated by about 2.5%. Um, and that's been a small increase in the amount of waste going to landfill.

00:31:24:12 - 00:32:17:18

Um, in terms of recycling, we've seen national recycling levels remaining almost static, continuing to remain static at around 44% and at a local level within the fuel availability study area, we have seen that waste generated has increased by about 1.5%. So these are the small increases that I mentioned in respect to the updated um, DEFRA local authority collected waste data. Um, broadly speaking, we the east of England, we are still considering that this represents a robust study area and a reasonable study area and that the East of England does continue to place a significant reliance on landfill, with local authorities spending almost three times the national average to landfill.

00:32:17:20 - 00:32:26:29

So in light of that, our conclusions in this updated offer remain the same. Um, that there is still a clear need for the proposed development.

00:32:27:28 - 00:33:09:26

Um, thank you for that intervention, Mr. Brown. Just just to clarify, obviously, considering the waste and where one can position the proposed development, the main concerns will be, um, the need to divert untreated waste from landfill to your proposed development. So can you please confirm then that in terms of your capacity that you have, um, according to your assessment and I have some queries in terms of geographical area and assessment, but I'll get to those in, in a, in a in a moment.

00:33:10:12 - 00:33:28:06

But according to your assessment as it stands now, can you confirm that you, um. Half the capacity of the facility does not exceed the amount of twisted untreated waste that is being diverted to landfill.

00:33:30:07 - 00:34:03:04

Claire Brown for the applicant? Yes, absolutely. The the fundamental basis of the fuel availability assessment is to look at the diversion of residual waste from being managed at the bottom of the hierarchy. So, in other words, diverting it from landfill. And that is the absolute basis of this assessment. And this assessment has looked at the quantities of waste that are currently being sent to landfill and they far exceed the at the local and national level, the capacity that this plant would would offer.

00:34:03:29 - 00:34:10:05

Thank you very much, Mr. Ralls. I believe that you would like to intervene.

00:34:11:00 - 00:34:20:27

Yes. Just a couple of comments on the presentation from the applicant. Um, recycling rates are currently at 44% and think it's maybe.

00:34:20:29 - 00:34:30:06

Excuse me, Mr. Wells, if I could just ask you to just confirm your name and your organization that you represent for for for the record. Apologies. Thank you.

00:34:30:19 - 00:35:13:09

Sorry. In Rules Cambridge, Friends of the Earth. Um, the applicant states that recycling rates currently at. Pardon me? 44%. It seems slightly troubling that they're basing their business model on a lack of ambition with regards to recycling. Um, furthermore, as for diversion from landfill, I believe that the incineration in general, um, reduces the volume of the original waste down to about 25%. So landfill is still going to be required for bottom ash and fly ash. And furthermore, the, the ash produced is going to be highly toxic because all of the contaminants produced from the incineration will require, um, disposal in special facilities as special landfills rather than just general landfill.

00:35:13:16 - 00:35:36:00

And also, there's a point that incineration and the contracts required by required to be signed by councils with the incineration company will reduce recycling rates further because waste that could have been recycled will have to be diverted to incineration to meet their contractual obligations. I hope I've made that clear there. Okay. Thank you.

00:35:36:13 - 00:35:44:15

Yes, Thank you very much, Mr. Ross. Um, can I ask the applicant to respond, please?

00:35:47:03 - 00:35:54:08

Gary McGovern for the applicant. Yes, sir. We would be pleased to respond to those points. I'll pass you to Mr. Kerry to do so. Thank you.

00:35:56:13 - 00:36:32:21

Paul Kerry for the applicant. Just as a matter of fact, just to correct it, something that was said there, sir. The fact is that of the waste that goes into an energy waste plant broadly, 25% by waste comes out as what we call incinerator bottom ash. But that can all be recycled and reused. A small amount of what we call the residue, the air pollution control residues. That's about 3% by weight. And that at the moment would be landfilled, although there are systems being developed that might lead to that sort of residue being recycled.

00:36:33:02 - 00:36:39:28

So it's certainly not the case that the bottom ash is is landfilled. It is all recycled. Thank you.

00:36:41:05 - 00:36:44:27

Can I ask on that point if.

00:36:47:16 - 00:36:53:08

That possibility is something that the applicant has built into the facility that they're proposing.

00:36:55:00 - 00:37:23:04

Airport caring for the applicant. Now, this process would not take place at the proposed site. It would be taken away and managed elsewhere. And we would we're certainly investigating options for dealing with air pollution control residues. But at the moment, the plan would be to have it landfilled in a specialist landfill, but it would be only a very small volume and a very small percentage of the original weight of the waste that came into the facility about 3%.

00:37:24:15 - 00:37:41:28

Um, thank you for that confirmation. Uh, Mr. Kerry, Um, I can just ask Mr.. Mr.. Mr.. If your, your hand is still up, do you still have another question or was it just left up from your previous intervention?

00:37:42:08 - 00:38:05:03

It was a further point regarding the recycling of bottom ash. I basically just wanted to wonder, I was basically wondering what they were going to recycle it into, seeing as how it will be laden with heavy metals, dioxins and other products of the incineration process. I find that slightly disturbing, to say the very least, that they are intending to recycle the bottom ash into products.

00:38:05:29 - 00:38:25:12

And thank you for that, Mr. Ross. Think that Mr. Kerry has actually confirmed that those plans are possible, but that is not something that the applicant is actually looking to do. Now, if I understood Mr. Kerry's answer correctly, but can I ask Mr. Kerry to just confirm and respond to the intervention of Mr. Ross, please?

00:38:25:29 - 00:38:58:12

Yes. Paul, care if the applicant Just to be absolutely clear, the incinerator bottom ash is routinely recycled across the country. All of the energy from waste plants are having their bottom ash recycled. That's certainly the case for our facilities that we operate in Plymouth and in Dundee. So it's a process by which we remove the metals. So in this case, the metals are now very clean, free of any contamination themselves, like plastics or, or paper etcetera. Um, all of the non-ferrous metals can also be recovered.

00:38:58:14 - 00:39:41:18

What is left over is basically an aggregate type, mineral based aggregate type material that can be screened and graded into different sized fractions and that can then be used as a secondary aggregate. It's not the sort of stuff that you would use to build a skyscraper with, but it's often used in drainage road projects, etcetera, and it is all usable. And this has certainly been the common practice in the UK for as long as the energy from waste industry has been working. Just to be clear, it's the air pollution control residues, which is about 3% by weight that would go to landfill at the moment and less and until some alternative treatment processes become commercially available.

00:39:42:08 - 00:39:56:25

Thank you. Thank you for that confirmation. Mr. Kerry. Can I just ask then, um, because you have mentioned this now twice. So what steps has the applicant actually taken in order to secure the recycling of the bottom ash?

00:39:58:16 - 00:40:22:04

Well, we've spoken to the companies that work with us already at our facilities in Plymouth and Dundee, and there are other companies that do this across the country and we speak to them as a matter of routine discussions, and they would be developing their own sites elsewhere in the country. And so the bottom would be transported, hopefully not too far to another site where it would be processed and recycled.

00:40:23:21 - 00:40:27:02

It would be done as a subcontract to us. In other words.

00:40:27:21 - 00:40:33:20

Thank you. Right. And have. Are those contracts in place?

00:40:35:12 - 00:40:54:20

Not yet, but we would have them in place in due course. It's not necessary, in our view, to have them in place right now because we're confident that there is enough capacity out there in the marketplace for this type of material and we'll negotiate a deal with a suitable operator at a suitable location closer to the time.

00:40:55:19 - 00:41:07:25

Okay. Thank you very much for that confirmation, Mr. Kerry. Now, can I ask Miss Barnett, I saw that your hand was up earlier, but I see that it has been lowered now. Would you still like to come in?

00:41:08:12 - 00:41:10:17

Yes, please. Yes, please, sir.

00:41:11:12 - 00:41:12:21

If you would like to.

00:41:13:12 - 00:41:44:18

Yes. Emma Barnett on behalf of Wisbech Parish Town Council. Sorry, I just want to clarify something that the applicant said in terms of the, the changes to the figures. Um, and it may have misheard an if so, apologies, but could you just clarify in terms of the baseline position, because looking at the figures in the WFA paragraph 4.1. 13, it would suggest that in the study area, the available waste has gone down from 17.9 million to 9.8 million, which to my mind is a significant reduction in just two years.

00:41:44:20 - 00:42:14:22

And from what I was understood, the applicant said this morning there was a very small reduction. Could you please clarify and a second point as well, if I if I may. Um, again, the applicant suggested that she had taken into account the the targets in the environmental improvement plan for reduction of residual waste. And I do note that there is some commentary in the in the document, but I don't see any actual forecasts in terms of what the implications that will do to the amount of waste available in the study area.

00:42:14:24 - 00:42:18:13

And again, I'll just be grateful for some clarification on those points, please.

00:42:20:02 - 00:42:24:25

I thank you very much for that intervention. Uh, Mr. Barnett. Um.

00:42:27:06 - 00:42:59:18

I will ask now the applicant to actually reply to the comments just made. But before I do, I just wanted to clarify that in terms of the reduction, obviously am mindful of what the applicant has said earlier in terms of that work has not been fully carried out yet. So I'm mindful that the applicant might not have a full response on this specific issue, which I believe would be understandable considering how recently that new data was published.

00:42:59:20 - 00:43:13:12

Nevertheless, if the applicant would like to come in on that point, but think that perhaps if the applicant could also respond then to the targeting, the environmental plan and how that has been addressed within the appetite of the offer, please.

00:43:16:16 - 00:43:56:21

Yeah. Claire Brown for the applicant. Yeah, I'll try and go through those. Um, first of all, the updated local authority collected waste data that we've analyzed is, is national data. So where I talk about there's been a sort of slight, slight increase in the amount of waste that's been generated. Um, and a slight increase in the amount of waste that's gone to landfill. That's at a very high level DEFRA that it's DEFRA data is at a very high level that data. So they're just that's just an indication of trends and the detail of that will be reflected in the updated, updated version of the fuel availability assessment that we prepare for.

00:43:56:23 - 00:44:45:09

Deadline five. In terms of Mis Barnett and the reference to, I think she's specifically referring to Table 4.2 in the fuel availability assessment, um, which is relates to household industrial and commercial waste arising for defined local authority waste codes. So this is where what we've tried to do in the fuel availability assessment is not just say that all residual waste is is up for grabs to us because it quite clearly isn't there certain um, um, categories of that what we call in scope waste that would be available to us.

