

**Medworth ISH3\_16 May\_PT2**

Created on: 2023-05-16 13:42:20

Project Length: 01:46:22

File Name: Medworth ISH3\_16 May\_PT2

File Length: 01:46:22

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:15 - 00:00:11:23

Mrs. Makinson, can I just check that? Um. You are logged in as well, please.

00:00:12:24 - 00:00:14:19

Yes, ma'am. Thanks, Mr. Pinto.

00:00:15:13 - 00:00:40:14

Thank you very much, Mr. Morgenstern. The meeting, this hearing is now resumed. Um, thank you very much for, um. Staying on the line. And I would just like to, as I mentioned before, um. I would. We are still on item. Um.

00:00:42:04 - 00:01:15:00

Item three of the agenda. I will now actually, as I have mentioned before, I will now hand over to the first of all, local host authorities, give them the opportunity to comment. And I would like to start with Cambridgeshire County Council, um, who have raised concerns at several different points during examination in relation to the welfare and waste issues in general.

00:01:15:02 - 00:01:36:24

So first of all, can I ask the representative from Cambridgeshire County Council to just introduce himself and also then explain in raised main outstanding areas of disagreement in relation to the Wafa in waste issues, if I may.

00:01:38:27 - 00:02:11:00

Yes. Thank you, sir, for introduction. Again. Andrew Fraser, Kings Council for the Councils. Um, I'm going to in a moment hand over to Mr. Matthew Breese, who is our waste officer. I will get him to formally introduce himself with his qualifications and experience in a moment. But just to give you an indication of where we're going and obviously we've tailored what we're going to say now to the discussions and the questions that you've already asked. We don't want to try and go over too much of the ground you've already covered.

00:02:11:02 - 00:03:01:18

But the three topics that we continue to have concerns about our first of all, the mechanism for ensuring that waste is managed as high up the waste hierarchy as possible, and in particular the the public visibility, as it were, of making sure that that happens. Secondly is the proximity principle in line with the discussions which we had immediately before lunch. Excuse me. And then finally, so in more general terms, ensuring that we all have a clear understanding of the implications of permitting this large facility in this location, given the likely distance that waste will need to travel in the current scenario.

00:03:01:20 - 00:03:33:17

And then the kind of difficulties presented by the fact that the proposal for its intended time span for most of it can't really predict a what amounts and nature of waste will be available, but more

particularly what other infrastructure may come along to also process waste and to upset the applecart, as it were, in terms of availability of waste within a reasonable, sustainable distance.

00:03:33:19 - 00:03:49:15

So these are our three principal concerns. That's really very much a headings for them. And I'll turn over if I may now to Mr. Briggs will put some flesh on those bones building on the questions and concerns, sir, that you've already put to the applicant.

00:03:51:11 - 00:03:54:23

Thank you very much, Mr. Breese.

00:03:56:20 - 00:04:37:10

So my name is Matthew Breese. I am the principal policy officer for Minerals and Waste at Cambridgeshire County Council. I have over ten years of planning policy experience and I'm a member of the Royal Town Planning Institute. I'll try and keep my points brief. So bear with me. And if you do have any questions, please do ask them after it. I've finished on the top. So as Mr. Cotter alludes to this, three topics, which was to briefly touch on the waste hierarchy. So on the topic of the waste hierarchy, the Council made the representations in the Council's relevant representations requesting additional criteria to schedule to requirement 14 waste hierarchy schemes.

00:04:38:05 - 00:05:19:04

At the moment this matter remains unresolved. But as the applicant alluded to this morning, they are currently revisiting our comments and maybe looking again at those. It's the Council's view that this is a it's these. Sorry. So the council view that it is important that the future operator not only be seeking to prevent waste that could be treated further up the waste hierarchy from being accepted at the facility, but also being seen to do this as well too. And given the nature of the facility, this is more likely to be achieved through company policies and how the operator interacts with its clients, helping them to reduce and recycle more waste so that they don't send as much waste to be recovered.

00:05:19:06 - 00:05:58:05

And that is what is intended by our requested additional criteria, and we hope the applicant will respond positively. But if they don't, we would ask that those be imposed on the basis of it. Whilst the applicant may be the proposing the facility now, they may not always be the future operator of this facility. In relation to the proximity principle. The Council has drafted the proposed draft requirements and it's our understanding that the applicant has agreed in print to the principle of the requirement and we're in the process of agreeing some appropriate wording and hope to be able to present this to the examining authorities soon.

00:05:59:28 - 00:06:31:22

Our initial proposal is set out in our deadline three submission and subject to nuances for those watching. This is broadly formed of three parts a requirement that a specified percentage of waste is sourced within 75km of the facility, a requirement that a specified percentage of the waste must be sourced within the list of the Waste Planning Authority areas listed within the Waste fuel availability assessment. Although this is in the detail of the requirements and that no more than half of the waste can be sourced from a single waste planning authority area.