00:44:45:22 - 00:45:17:12

Um, so what, what table 4.2 does, and she very quite rightly points out that the original version of the fuel availability assessment had a total household industrial and commercial arising for defined codes

of over 17 million tonnes. And in the updated version we've got down to just under 10 million tonnes. Um, that correction is a refinement of the applied local

00:45:19:12 - 00:45:52:13

refined list of waste codes that the facility could take. So it's a refinement of the of the fuel availability assessment. And as part of the submission at deadline five, what we're proposing to do is the data that sits behind table point four. Point two is waste data interrogator data. It's environment agency data that comprises a number, um, several hundreds of sheets of Excel spreadsheets.

00:45:52:15 - 00:46:22:28

And you can run reports and interrogate that data every which way. It's publicly accessible data. And what we're proposing to do as deadline for deadline five is to provide the detail of the reports that we run that sit behind the revised data set out in table 4.2 to provide Consultees with more clarity and transparency around how that nine point, that 9.8 million tonnes, just under 10 million tonnes has been arrived at.

00:46:23:13 - 00:46:54:23

I should just stress though that whilst table 4.2 is a reduction in the total size of the household industrial and commercial waste cake, what we're absolutely focusing on is how much of that overall cake is currently managed by way of landfill, i.e. at the bottom of the waste hierarchy and in the updated fuel availability assessment. That quantity has not changed.

00:46:54:28 - 00:46:56:03

So that is.

00:46:56:05 - 00:46:58:15

Table 4.4, if I'm not mistaken.

00:46:58:17 - 00:47:28:23

For it is indeed, sir. Yes, 4.4, which tells us that we are still, um, to 2.4 million tonnes of material in the study and that's importantly suitable material as well. Um, within the study area is currently disposed of to landfill. So we've taken account of the fact that some of this material is not going to be suitable for putting through an energy from waste facility.

00:47:28:25 - 00:47:38:02

We've weeded that out and we're still at 2.4 million tonnes of material not going to landfill, suitable material going to landfill.

00:47:39:01 - 00:47:48:20

Um, thank you for that. Ms.. Barnett. Can I just ask you to confirm if you are happy with that response or if there is any follow?

00:47:49:19 - 00:48:18:10

I think. Question. Sorry. I think that's helpful, that clarification, because it was very puzzling as to why we saw such a significant drop in just two years. I think it would have been helpful if that would make clear in the woofers. But if that's going to be in the next version, then that would that's only helpful. The only comment I would make on the the landfill figures is that it relies on a significant amount of landfill in Essex, which I have made consistently throughout this. This process is significantly far away.

00:48:18:23 - 00:48:50:03

I'm going to have a lot of questions on that specific issue. So I'm just mindful of the time. So if I'm going to I'm going to ask a lot of questions, have some questions prepared that will cover that point.

Okay. So perhaps if I could ask you to then raise any further questions that you might have later on in today's in as part of this item? That will be helpful. Okay. Thank you very much. Mr.. Shlomo Dhawan. I believe that you have you raised your hand as well.

00:48:51:04 - 00:49:22:12

Thank you very much, sir. Yes. Shlomo, doing for win apology stolen. Thank you. Thank you. We have a few quick points that we would like to make now and we'll save our more substantial comments for later. The use of just to clarify the use of incinerator bottom ash, for example, as aggregate for road building. If it passes the necessary tests, it is not recycling as it is not using the material as part of the original material cycle.

00:49:22:14 - 00:49:56:20

It does not contribute to recycling targets. It's a it's a misnomer to call that recycling, let alone reuse appreciate. In common parlance, it is used again and therefore it is reuse. But it is neither recycling nor reuse. Um, that that is just a fact. The second quick point is that of course Winn has studied the report and one of the key messages that arises from that report is the increase in the use of residual waste for cement kilns.

00:49:56:22 - 00:50:42:19

And we're interested to see how the applicant will address that. We are frustrated that the revised waste fuel availability assessment will not be available until deadline five. We hope that that gives the applicant more opportunity to take on board the points that we raised. But just the final question is, despite the applicants comments that we heard earlier that cement kilns were considered in their deadline to Wafa, we couldn't find any assessment of the residual waste used as a fuel for cement kilns in the D-2 Wafa And so we're wondering if the applicant could please point us to where in the document they consider that they've addressed that issue.

00:50:43:06 - 00:50:43:21

Thank you.

00:50:44:06 - 00:51:05:16

Thank you very much for that intervention. Can I ask the applicant to quickly reply, particularly on this last point? I'm mindful that we have some question one, so I'm keen to move on. But can I just ask the applicant to actually reply to particularly to that last point in terms of where that information can be found?

00:51:07:04 - 00:51:39:18

Pool. Care for the applicant. I'll defer to Claire Brown for the very last point, but just to point out that on the subject of whether the bottom ash is recycled or not, it's a matter of terminology. It is used and it displaces the use of virgin aggregates, one from a quarry somewhere else. So there is an environmental benefit of not using newly one aggregates or sand or other materials when you can use this bottom ash. So it has an environmental benefit in that sense, whether you want to call it recycling or not is a matter of personal judgment, I think.

00:51:40:27 - 00:51:42:13

Okay. Mrs. Brown.

00:51:43:28 - 00:52:14:08

Claire Brown for the applicant in terms of the residual waste issue and the capacity of the capacity that's offered by cement kilns, the toll, the waste fuel availability assessment relies upon. The analysis set out in the May 2022 report on Energy from Waste Statistics, which is the report which we know was updated last week. And we still need to sort of evaluate that.



00:52:14:10 - 00:52:48:11

However, the 2022 reports, the one that the fuel availability assessment relies upon for the first time toll included the capacity offered by cement kilns in their overall assessment of total capacity. So when we when we refer back to the the the capacity figure provided by by Toll Vic, it includes the the cement kiln capacity.

00:52:49:00 - 00:52:50:09

It's implicit.

00:52:50:24 - 00:53:24:14

Thank you for that clarification. Mr.. BROWN. Right. I still have three hands raised. I have Councilor Michael Wally and Mr. Andrew Fraser from Kent County Council and Mr. Numerals, Mr. Numerals considering that we are still on Question one could I please ask you to actually hold on to any questions until we actually move a little bit further down the agenda, if that is okay, considering that that you have participated in intervene twice and I will now ask if that's okay.

00:53:24:16 - 00:53:25:26

Can you just confirm that, please?

00:53:25:28 - 00:53:27:05

Yeah, no problem at all.

00:53:27:07 - 00:53:29:21

Thank you. And can I ask.

00:53:31:15 - 00:53:36:12

Counsel, Michael Duvall, if he would like to intervene on this specific point.

00:53:38:18 - 00:54:17:23

Yes, if I may. Please, sir. Um, just really wanted to ask that a lot of this is based firstly on current statistics. There is speculation that there will be shortfall. Surely we should be working to government policy and target and by plugging a temporary shortfall with a waste incinerator with a 40 year lifetime. Is that is that preferable to maintaining a buffer of landfill, which can be quickly reduced when recycling and waste reduction improves? Thank you.

00:54:20:23 - 00:54:21:08

Um.

00:54:21:22 - 00:54:30:25

Right. Can I just ask the applicant to then clarify if there is a surplus or not in terms of waste? Just very quickly, please.

00:54:32:24 - 00:55:05:11

Claire Brown for the applicants. And we've certainly the fuel availability assessment does look at recycling aspirations moving forward, various scenarios, including the achievement of the Government's aspirational 65%. And we're still predicting a up to a minimum of 1.6 million tonnes shortfall in capacity. In terms of the point about landfill. I mean, I think the only point we would make there is clearly landfill is at the bottom of the hierarchy and we're seeking to move waste up the hierarchy.

00:55:06:12 - 00:55:15:01

Thank you very much for that clarification. Mr.. Mrs. Brown. Mr. Andrew Fraser, Can I ask you if you'd still like to intervene on this specific point?

00:55:15:20 - 00:55:23:08

So yes, Mr. Briggs has 1 or 2 comments on table 4.2, which seem as we are there would seem sensible for him to give those comments now.

00:55:24:07 - 00:55:24:27

Um.

00:55:28:08 - 00:55:34:18

Okay. Um. Okay, that's fine. Let's just. Can I just ask?

00:55:35:09 - 00:55:35:24

Um.

00:55:36:12 - 00:55:38:25

Yes, that's fine. Will allow that, please.

00:55:38:27 - 00:55:41:02

We'll bring Mr. Breeze on. Thank you.

00:55:43:15 - 00:55:44:09

Mr. Breeze.

00:55:45:15 - 00:55:46:00

Thank you.

00:55:47:08 - 00:56:15:24

In our deadline, three submissions we noted there were errors in table 4.2 of the version. One of the waste fuel assessment in our we didn't go into detail as Mrs. Brown has set out. The title is misleading in that it includes all Chapter 19 and Chapter 20 wastes. So it includes a lot more. So the comparison between the first version of the the second version of Table 4.2 is not something that can be

00:56:18:12 - 00:56:51:24

is not is not something that should be done. We also noted there appears to be some transcription errors in that table as well, which the applicant may wish to address in that there appears to be some tonnages assigned to some areas accurately, other areas, but with the wrong name, and some were just completely different areas which I believe the applicant will wish to address from our review of the data. If you look at the 2019 data, you end up with a figure in the region of 9.56 million tonnes.

00:56:51:26 - 00:57:04:27

This is 0.27 million tonnes lower than the 9.83 million tonnes cited in version two of the report. That is all I've got to add at the moment, but thought that may be helpful. Yes.

00:57:05:01 - 00:57:38:01

Thank you. Thank you very much. Mr. Briggs. Considering the time in the nature of your comment, can actually ask an action please, for Mr. Briggs and the applicant, particularly considering that they will have to be the applicant has already stated that is working on another update to incorporate new data. Can I ask Mr. Briggs to communicate with you? For the applicant to communicate with Mr. Briggs in order to get hold of those, um, of those errors that Mr.

00:57:38:03 - 00:57:44:14

Briggs has mentioned and has identified and take those into consideration the next update.

00:57:46:27 - 00:57:58:21

Gary McGovern for the applicant? Yes, sir. We're happy to have that discussion. In fact, I believe there are already discussions around these points, and we'll take all of that into account in the next version of the woofers at the headline five. Thank you. Thank you.

00:57:58:25 - 00:58:32:29

Thank you very much. Um, okay. I will like us to then move on to the next point, which is a question for the applicant as well, which is can the applicant explain how to propose development is of a type and scale as to not prejudice the shipments of local or national waste management objectives. And that obviously is linked with the waste turaki and not, um, undermining objectives in terms of recycling, obviously.

00:58:33:01 - 00:58:38:02

So if the, if the applicant could reply to that specific question, please.

00:59:03:09 - 00:59:16:03

Gary McGovern for the applicant. Yes, sir. I will pass you to Miss Brown again and believe some of what she's already expressed in responding to earlier questions. Me in part also answer this item, but I'll pass you to Miss Brown.

00:59:17:02 - 00:59:25:27

Yes, please. Just just to clarify, I'm now concentrating on type and scale. Not so much need, just if that is helpful, Mrs. Brown.

00:59:29:28 - 01:00:08:07

Yeah. Mean can just. I'll just open up open up this discussion. Think I'll probably pass to my, my my colleague Mr. Carey. But, but really in terms of type and scale, we very much look to focus, as I've already said this, this development on meeting the residual waste requirement needs, we're looking at diverting material from landfill only and we've looked at both the current position and then moving forward looking at what the availability of that residual waste would be should the national recycling targets and residual waste reduction targets be met.

01:00:08:09 - 01:00:15:06

That's just setting the scene. I do believe that my colleague Paul is Mr. Carey is going to talk to this past year overall.

01:00:16:29 - 01:00:47:24

Paul Carey for the applicant in terms of choosing the size of the facility, this is because, as we've discovered already, there is more than enough residual waste that's currently going to landfill that would need to be diverted further up the waste hierarchy. Um, this is a facility which we would normally refer to the thermal capacity of this. It's two boilers of each of 100MW thermal capacity.

01:00:48:16 - 01:01:36:21

In terms of tonnage. That means the tonnage can vary and it depends on the calorific value of the waste. The contrary to what some other people might have said, this is not the largest facility in the UK. There are several others which are much larger. For example, there is an energy from waste plant and in fact there are two energy from waste plants at Ferry Bridge in north of Leeds, which have a thermal capacity about 24% higher than what is proposed here. And there are two of them side by side. So this is by no means the largest in the country, but the capacity that's proposed, the facility can deal with up to 625,000 tonnes a year, depending on what the calorific value of the waste is and a higher calorific value will tend to lead to or will definitely lead to a much lower tonnage.

01:01:36:23 - 01:02:15:22

Because if you're restricted to a constant thermal throughput, you can't take as many tonnes. If the calorific value per tonne is higher. So it very much depends on the calorific value of the waste and that very much depends on the composition of what people put into their residual waste bins. So the 625,000 tonnes a year is a maximum. We believe that is sufficient for the site, it's sufficient for the regions given the amount of waste that's going to landfill and it depending on the calorific value of the waste, the actual throughput will be lower than that.

01:02:17:07 - 01:02:41:02

At. Thank you for that clarification. You mentioned in your response the calorific content of the waste and that you are working on a maximum, which actually leads me to my next question. So on paragraph one, point one, point two of the warfare, you stated proposed development would recover useful energy in the form of electricity.

01:02:41:29 - 01:02:42:14

Um.

01:02:43:22 - 01:03:12:22

In the form of electricity and steam from over half a million tons of non-recyclable, residual non-hazardous, municipal, commercial and industrial waste each year, and that this has a generating capacity of over 50MW of electricity and export stream. A steam pardon. How confident is the applicant that there is that you actually be able to reach that output capacity of the over 50MW of electricity that you mentioned?

01:03:14:01 - 01:03:45:09

A pull carry for the applicant. Very confident in the process that we use. Incineration is very well proven. The efficiency of the boiler and all of the systems that we employ turn as much of that energy in the waste into useful energy. If it's electricity only then it would be 53MW going into the grid, which is well needed. And the circumstances we find ourselves with high import prices for fossil fuels.

01:03:45:11 - 01:04:14:09

So this would be immune from that pricing process. Um, if we supply steam, then naturally the amount of electricity would go down because you would be diverting steam away from the steam turbine, but that would still be an even better use of the energy, more efficient overall. But this is the best way of turning the waste in the energy into useful energy in the form of electricity and steam. Does that hope that answers your question?

01:04:14:24 - 01:04:43:24

It does answer my question. Thank you very much. And can I also ask if you have established a minimum amount of waste of fuel waste required to achieve a similar output? I know and I do understand that it depends on the composition of the waste, but have you done any work or any calculations in order to look at the minimum amount of waste fuel that would be required?

01:04:44:16 - 01:05:17:18

Paul Carey For the applicant? Yes, sir. We have what's called a firing diagram for the facility, which shows the broad combinations of different forms of different levels of calorific value versus the tonnage going through. When the calorific value is at its highest, the tonnage will be reduced to about just over 520,000 tonnes a year. I think it's actually 523,000. I can't I can't read the number from this distance. I'm afraid. 522,500 tonnes is the exact figure.

01:05:17:20 - 01:05:18:05

Sorry.

01:05:18:13 - 01:05:25:12

Mr. Kerry, for brevity. Actually, can I please ask you to confirm which document you're reading that information from just so that we can follow?

01:05:26:17 - 01:05:28:01

A Tim Marks will tell you that Sir.

01:05:28:21 - 01:05:39:25

Tim Marks for the applicant. It's in environmental statement, Chapter three Description of the Development. It's in section 3.5.2.

01:05:41:02 - 01:05:44:20

3.5.2. Thank you very much. Please continue.

01:05:51:01 - 01:05:51:16

So

01:05:53:05 - 01:06:25:29

that that capacity. Yes. Sorry. Just spoke to the applicant just to confirm that figure of 523,500 tons is derived from our firing diagram, which defines the full characteristics of the boiler. So the thermal capacity of 100MW is what sets those tonnage ranges. So depending on the calorific value, the tonnage can be as low as 523,500 tons and as high as 625,600 tons when the CV is at its lowest.

01:06:26:21 - 01:06:27:07

Right.

01:06:27:11 - 01:06:55:00

And thank you for that. And throughout the document on several different points you actually highlight still in relation to need that there is local need for the electricity and the energy in the form of steam that you will be producing. Can you please confirm, um, evidence of local industries that would be willing to use the power exported?

01:06:56:15 - 01:07:28:20

Paul Carey for the applicant. We've had discussions with a number of potential off takers. I'm not prepared to disclose commercially confidential information if that's permitted because it would be wrong to do so. We're confident that in the fullness of time we will find users for the for the steam, the electricity will go into the grid that then disperses into the local system. And there's always capacity for more electricity because it would displace other forms of electricity, such as gas and coal fired generation.

01:07:28:22 - 01:07:31:29

So that is also a benefit of this project.

01:07:33:13 - 01:07:35:20

Mr. Kerry. I accept that there are.

01:07:39:07 - 01:08:10:05

Business sensitivity issues around some of these contracts. Nevertheless, on your proposal, you already state and you're already showing the diagrams of the works being proposed. You you already you're already show generation in connection to specific sites in terms of steam. So my question is, uh, there is already some information in the public domain in terms of where that steam will go. So my question is, I do not want the details.

01:08:10:07 - 01:09:03:25

And actually, if you feel more comfortable, we would be willing to actually receive this information in writing and redact appropriately, uh, any confidential, sensitive, um, financial information that might be included. But what I'm asking is more general. What I'm asking is, um, have you had this conversation with local industries? Uh, have they said that in principle they would be willing to use the power exported if the application is actually accept it and permission is granted? Um, and is there any evidence that you can provide us of those conversations? And obviously this is important for us in terms of looking at the benefits of the proposal, because as I'm sure that you understand, it will give us more certainty in terms of the overall benefits that you have highlighted in your response.

01:09:03:27 - 01:09:06:28

So that is the reason why I'm asking the questions I'm asking.

01:09:08:21 - 01:09:44:23

Paul. Care for the applicant? Um. We've had a number of discussions with local potential users. We've included in our proposed development a pipeline that would enable us to reach several of those users. It may become obvious when you look at the drawings, who they are. We have explored opportunities, but as you can might imagine, until we actually get consent, if we get consent, no one is really going to want to speak to us in in any detailed terms about what we can do.

01:09:45:05 - 01:10:19:24

And especially we would not get into commercial details such as pricing of of steam or electricity. Um, suffice it to say, though, that it would always be of commercial benefit to an off taker of either steam or what we call license exempt electricity. This is electricity that's supplied via a private cable. And there would also be always be large commercial benefits to the end user by taking steam or electricity from our facility rather than generating their own or importing it from the grid.

01:10:20:07 - 01:10:25:23

And beyond that, I can't really say any more because of the commercial sensitivities of the subject.

01:10:29:04 - 01:10:31:23

Thank you for that, Mr. Kerry. Um.

01:10:33:05 - 01:10:35:27

I think. Um. Well.

01:10:36:18 - 01:10:55:27

You have mentioned in your documents you have already mentioned some some of these sites. So on the sites that you have mentioned, can I ask if. You have had initial in-principle conversations in terms of use of any power or steam that you'll be producing.

01:10:57:05 - 01:10:58:09

Yes, we have.

01:10:59:08 - 01:11:08:23

Right. Wood. Is there any evidence that you would be willing to actually submit to us in order for us to assess that?

01:11:11:02 - 01:11:42:05

I'll have to take counsel on that, sir, because I need to check whether or not we are permitted to do so with any non-disclosure agreements that we might have first, and then also to check the particular details that you might want to have. As I said, it's often the case that people won't want to enter into

any detailed conversations until we know that we have a project that we can deliver. In other words, we have a development consent order to allow us to build the facility. So we do not expect to go into any great detail with anybody at this stage.

01:11:43:09 - 01:11:45:06

Thank you. Thank you for that.

01:11:45:15 - 01:11:46:00

Um.

01:11:47:29 - 01:11:50:05

Thank you for that response, Mr. Kerry. That's fine.

01:11:50:16 - 01:11:51:01

Um.

01:11:51:20 - 01:11:53:03

Can I ask.

01:11:53:05 - 01:11:54:12

Um, I have.

01:11:54:15 - 01:12:00:15

Six hands raised as well. Uh, Mr. Rales.

01:12:02:03 - 01:12:04:10

I think that you were the first one to raise your hand.

01:12:05:07 - 01:12:38:13

Yeah. In Cambridge. Friends of the Earth again. Mr. Kerry mentioned earlier on that part of the recycling process for the bottom ash with the removal of paper and plastic. Now, to my mind, that suggests that the actual incineration process isn't a very efficient way of releasing the energy embodied in the waste stream, and that recycling will be a much more efficient way of achieving that. And that's in addition to the implications of incomplete combustion, which are the creation of dioxins inference from incompletely burnt organic and chlorinated compounds.

01:12:39:00 - 01:12:39:21

Thank you. Thank you.

01:12:39:29 - 01:13:06:18

Thank you for that point. Mr. Wells. Can I suggest that you submit that as part of your written representation of your oral intervention today at the next deadline? Deadline for. I'm just mindful that we have actually moved on from that specific topic. And I, I'm mindful of the agenda, if that is okay. And then I can ask the applicant to answer that in writing.

01:13:07:09 - 01:13:09:18

Apologies. Yes, certainly will do. Thank you very much.

01:13:09:26 - 01:13:22:27

Sorry, sir. Sorry, sir. Okay. For the applicant. I don't know how I can raise my hand without physically putting it up. I just want to clarify. I think what I said was that the metals in the bottom mesh would have no paper or plastic apologies.

01:13:22:29 - 01:13:38:08

But. But I we have sort of covered the topic and Mr.. Mr. Ross has already Mr. Wells has actually agreed to submit that question in writing. So I would prefer that we actually then addressed it in writing. Thank you, Mr. Howlett.

01:13:46:28 - 01:14:30:18

Joseph Howlett representing Wisden. I'd like to come back to Mr. Carey's points, particularly pertaining to supply steam and the customers that have been detailed in their environmental statement to 2022, chapter three, where they talk about constructing the steam line alongside the railway line to Wisdom Lane over Wisdom Lane and the two companies in question, the two largest, largest steam users in the vicinity, Lamb, Weston and Nestlé Purina are both mentioned as potential customers for the steam.

01:14:32:05 - 01:15:04:00

Now, they've been mentioned from day one in their proposals, and I believe Mr. Carey, at one of his previous hearings, said he's driven past here many times over the last ten years, looking at all the lovely steam coming out of the whispered trading estate, obviously salivating on when he can get his incinerator built. But I have to stress, we've written to both of these customers and we have submitted their responses in library submission. 1095.

01:15:04:10 - 01:15:11:22

You've got those at hand, and both those companies state they have no intention of dealing with at all.

01:15:13:13 - 01:15:23:14

Lamb Weston Quite vociferously. And also they have woodwind posters on their perimeter stating their objection to the incinerator.

01:15:23:27 - 01:15:25:12

Thank you for that, Mr. Howlett.

01:15:25:22 - 01:15:35:25

Furthermore, more importantly, Motorhead, please, if you could allow me that time, sir. Nestlé Nestlé Purina is a multinational company who

01:15:37:12 - 01:15:58:24

possibly generate more steam than Lamb. Weston and their chief executive officer for Europe, states that they have no real objection to energy from waste sites. But they specifically say the location of this site in Wisbech is not correct. It's not suitable. That's my submission. Thank you.

01:15:59:11 - 01:16:01:11

Thank you very much for that, Mr. Howlett.

01:16:01:22 - 01:16:05:13

Can I ask the applicant to reply to Mr. Howard's submission, please?

01:16:07:23 - 01:16:21:11

Paul Carey For the applicant. As I've said before, I'm not going to reveal commercially confidential discussions, and it's unusual for any company to commit to anything ahead of a facility being given consent to build.

01:16:23:16 - 01:16:25:27

Thank. Thank you very much for this response.



01:16:26:09 - 01:16:30:18

Claire Broderick for the applicant. It might also be helpful just to

01:16:32:05 - 01:17:11:17

reiterate the tests that are set out in national policy. Statement one Both the adopted statements and also the revised draft that was published by the government in March of this year. And paragraph 4.7. 19 of the adopted NPS, Ian, one does allow for a situation where there are not any um, existing customers that have expressed a firm commitment to take any steam or power, but where there could be customers in the future, which is the situation that Mr.

01:17:11:19 - 01:17:52:13

Kerry has described here, where there isn't an ability to provide necessarily written confirmation at this stage in the process, but where it's possible for an applicant to reach an agreement with a potential heat customer during the lifetime of the facility, the Secretary of State is able to impose a requirement to ensure that the state generating station is ready and to allow heat supply at a later date. We've obviously designed the proposed development to be ready, as can be seen from the components that form part of the works packages and in particular the connection and a requirement requirement.

01:17:52:15 - 01:18:20:16

25 of schedule two has been included in the draft development consent order, which was submitted at deadline three, which is REP 3006, and that includes an obligation on the applicant to provide reporting on the availability of. So I think it's important to appreciate that the policy does provide for the current situation. Thank you.

01:18:23:17 - 01:18:26:12

Thank you for that, Mr. Broderick. Um.

01:18:29:06 - 01:18:34:09

May I ask now, Mr. Counselor? Michael Dooley, if you would like to intervene.

01:18:35:16 - 01:19:06:10

Thank you, sir. Yes. My question is regarding to size and generating capacity. The applicant has expressed a desire to move towards carbon neutrality and has reserved space for carbon capture and storage. So the question is, um. What? What is the parasitic load expected for this carbon capture and storage? And will it drop a significantly below the 50MW? And should we have due regard for this? Thank you.

01:19:07:24 - 01:19:10:27

And thank you for that question. Councillor McAuley.

01:19:10:29 - 01:19:13:09

We do have a hearing on a.

01:19:13:11 - 01:19:15:23

Carbon capture proposed.

01:19:15:25 - 01:19:21:07

As well tomorrow on climate change, including carbon mitigation and carbon capture Wednesday.

01:19:21:09 - 01:19:23:27

So I would perhaps.

01:19:23:29 - 01:19:27:15

Suggest that we pick that specific issue tomorrow.

01:19:29:07 - 01:19:29:22

Um.

01:19:30:08 - 01:19:32:16

If that is acceptable. Thank you.

01:19:32:29 - 01:19:33:14

Uh.

01:19:34:27 - 01:19:35:27

Mr. Howlett, you.

01:19:35:29 - 01:19:39:21

Still have your hand raised. Is it left from your previous intervention?

01:19:43:01 - 01:19:45:06

Possibly. Yes, sir. Um.

01:19:45:19 - 01:19:46:08

If I could.

01:19:46:10 - 01:19:50:27

Ask you to then lower your hand, please, just so that we can then continue.

01:19:50:29 - 01:19:51:26

Thank you very much.

01:20:03:18 - 01:20:05:09

And my next question.

01:20:05:11 - 01:20:35:20

Is also for the applicant. And it's in relation with the the updated version of the Wofford West fuel availability assessment. And can the applicant please present the key changes carried out in terms of the updates, including update of the baseline position? But I had this question prepared, but I understand that now actually with the next update that you are going to provide us, I believe that probably.

01:20:35:28 - 01:20:36:13

Um.

01:20:36:22 - 01:20:48:15

You would rather then talk us through the update in terms of the baseline at, um, after you submit the next update of the is that case, can I just ask the applicant to confirm that?

01:20:51:01 - 01:21:00:13

Yes, sir. Claire Brown for the applicant? Yes. We would prefer to just wrap all the changes up in one hit just for clarity.

01:21:00:17 - 01:21:01:13

Yes. Okay.

01:21:01:16 - 01:21:02:10

That makes.

01:21:02:20 - 01:21:07:00

That makes sense to me. Uh, can. Can I just, um.

01:21:10:14 - 01:21:12:09

All right. Can I just ask.

01:21:12:11 - 01:21:13:09

Then, in terms of.

01:21:13:11 - 01:21:15:16

Current updates? Um.

01:21:16:03 - 01:21:37:01

Can the applicant please just explain on a very high level and I know that you have done this already, but it is to sort of set us up to the next set of questions. Can the applicant please explain how they have arrived to the conclusions in relation to local needs? So I'm not looking at national waste. I'm looking at local need now, please.

01:21:39:17 - 01:22:11:25

Yes, sir. Claire Brown for the applicant in terms of local needs. Just very broadly, we've we've defined a study area, the same study area from the first version to the second version of the of the woofer based upon a two hour drive time. However that where that two hour drive time, um, spills into a waste planning authority area, we've included the entirety of that waste planning authority area in the study area.

01:22:11:27 - 01:22:52:01

The reason for being is because the, the part of the the local analysis that is underpinned by the evidence bases that underpin waste local plans, the very documents that plan for future needs of of waste management in the area that we're looking at. So what we've sought to do in the update to the local analysis is, is not only apply the latest um, arising and disposal data published data through national data sources such as the Environment Agency and local authority collected waste returns.

01:22:52:16 - 01:23:25:05

But we've also sought to update where um local waste local planning authorities in the study area of updated their own need assessments. So consultees very helpfully steered us to those to those areas where planning authorities have updated either their evidence base or their local plan, or when we did the first version of the fuel availability assessment, a local plan may have been emerging and it's subsequently either adopted or come through a later stage.

01:23:25:07 - 01:23:46:07

So we've not only just reflected updated baseline data, but also the updated evidence bases and narrative around those has been provided as well in the updated fuel availability assessment that really summarizes the change for the for the local analysis.

01:23:46:26 - 01:23:47:19

Thank you for that.

01:23:47:21 - 01:23:48:15

Explanation, Mrs..

01:23:48:17 - 01:23:52:22

Brown. Um, I would like us to then would like us to.

01:23:52:24 - 01:24:10:09

Question and then actually looking a little bit more detail in terms of the area that you have actually mentioned, catchment area. And perhaps I would suggest that we look at graphic two of the what I'm going to try and actually share that on my screen.

01:24:10:26 - 01:24:11:11

Um.

01:24:12:07 - 01:24:25:15

So that everyone can see, can I please ask someone to confirm that they can actually see graph to the location plan for two hours travel time of heavy goods vehicle.

01:24:28:06 - 01:24:31:03

Gary McGovern for the applicant. Yes, sir. We can certainly see it.

01:24:31:23 - 01:24:35:05

Thank you. Thank you for that confirmation. Um, so.

01:24:35:07 - 01:25:11:29

Looking at this specific, uh, graphic, uh, you obviously highlight three catchment areas, one hour travel time, which is the red. Then you have a purplish color, which is a two hour time travel, which is the one that you have just mentioned. Now, Mrs. Brown, in your intervention and also the three hour travel time, if we actually look at the purple one, which obviously is in the middle of the other two circles, we actually see that a significant amount.

01:25:12:01 - 01:25:14:00

And I'll say actually the majority.

01:25:14:18 - 01:25:15:15

Of.

01:25:15:17 - 01:25:17:27

Of the areas. Um.

01:25:19:12 - 01:25:32:12

In some of the West local authorities. There were found by some of the West local authorities, particularly around the Essex, Hertfordshire.

01:25:33:07 - 01:25:35:27

Half of.

01:25:36:09 - 01:25:44:20

I believe this would be Central Bedfordshire and a significant proportion as well of Suffolk actually lie.

01:25:45:03 - 01:25:47:02

Out in lay away from.

01:25:47:04 - 01:25:51:02

The two hour driving distance. So can I ask.

01:25:51:15 - 01:25:54:01

First of all, do you actually.

01:25:54:03 - 01:26:28:03

Think that, for example, in the most extreme case, which is actually Hertfordshire in Essex, do you actually think that it is suitable for you to take the waste from those areas into consideration, considering that according to your own defined scope area and according to your own report, you do say that two hours travel time for heavy goods vehicles starts to become an viable. UM, and what sort of work have you done or could you potentially do in order to address that issue?

01:26:31:25 - 01:27:04:18

Claire Brown for the applicants. I think the first point I would like to stress is that the as far as the fuel availability assessments are concerned, the two hour drive time is an indicative tool. It's not never meant as a hard and fast, you know, sort of line in the sands. Waste flows across local authority boundaries, waste flows across regional boundaries and depending upon the availability of capacity and the type of waste, it can flow much further afield.

01:27:04:20 - 01:27:45:00

We're seeing waste being exported outside of the UK. We also see a lot of waste, you know, flowing from the east of England across to the across country. So that to that two hour drive time was only ever an indicative tool to use in the assessment. And yes, that tool is very much based upon professional judgment and that professional judgment. Um, is around the commercial judgment of our clients in that you get much past two hours, then things, things don't become unviable, but they become more expensive.

01:27:45:10 - 01:27:52:29

So two hours was deemed to be a reasonable line in the sands to draw. I don't know if my, my colleague.

01:27:53:12 - 01:27:54:21

If, um, if.

01:27:54:28 - 01:27:59:03

If, if I'm a mrs. Brown Just to press a little bit more on that point.

01:27:59:05 - 01:28:00:00

I.

01:28:00:02 - 01:28:01:06

Understand what.

01:28:01:08 - 01:28:02:22

You are saying and I understand.

01:28:02:24 - 01:28:07:23

That there isn't a hard and fast rule and that obviously.

01:28:07:25 - 01:28:08:10

Um.

01:28:08:22 - 01:28:40:06

It will also depend on traffic. It will also depend on the quality of the roads. It will depend on a series of different factors. The fact remains that your own report and your own professional judgment has actually established a two hour distance from the site as a reasonable distance in order to transport waste in the way that you are proposing. That is your assessment. That is what you have based your assessment on, and that's what you have based your justification in terms of catchment area on.

01:28:40:13 - 01:29:17:13

So bearing that in mind and bearing in mind that, for example, I'm going to pick again on Hertfordshire and Essex, but particularly Essex, which I note that in terms of the waste, um, suitable to be brought into your facility is actually one of the local um, local waste authorities that has the highest quantity in a, in quite a high, high number on the tables that you that we have covered before. So considering that actually the vast majority of it is outside of the two hour catchment area, I do ask.

01:29:17:15 - 01:29:18:03

Again.

01:29:18:13 - 01:29:26:13

Why do we think that it is justifiable to actually include that as part of your calculations?

01:29:27:22 - 01:29:58:23

So if my answer to that is poor care for the applicant in the waste industry, um, cost is clearly always important. So much of this waste is carried by private companies on behalf of local authorities. So in the case of Essex, for example, they did have a contract with a private company that has been terminated and Essex are currently tendering with the public, with the private sector for their ways to be taken away to locations yet to be identified.

01:29:59:09 - 01:30:44:23

Cambridgeshire has a contract with a private company that deals with this waste, and each of these companies will have the job of disposing of the waste at a location that suitable for them, both in terms of physical location, but also economic sensitivities. The cost to the company that has to dispose of that local authority waste depends on two things. Firstly, the gate fee that we would charge them and secondly, the transport cost. The two together is what the company will consider and if they consider it suitable to pay X, which is which is a factor of A plus B let's say as long as X is within their budget, they will take the waste from wherever it is, and that may well be beyond the two hour limit.

01:30:44:25 - 01:31:23:01

The two hour limit is not a limit. It's a guide for what is economically sensible. But it doesn't exclude waste coming from further afield. And it all comes down to the balance or the total of the gate fee that we would charge them, which is a variable number. We don't always charge the same gate fee to the same company. It's not a standard fixed rate. It's a number that we will offer as part of a tender. And the company that's dealing with the local authority waste will then make its judgment based on that price plus the transport price and whether that fits within the budget that they've allowed for in dealing with their contract with the local authority.

01:31:23:03 - 01:31:51:12

So it's mostly driven by economics. It's not the two hours is purely a guide. One thing I would like to point out, it has been said by one of the participants that we would be taking waste from 200 miles away, which I think that would certainly be a stretch too far. But two hours is purely a guide on where the waste will come from. Not an absolute limit. Thank you. Hope that answers. Um.

01:31:52:10 - 01:31:54:13

It. It does in part, but.

01:31:54:15 - 01:31:56:07

I'm.

01:31:56:09 - 01:31:58:28

Apologies, but I'm going to have to actually press this point.

01:31:59:12 - 01:32:02:13

And and Mike, I'm still.

01:32:02:15 - 01:32:03:17

Not 100%.

01:32:03:19 - 01:32:04:25

Clear in.

01:32:04:27 - 01:32:05:12

Terms.

01:32:05:14 - 01:32:05:29

Of.

01:32:06:18 - 01:32:08:13

Picking again at

01:32:09:29 - 01:32:39:29

the example of Essex. But there are other examples here as we can actually see. But peaking again on the example of Essex, If if what you are saying is correct, then Mr. Carey then my question would be what conversations have you had with the Essex Waste Planning Authority in order to actually ensure that they would be willing in principle to actually transport the waste to your facility and.

01:32:42:05 - 01:32:45:15

And that would actually be more economically.

01:32:45:17 - 01:32:46:22

Viable for them.

01:32:46:26 - 01:32:50:24

So I understand that it is possible.

01:32:50:27 - 01:32:52:17

But how likely.

01:32:52:19 - 01:32:59:15

Is it and what sort of evidence can you actually provide to the examining authority of such likelihood?

01:33:00:21 - 01:33:38:17

And the pull carry for the applicants. To answer your question specifically about Essex, we have not had any conversations with Essex County Council and we would unlikely to have any with them directly because they would come out for a tender. And they recently announced, for example, that

they have terminated a tender process. They had started because they were unable to get suitable bids and they're going to restart that tender. But that tender would be for a variety of operations, which would include final disposal of the waste, and we would only act as a subcontractor to one of those tenderers.

01:33:38:19 - 01:34:17:12

So the tenderer would be the one that would speak to Essex. The tenderer would be the one that proposes a total price for the services they offer to Essex, and we would act as a subcontractor to that company for part of the waste, the residual waste fraction that would then come to us in Bedworth should we be successful. And that would come down to, as I said, the combination of the gate fee that we would charge to the tenderer and the cost of transport that the tenderer would then have to pay for, and often impractical fact waste that might be collected in what we call a refuse collection vehicle will be taken to a waste transfer station.

01:34:17:14 - 01:34:49:05

And what we're talking about is really waste that comes from the waste transfer station originating in the in the larger vehicles that would come to us. So we would not receive refuse collection vehicles from Essex. We would only receive what we call waste transfer vehicles, large bulk lorries that would come up from Essex and they may well be bringing waste that comes from further afield, even though they start their journey from much closer to us. I hope that tries to explain the vagaries of the waste management industry.

01:34:50:06 - 01:34:56:19

It does begin to explain, but my question still remains then in terms of.

01:34:58:15 - 01:35:18:10

Providing certainty to the fuel availability assessment and the numbers that you have actually included in your assessment. Then my next question would be what sort of work have you actually carried out with these local authorities, particularly the ones that are more distanced, that require distance from your facility.

01:35:18:12 - 01:35:18:27

In.

01:35:18:29 - 01:35:27:13

Order to actually ascertain how likely it is that there would be willing to transport the waste to.

01:35:27:15 - 01:35:28:19

Your facility?

01:35:28:24 - 01:35:41:00

And also, have you, for example, taken into consideration other facilities that would be able to process these weights to that might actually be closer to those.

01:35:41:02 - 01:35:41:18

Local.

01:35:41:26 - 01:35:42:19

Authorities?

01:35:46:20 - 01:36:20:07

Gary McGovern for the applicant. Just before I might pass back to Mr. Kerry for any further responses he may want to give. I think it is important to bring this discussion back to the policy tests



that apply here, which do not require an applicant to demonstrate certainty as to exactly where all waste streams may come. It's about demonstrating that there is sufficient capacity in the local level and also at the national level, and that provision of a facility of that proposal would not result in overcapacity, and that is the function of the woofer.

01:36:20:09 - 01:36:54:28

And that is what Miss Brown has demonstrated through the analysis that she's done. And just to clarify, in relation to the two hour limit, as Ms.. Brown explained, that was a starting point and a benchmark that was used when considering what the study area should be. It's not the outer boundary or limit, as Mr. Kerry has explained, of where waste may still come from. And the study area that was used for the woofer and includes reflects the waste management areas because that is the way that the data I understand is compiled.

01:36:55:00 - 01:36:59:24

So there is good reason for adopting that study area. Thank you, sir.

01:37:01:06 - 01:37:05:24

Mr. McGovern. Two points. I am aware of what the.

01:37:05:26 - 01:37:07:09

National policy is.

01:37:07:24 - 01:37:08:09

And.

01:37:08:15 - 01:37:43:09

The questions that I'm asking have got to do with the planning balance and how the examining authority can best assess the benefits of this planning application. So I am quite aware of what the requirements of the national policy, but nevertheless, the examining authority still needs to do a planning balance and the benefits of this planning application are intrinsically linked with disposal of waste. Therefore, I do think that my question is still valid in light of the planning balance that the examining authority needs to make.

01:37:44:13 - 01:37:48:27

The second point that I would like to make is that.

01:37:48:29 - 01:37:53:25

You have defined the two hour boundary that.

01:37:53:27 - 01:37:58:02

Was done via the applicant. The applicant.

01:37:58:20 - 01:38:00:14

Can just confirm, Can.

01:38:00:16 - 01:38:04:13

People hear me? Because I believe that my camera has just shut down.

01:38:06:13 - 01:38:08:00

We can hear you in London. Yes.

01:38:09:00 - 01:38:09:21

Right?

01:38:09:27 - 01:38:10:13

Yes, sir.

01:38:11:00 - 01:38:13:07

I'm just going to restart my camera.

01:38:21:10 - 01:38:24:17

Okay. Think that my camera is back on. Thank you. Um.

01:38:25:22 - 01:38:26:07

Is.

01:38:26:11 - 01:38:29:10

As I was saying, the two hour boundary, the two.

01:38:29:12 - 01:38:32:01

Hour catchment area.

01:38:32:09 - 01:38:53:28

Has been defined by the applicant based on professional opinion. So I do think that this part of the examining process of the waste fuel availability assessment document that you have produced, I do think it is appropriate for me to query that specific boundary and to actually look into question why.

01:38:54:00 - 01:38:55:02

Local.

01:38:55:20 - 01:39:09:05

Waste planning, local authorities, that the majority of the waste planning local authority is actually outside the two hour line that you have defined why that has been included.

01:39:10:27 - 01:39:13:18

I'm not really understanding why.

01:39:13:28 - 01:39:14:13

Um.

01:39:14:26 - 01:39:15:26

I'm receiving.

01:39:15:28 - 01:39:16:19

Comments.

01:39:17:03 - 01:39:20:26

In relation to the contents of the national policy.

01:39:23:11 - 01:40:06:27

Claire Brown For the applicant, If I may clarify, sir. Um, the, the two hour drive time when we talk about the local study area for the woofer, the local study area is, is not the area inside the two hour, two hour contour line, the two hour contour and the two hour drive time line has been used to enable us to define a suitable study area. Um, and the reason that the two hour contour line is, is not our

study area is because when we're looking at the future local needs, the future local waste management needs.

01:40:07:05 - 01:40:49:07

Um, as we all know, um, waste management needs our plans at a waste planning authority level, which is two tier authorities, is a county level. Um, and then the unitary level. So what we've done is we've used that two hour contour to say, okay, so we've got, you know, half of, half of this area falls within two hours. But, but because future needs are planned for on a, on a wider basis, we then use that two hours to say, well, we're going to look at the whole of that waste planning authority area and their future needs because our two hour, hour, two hour drive time cut falls within it.

01:40:49:09 - 01:40:50:16

So in short.

01:40:51:03 - 01:40:54:15

I understand that point. Okay, I understand that.

01:40:54:17 - 01:40:55:26

But, um.

01:40:56:22 - 01:41:18:19

So first of all, let's just confirm that the local authorities that you have included in your calculations and that have actually shown in graphic two of the met with local plan for two hour travel time of heavy goods vehicles which are the local waste authorities that then you have used based on your calculations, can you just confirm yes or no?

01:41:18:22 - 01:41:19:11

Yes.

01:41:19:15 - 01:41:20:20

Yes. Okay.

01:41:20:22 - 01:41:23:19

Those are identified because those lie within the.

01:41:23:21 - 01:41:24:12

Two hour.

01:41:25:00 - 01:41:26:01

Study area.

01:41:27:11 - 01:41:29:22

Yes. Yeah, that's right. Yeah.

01:41:30:02 - 01:41:38:08

In that case, my question maintains and remains, which is if you if those are the local.

01:41:38:10 - 01:41:39:04

Authorities.

01:41:39:06 - 01:41:43:11

That you have identified, the local authorities that you have identified.

01:41:43:20 - 01:41:44:27

Are likely.

01:41:44:29 - 01:42:13:00

To actually be able to use your facility and that you are underpinning your waste fuel availability assessment based on the waste coming from those local authorities, because part of that local authority is within the two hour drive time from your facility. Then my question remains, when the majority of that local of of the local waste planning authority.

01:42:13:02 - 01:42:15:09

Lies outside.

01:42:15:11 - 01:42:23:04

Of that of those two hours, what is your justification for including that? That is my question.

01:42:24:09 - 01:42:25:24

Is it clear now?

01:42:26:21 - 01:42:31:00

The question is clear, sir. I'm going to defer to my colleague, Paul. Mr. Kerry.

01:42:31:12 - 01:42:31:27

Thank you.

01:42:32:27 - 01:43:04:10

Paul, for the applicant. Three points to make for me, sir. Firstly, the size of this facility and the woofers is not based just on local authority. Waste arising is. It's based on commercial and industrial waste, which comes from a variety of sources. The second point is, as I tried to mention earlier, we would not deal directly with waste authorities. We would simply act as a subcontractor to private sector companies that would then tender for that waste.

01:43:04:12 - 01:43:20:25

And it's as a result, we have not had direct discussions with any waste local authority, but it's likely that that tender would require the private sector companies that tender for that waste to take all of the authority's waste and just that part which had read.

01:43:21:08 - 01:43:24:04

And have you had conversations with those.

01:43:24:27 - 01:43:26:17

Other waste companies?

01:43:26:28 - 01:43:40:09

Yes. Yes, we have. And we've had expressions of interest from those companies that would like to send us waste should we get consent. So we happily provide some of those in evidence to you, but they are private.

01:43:40:13 - 01:43:41:28

That would be greatly appreciated.

01:43:42:00 - 01:43:44:12

So can I get an action on that, please?

01:43:44:27 - 01:43:54:21

That the applicant will provide the examining authority with evidence of contacts in principle.

01:43:55:21 - 01:43:56:21

Of.

01:43:57:22 - 01:44:03:00

With other waste companies that would be able to redirect waste.

01:44:03:13 - 01:44:04:12

To.

01:44:04:18 - 01:44:05:24

Your facility.

01:44:08:01 - 01:44:09:21

Yes, sir. Please continue, Mr. Kerry.

01:44:10:12 - 01:44:40:13

The final point is that outside of these hearings since the last hearing, we have entered into some discussions with Cambridgeshire County Council. Mr. Briggs, who was on the call earlier. And we're cautiously optimistic that we can reach an agreement on the wording of some terms that would be incorporated into the order, including some conditions that they would like us to comply with concerning materials that could otherwise have been recycled. So I think by the maybe the next deadline, I'm not too sure which deadline.

01:44:40:15 - 01:44:55:04

Deadline five, I'm told we'll be able to provide you with something that has been agreed with Cambridgeshire County Council that would regulate the amount of waste and where it comes from and how we deal with waste moving waste up the waste hierarchy.

01:44:55:15 - 01:44:58:06

And that would be the same deadline as the updated offer.

01:44:58:08 - 01:44:59:21

So yes, yes, that.

01:44:59:23 - 01:45:00:20

Would be acceptable.

01:45:00:27 - 01:45:03:09

And I am mindful that I have one.

01:45:03:11 - 01:45:05:09

Hand raised, but I also am mindful that.

01:45:05:11 - 01:45:07:24

Previously Mr..

01:45:07:27 - 01:45:09:00

Barnett has actually.

01:45:09:02 - 01:45:11:21

Expressed some.

01:45:11:25 - 01:45:24:11

Desires to actually intervene on location. So, Mr. Burton, if you are still with us, can I ask you if you would, if you'd like to come in now, I think that now might be a good appropriate point.

01:45:25:00 - 01:45:55:01

Yes. Thank. Thank you, sir. Mean. Mean. Think. You've asked a lot of the questions that I wanted to answer anyway, so I won't. I won't belabor the point. Um, but one of the things I'm going to think that hasn't been really just discussed is the proximity principle. And a lot of these authorities have designated climate emergencies and and, you know, that has got to be a part of their future plans in ensuring that they do not enter into contracts, which is going to allow waste to be transported, you know, hundreds of kilometers, if not miles, to to the nearest facility.

01:45:55:17 - 01:46:32:13

Um, the other point I wanted to make as well in terms of Essex, obviously, as you mentioned, that a significant part of the residual waste requirement that the applicants are relying on comes from from Essex. And there obviously is a new energy from waste plant at River Hall, expected to be open at 2025, which is 595,000 tons. So nowhere in in the woofers does it give any indication of when you take into account these facilities that are under construction. So there is reasonable certainty that they will come on stream. There is no indication of what the final actual likely availability of residual waste will be, taking those into account as well.

01:46:32:15 - 01:47:02:13

And to go back to my earlier point, which wasn't actually answered by the applicant, was in terms of what are the implications of the environmental improvement plan targets, they discussed them, but they don't actually translate into any requirements. Um, and then just finally, just very quickly, I've said it out very clearly in my response to the deadline three the assumptions in terms of local plan requirements and, and my, my, my estimate is that there's actually a surplus of requirements, not a deficit. But don't propose to go in detail. That's all set out in my my representation.

01:47:02:18 - 01:47:06:22

Thank you. Um, thank you very much for that intervention, Missus Barnett. Thank you.

01:47:07:09 - 01:47:14:15

And ask the applicant to reply to those points. So and please correct me.

01:47:14:29 - 01:47:15:24

If I if.

01:47:15:26 - 01:47:21:28

I missed one of the points. I have four key points. The proximity principle.

01:47:22:07 - 01:47:22:22

Um,

01:47:24:03 - 01:47:25:16

the, um.

01:47:25:18 - 01:47:41:06

Other facilities for similar use that might be in the construction environmental plan and also um, issues to do with surplus identified. So can I ask.

01:47:41:25 - 01:47:42:19

The applicant to.

01:47:42:21 - 01:47:53:14

Come on those four key points? Believe that those are the four key points. Miss Barnett, please, please correct me if that's not if that's not right. But Miss.

01:47:53:16 - 01:47:55:21

Brown. That's correct. Thank you. Yeah. Thank you.

01:47:57:08 - 01:48:40:01

Clare Brown, for the applicant. Um, I'll turn to the point about, um, Essex first, if I may. Um, mean certainly the graphic that we've, we've seen today, it shows that a large, you know, a large swathe of, of Essex, it falls outside the two hour, two hour drive limit, although we have included the whole of Essex in the study area. Um, if I just turn said at the outset of this, this hearing, our fundamental basis upon which we're sort of resting our need case is on the amount of waste that goes to Non-hazardous landfill and diverting that material from Non-hazardous landfill.

01:48:40:03 - 01:49:17:02

And that's in scope materials and material that can be used as fuel. We have table 4.4 in the updated water waste fuel availability assessment, which we've already discussed today, which talks about the amount of material in on an authority by authority basis that's currently sent to Non-hazardous landfill. And Ms.. Barnett quite rightly points out that a large chunk of that 1.1 million tonnes of material currently rests within Essex and Essex is sending to landfill.

01:49:17:07 - 01:49:47:15

However, the total is still 2.4 million tonnes. So even taking out Essex from the equation, we are still very much in excess of the capacity that would be offered by the proposed development. We're still um, in excess, well in excess of a million tonnes of material in scope material going to landfill in the, in the study area.

01:49:48:03 - 01:50:24:09

And but, but mean we we've included Essex for for good reason. So just wanted to make that point there. In terms of the proximity principle, I think this point more widely comes back to the definition of the the study area itself. Um, material does cross cross boundaries, waste planning authority, boundaries that's recognised widely in, in developing waste local plans and planning for future needs and indeed most waste planning.

01:50:24:11 - 01:51:04:09

Authorities recognize that what matters is that they provide for a net equivalent of their waste risings. Um, so effectively in terms of proximity. The vast our study area broadly equates to the to the east of England study area, east of England region if you like. And um, we would argue that that there's certainly cases of waste travelling much further afield and that the two hour boundary, the two hour general area study area is something that complies with the proximity principle in that we're showing that there is a local need, i.e.

01:51:04:12 - 01:51:37:08

a localized regional need for that, for that material to be managed and indeed to stop material. There's a, there's material or 1.1 and a half, 11.5 sorry, beg pardon, almost 200,000 tonnes of material being exported. So from the study area. So in that respect, compliance with the proximity principle and

keeping that material domestically dealt with. Um, I'm just going to pause there to see if my colleague, Mr.

01:51:37:10 - 01:51:42:21

Kerry, has anything else to add on proximity before I come to the environmental improvement targets?

01:51:43:28 - 01:52:24:05

Yes. Just think it's useful to give you some what could be some real practical scenarios and remembering that over the life of this project, things will change as time goes on. But at the moment, for example, taking Essex, they have a big problem in that their mechanical and biological treatment plant failed completely. They terminated the contract and they have to return to that. It could well be should we get consent and mentioning revenue is valid that the contractor that wins that contract may well um decide to send some of the waste arrive and haul and some of the waste to us.

01:52:24:07 - 01:53:03:09

They would deal with all of Essex's waste and they would comply with their contract in that manner, but they wouldn't necessarily send it all to the same place. And revenue has been taken into account in the woofers. So that has already been factored in. If you take Norfolk as an example, they currently send all of their waste past Wisbech to Bedfordshire. Now that is on a contract that was initially for seven years. By the time we get built, if we get consent, we would be in a position to tender for that waste and it would therefore be if it came to us be complying with the proximity principle in that it would be dealt with much closer to Norfolk Cambridge's mechanical sorry.

01:53:03:11 - 01:53:23:23

So let me just finish this last point. Cambridge's mechanical biological treatment is widely known to be not working very well, and the majority of their waste goes to landfill. And the operator of that facility could easily send its waste to us. Therefore, bringing it up the waste hierarchy and complying with the proximity principle at the same time.

01:53:23:25 - 01:53:47:20

Thank you. Thank you for that response. Mr. Kerry, You have actually mentioned Essex Local Authority and the power that they would actually have in order to send waste to this facility, which would just like to point out that is exactly what was asking the question that I was asking earlier in terms of conversations with waste planning authorities that might have happened already. But putting that issue.

01:53:47:22 - 01:53:49:21

Aside, and I would.

01:53:49:23 - 01:53:59:03

Like you to still address the proximity principle and the environmental plan issue that Ms.. Barnett has raised as well.

01:54:01:22 - 01:54:37:09

Claire Brown for the applicants. In terms of the environmental improvement targets. Um, certainly the waste fuel availability assessment does seek to look forward. Um, it's, it looks specifically at and relies upon some information and market analysis provided by Vic, which looked at a series of potential residual waste scenarios, 20, 20, 30 residual waste scenarios.

01:54:37:11 - 01:55:20:15

And these scenarios all had a number of assumptions included around recycling, the achievement of recycling targets for household and municipal type commercial industrial waste and combined targets.



And just in summary, I mean, there were basically five different scenarios included in that study and the woofers zones in really on two of those scenarios, one of which is called the 55% household scenario, which despite its name, actually assumes a combined 2030 recycling rate of 60%.

01:55:21:03 - 01:55:58:00

That's the lower of the scenarios that the fuel availability assessment assumes. And on that scenario, it's predicted the market analysis predicts that in 2030 there will still be 24.5 million tonnes of residual waste needing treatment in the UK. Um, the second sort of more ambitious scenario that the Woofer considers is what we call the circular economy target, which assumes a combined recycling rate of 65% by 2030.

01:55:58:02 - 01:56:47:07

And that's the rate that aligns with current government aspirational targets to achieve 65% recycling. And even based on that very aspirational of that very sort of stretch target. Um, the scenarios are that scenario is predicting a shortfall of a residual waste amount of 21 million tonnes. Um, so when we look at what current capacity is in capacity and other in the, in the UK, we're still predicting, even assuming those um, two scenarios of 60% combined recycling and 65% combined recycling, a minimum shortfall of around 1.6 million tonnes a year.

01:56:47:14 - 01:56:51:28

And that's assuming those recycling recycling targets are achieved.

01:56:52:20 - 01:56:56:00

Thank you for that, Mrs. Brown. I'm I'm mindful of the time.

01:56:56:02 - 01:57:21:03

And said that we would have a break at 11:30. That time has passed, but I think it is important for us to actually just press with this issue now. So if everyone is okay with that, I would actually like to go back to Ms. Barnett that because her hand was raised again and also Mr. Andrew Fraser. Urquhart I believe that I've seen your hands raised earlier.

01:57:21:12 - 01:57:22:00

Um, can.

01:57:22:02 - 01:57:26:15

I just check if you'd still like to intervene just so that I can manage time?

01:57:27:14 - 01:57:32:10

Uh, sir? No, we put it up. But then the discussion moved on and covered the point we made.

01:57:33:06 - 01:57:33:25

Perfect.

01:57:34:11 - 01:57:48:15

Hang fire. I'm very conscious that you've set aside in the agenda a particular slot for us to respond. We've got 1 or 2 additions to the points that you're exploring now, but we'll come to those in due course, I'm sure.

01:57:49:03 - 01:57:52:27

Um, hopefully, yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Urquhart.

01:57:53:08 - 01:57:54:24

Miss Barnett. Then, please.

01:57:57:29 - 01:58:34:17

Thank you, sir. I'm just to come back to to some of the points and think in terms of the landfill in table 4.4, the applicant referred to and just said, you know, if you even if you took 1.1 million tonnes from Essex, you'd still have enough. But Essex isn't the only, only authority where a significant proportion of is outside the two if you do it. I mean, I've gone through the whole process and you'll see again I won't labour the point, but you'll see in my deadlines resubmission what I believe to be the actually more realistic figure. Um, secondly, in terms of the proximity principle, um, again, the applicant says it's about the net equivalent equivalent of waste arising.

01:58:34:19 - 01:59:04:22

So is the applicant saying that even by exporting all this waste to it elsewhere, they will be importing somewhere sufficient, so they'll still be have a net equivalent to waste arising in their own authority. I mean, don't think that analysis has been done. I'm not sure where Rivendell has been taken into account in the woofer and perhaps the applicant could just explain why that is the case. And just very just finally, again, the applicant talks about the 65% recycling targets, but the the environmental improvement plan that talks about 50% of residual waste.

01:59:04:26 - 01:59:13:15

So it's more than that. And and think we are talking about reduction in the first place. So you don't have that waste in the first place. So thank you.

01:59:13:17 - 01:59:16:13

Thank you for those points. Miss Barnett. I'm going to ask the.

01:59:16:15 - 01:59:17:05

Applicant to.

01:59:17:07 - 01:59:20:03

Reply, but may I suggest, just.

01:59:20:05 - 01:59:20:29

For.

01:59:21:20 - 01:59:47:05

Time management purposes, that actually if the answers that the applicant now gives, um, are not do not fully address your point. Can I just ask you to then submit that as part of your written representation to us following this hearing and then we'll give obviously the opportunity for the applicant to actually reply again more fully. So if that's acceptable, I see. Nodding saw that it is.

01:59:47:15 - 01:59:48:22

Um, I would.

01:59:49:08 - 01:59:51:28

Turn to the applicant please to reply to these points.

01:59:56:24 - 02:00:04:21

Claire Brown for the applicants. Um, okay. I'll deal with the relevant point first.

02:00:05:03 - 02:00:08:21

So in the woofer, um, we rely.

02:00:08:23 - 02:00:09:14

On.

02:00:09:16 - 02:00:18:21

Two analyses of capacity. Available capacity. Um, one is our own, which is set out in appendix C of.

02:00:18:23 - 02:00:26:00

The woofers, which Riven Hall is included. And the other calculation of capacity sits within the 12.

02:00:26:09 - 02:00:33:02

2022 report of capacity, which the Ms..

02:00:33:04 - 02:01:07:24

Barnett rightly points out is, is excluded from that from that document. Um, so it's included in one part and not in the other. Now the reason for that we rely on the capacity data which excludes Riven Hall. Um, but what we will, will need to do is review the 2023 update to total to see if it's being included, which I believe it has. But we, we will be taking that into account and including that in the updated waste fuel availability assessment.

02:01:08:03 - 02:01:23:05

Um, so whilst we've included it in Appendix C also relies upon the total capacity data which excluded revised hall, but in the updated version of the woofers. Um, that that should be should be remedied. So that's Riven.

02:01:23:07 - 02:01:23:25

Hall.

02:01:25:06 - 02:01:37:17

The 50% reduction. There's also narrative in the um in the updated waste fuel availability assessment around the achievement of a 50% reduction.

02:01:38:03 - 02:01:39:26

In residual waste.

02:01:40:10 - 02:01:53:09

Um, and that 50% reduction does mean the reduction in residual waste comes hand in hand with the achievement of overall recycling targets as well. Um, so we've made the.

02:01:53:11 - 02:01:54:09

Um.

02:01:54:11 - 02:02:38:08

Statement there that even with a 50% reduction in waste, clearly we're looking at some time. Hence here we're looking at not the position. Now this 50% reduction is something that would be achieved by 20 aim to be achieved by 2042. So it's some almost 20 years ahead. So we also have to take a view on in 20 years time, what capacity is there going to be? We can't assume that existing capacity, 20 years ahead is going to still be in place in 20 years time. Um, so we consider that there still would be, even with the achievement of that 50% reduction, a future need for, um, for this capacity offered by the proposed development.

02:02:38:10 - 02:03:02:21

Because ultimately, over the course of the next 20 years there will be um, facilities coming offline as the infrastructure ages and, and moves on. We are, we are talking a long time ahead. Um, now what

were the other points was one about the one about nest analysis. I can't recall what the other points were actually. Apologies. There was a lot there.

02:03:04:01 - 02:03:06:08

Miss Barnett, can I ask you to just.

02:03:06:10 - 02:03:07:21

Clarify, uh.

02:03:08:04 - 02:03:13:24

What just very quickly, if you can, in one word or two, your other points, just, you know, topic, really?

02:03:14:19 - 02:03:36:28

Yes, I'm just trying to go back to them. Yeah, it was about the proximity principle. And think you were saying it's got to be, you know, it's about net equivalent to waste arriving cause they got to deal with their own waste arising and they may export some and import some. So overall they've got a net equivalent. So just want to understand what analysis had been done to make sure that actually the waste planning authorities in the study area, that will be possible.

02:03:37:29 - 02:03:39:16

Right. Ms. Brown will hand over.

02:03:39:18 - 02:03:54:19

To you to actually reply to that point. But can I just ask you for the sake of time management that you tried to keep it briefly and obviously you have heard as well what have asked me to do in terms of a written representation of today's.

02:03:54:28 - 02:03:55:20

Oral.

02:03:55:24 - 02:03:56:09

Input.

02:03:56:11 - 02:03:57:16

So if.

02:03:57:18 - 02:04:02:19

You could just briefly address that and then more detail than can actually be done in.

02:04:02:21 - 02:04:03:20

Writing, please.

02:04:04:06 - 02:04:05:16

Yeah, of course.

02:04:05:29 - 02:04:13:22

Clare Brown for the applicant mean, certainly our analysis of the local assessment is based upon the waste of local plant evidence bases.

02:04:13:24 - 02:04:15:01

That underpin the.

02:04:15:03 - 02:04:35:11

Future needs assessments across the area. Now those assessments themselves are based upon this understanding that waste flows across of planning authority boundaries. Indeed, Cambridgeshire, as are other authorities across the east of England, signatories to a memorandum of understanding which talks about

02:04:37:03 - 02:04:42:09

waste flowing between the areas, but a commitment that each area is going to make the.

02:04:43:10 - 02:04:43:25

Set.

02:04:43:29 - 02:04:45:06

That we're going to have some further.

02:04:45:08 - 02:04:48:11

Questions on that later on today on this session. Okay.

02:04:48:13 - 02:04:49:20

So so.

02:04:50:15 - 02:04:51:02

Yes.

02:04:51:06 - 02:04:52:29

Anything else that you would like to add then?

02:04:53:01 - 02:04:54:17

No, I'll leave it there. So think.

02:04:54:19 - 02:05:04:01

Okay, Thank you very much. Right. Um, just very quickly then, um. I, considering the time, said.

02:05:04:03 - 02:05:09:16

That we would have a break at 11:30, which is now past, but did say that we would.

02:05:09:29 - 02:05:10:23

Actually have.

02:05:10:25 - 02:05:19:15

Another break at 12:00. I think that it might be time then to actually have a significant break now.

02:05:19:17 - 02:05:21:27

So I would actually.

02:05:21:29 - 02:05:24:27

Propose that we adjourn.

02:05:25:07 - 02:05:25:22

Um.

02:05:26:18 - 02:05:40:21

This hearing today and then get back at 1:30 if everyone is in agreement with that. And then at 1:30, just just to clarify as well.

02:05:40:29 - 02:05:41:14

Um.

02:05:41:26 - 02:06:11:14

I am happy to actually move on from the agenda on this specific item and we'll actually bring in the local host authorities and other representations from other organizations that submitted questions and queries on this specific item after lunch, if everyone agrees with that. Can I ask if there is anyone that does disagree with this or does not work to please just raise your hand and let me know.

02:06:16:24 - 02:06:19:02

Okay. Mr. Andrew Fraser. Okay.

02:06:19:22 - 02:06:24:26

So, yes. Do I do understand that you're now proposing we break effectively for an hour and a half?

02:06:26:03 - 02:06:31:24

That was that was that was our original schedule. I believe that was.

02:06:31:26 - 02:06:32:11

Um.

02:06:32:13 - 02:06:33:23

Said.

02:06:34:10 - 02:06:35:03

Let me just.

02:06:35:12 - 02:06:36:04

Think with.

02:06:36:09 - 02:06:50:10

With respect, sir, I think from our perspective, um, an hour, whether we take it now, whether we press on a, a little bit more business now is more than sufficient for for lunch and no apologies.

02:06:50:12 - 02:06:54:07

Apology. Um, yeah. No apologies.

02:06:54:09 - 02:06:54:24

No.

02:06:54:26 - 02:06:57:09

Did I confuse myself here?

02:06:57:23 - 02:07:06:26

We said that we would resume at 12:00 and then we would continue until 1:30, and then we'd have a session starting at 2:30. So actually will be a.

02:07:06:28 - 02:07:09:06

One hour lunch hour, but it.

02:07:09:08 - 02:07:23:02

Would be at 130 rather than 230. What I'm proposing then is that actually we come back at 1:00 and then deal with. So that would be the one hour break that we have highlighted before.

02:07:23:04 - 02:07:24:00

It's not 12.

02:07:24:02 - 02:07:26:09

So we would go back. We would get back at.

02:07:26:11 - 02:07:29:12

One if everyone agrees with that.

02:07:31:14 - 02:07:33:08

So forgive me. I'm.

02:07:33:10 - 02:07:39:06

I'm confusing myself. You're proposing that we. We adjourn now till 1:00.

02:07:42:13 - 02:07:46:01

Well, we were supposed to have we were supposed to have a break.

02:07:46:12 - 02:07:54:15

At 11:30 and then resume at 12:00 and then continue until 130 and then have a break.

02:07:54:17 - 02:07:56:22

At 130 to 230.

02:07:56:25 - 02:08:10:12

So what am proposing now and please let me know if this does not work and I'm going to have to check with case team and inspectors as well, is if we actually resume at 1:00.

02:08:10:14 - 02:08:12:01

Because otherwise.

02:08:12:03 - 02:08:20:22

Otherwise, we are going to we are going to continue until 3:00. So because it will be a one hour and.

02:08:20:24 - 02:08:21:22

A half slot.

02:08:21:24 - 02:08:22:23

So we.

02:08:23:02 - 02:08:23:17

We'll.

02:08:25:14 - 02:08:26:06

Actually, we break.

02:08:26:11 - 02:08:29:18

We break till one. Yes. Is that correct?

02:08:30:01 - 02:08:33:20

If if we have a break now, it's 12:00 roughly.

02:08:33:22 - 02:08:34:07

So we would.

02:08:34:09 - 02:08:36:11

Have a break until 12:30.

02:08:36:13 - 02:08:37:04

And then we would.

02:08:37:06 - 02:08:37:21

Have it.

02:08:37:27 - 02:08:47:11

And then we would have to continue it to to 2:00 and then resume it three, which I think might actually push things a little bit too fast. So what.

02:08:47:14 - 02:08:47:29

Am.

02:08:48:01 - 02:08:50:15

Proposing is that we actually break now for.

02:08:50:17 - 02:08:51:24

One hour and.

02:08:51:26 - 02:08:53:10

Resume at 1:00.

02:08:54:22 - 02:08:58:02

So we resume at 1:00. And then when do we next break.

02:08:58:04 - 02:08:58:25

Or do we just And.

02:08:58:27 - 02:08:59:21

Then it would be.

02:08:59:23 - 02:09:01:26

A one and a half. It would be.

02:09:01:28 - 02:09:11:20

A 1.5 hour slot, ideally. So if we resume at 1:00, then we would break again at 2:30. That would have that and then would have another slot.

02:09:11:22 - 02:09:12:23

From.



02:09:13:06 - 02:09:15:27  
3:00 until 430.

02:09:15:29 - 02:09:16:24  
5:00.

02:09:17:15 - 02:09:20:13  
Did we finish? Yes. Thank you. Sorry. Forgive me. That was a bit.

02:09:20:15 - 02:09:21:27  
No, it's fine. It's fine.

02:09:22:00 - 02:09:29:05  
I understand that these changes can be confusing, and it's everyone clear on that. And can I ask if there are.

02:09:29:07 - 02:09:29:28  
Any.

02:09:30:00 - 02:09:31:14  
Comments that anyone would like to.

02:09:31:16 - 02:09:32:10  
Make on that?

02:09:33:17 - 02:09:38:16  
And it's your intention, sir, that we, when we resume it one, we'll go straight to our contribution.

02:09:38:18 - 02:09:42:01  
As the leader, correct? Yes. Thank you, sir. That's very helpful.

02:09:46:19 - 02:09:47:04  
Right.

02:09:47:09 - 02:09:53:27  
Does anyone have any other questions on this point or would like to make any comments that this might not work for them?

02:09:56:10 - 02:09:57:24  
I see no hands raised.

02:09:57:26 - 02:10:07:08  
So in that case, as I said in just to recap, we will adjourn now until 1:00. We will resume at 1:00 and then aim to have.

02:10:07:10 - 02:10:08:27  
A break at 230.

02:10:08:29 - 02:10:23:25  
And then we'd have a half an hour break, which would mean that then we would have another slot from 3:00 until 430. And if there's need, we would we would go until five. Is that clear for everyone?

02:10:27:21 - 02:10:30:15

That's certainly clear from the applicant, sir. Thank you. Okay.

02:10:30:22 - 02:10:32:04

Thank you very much. Right.

02:10:32:06 - 02:10:37:19

In that case, I would now adjourn this meeting and we will resume at 1:00, please.

02:10:37:21 - 02:10:38:08

Thank you.