00:06:31:24 - 00:06:40:23

This last one is to ensure that the facility is not monopolised by one area to the exclusion of other closer areas.

00:06:40:25 - 00:06:50:17

And you sorry to just confirm Mr. Briggs, and you have submitted those requirements to us in writing as part of your Deadline three submission, you said.

00:06:51:20 - 00:07:06:10

Yes. So we. So the we proposed to the applicant the proposed requirements. It can be found on page 23. Of deadline three submission, which is reference.

00:07:07:06 - 00:07:10:18

I believe 3044.

00:07:11:03 - 00:07:12:13

That is correct, yes.

00:07:14:04 - 00:07:37:03

And this is it should be clear that this was what we've set out in our deadline three. Response was only proposed requirement and the applicant. We have had a meeting with the applicant and they wish to make some amendments to the proposed percentages and some of the text later on regarding monitoring. But that is a cover. That's at another time. So.

00:07:37:21 - 00:08:10:14

So can I just jump in at this point? Sorry to cut across you. It's important to appreciate, sir, that this requirement is very much to be seen as a sort of long stop in terms of the where the waste comes from. I mean, when you examine the proposed text, you'll see that, for example, not less than 80% of the waste is to come from effectively those areas which are in the catchment area for the woofer study.

00:08:10:16 - 00:08:17:13

But this requirement wouldn't deal with the points that you raised about the two hour

00:08:18:29 - 00:08:43:29

drive time limit. It simply provides a very basic long call, a sporting analogy, a long stop so that to prevent, you know, really terrible situation developing in terms of sustainability. But it's it's there. It's a valuable thing, but it doesn't deal with the nuances of the points that that you were considering earlier on. Think that's fair as the matter.

00:08:44:12 - 00:09:07:27

And so we cannot just clarify on that point. Then you mentioned the distance in terms of kilometers. Can you tell me or do you have any information or if you don't, then please do submit that after this hearing. But how does that compare to the two hour, um, cat study area that that that we have looked at before?

00:09:08:29 - 00:09:38:03

So the 75 kilometre range is broadly equivalent to a one hour travel time. What? It's been one hour. Look at the one hour. And then add in that the the waste planning authorities in that area. Um, so the likes of Cambridgeshire of course it gets down to the Cambridge, it just about 75km includes all of those And you'll note in the text it says the waste has to be sourced from within the West Bank authorities in that area.

00:09:39:24 - 00:09:52:27

Right. Okay. Um, and I believe that you mentioned three points. I can see from my notes that you have mentioned waste your proximity principle. And in terms of capacity. Is there anything else that you would like to add?

00:09:54:04 - 00:10:03:27

Yes. So we'd like to move on to our main key point for your consideration today, sir, is the spatial distribution of waste and the local impacts of that.

00:10:05:28 - 00:10:50:23

Uh, many of these points we've already set out in our presentation, so I won't go into too much detail here. Okay. The has made representations in relation to the waste fuel assessment, most of which contains with the local impact reporting deadline for submissions. Was there a number of points of dispute in relation to some of the figures presented there? Confirmed there is common ground at table 4.3 and 4.4. Essentially the waste, particularly 4.4, which is the waste we currently being sent to landfill, are accurate in our mind and that if this waste in Table 4.4 is diverted to this facility, there would be sufficient fuel for the facility to operate based on the data as it is now.

00:10:51:17 - 00:11:16:19

Right? Mr.. BRIGGS Apologies. But just to clarify, for my own benefit and actually for the benefit of everyone hearing, so when when you say that you agree with Table 4.4, do you mean that you agree with the numbers and waste based on the waste data, or do we actually agree in terms of the local waste planning authorities that are included in that table?

00:11:17:19 - 00:11:22:06

Um, I'm referring to the accuracy of the numbers in the data that they are. Okay.

00:11:22:14 - 00:11:24:27

Thank you for clarifying. That's useful.

00:11:25:13 - 00:12:17:20

Those numbers. Okay. Um, and if you look at those numbers, again, subject to your discussion earlier in the 60s, a long way from Cambridgeshire, if you add those numbers up, there is sufficient fuel to fuel this facility as of 2021. But those figures also accurately reflect the spatial distribution of the availability of waste. So was there some nuances regarding waste being recovered at existing facilities which have already been alluded to with Norfolk sending it across to other areas? But broadly speaking, 4.4 is the waste of this available? This development we've got here presented to us is presented as a regional facility with a capacity of 625,000 tonnes, and that's the applicant confirmed this morning it will require 523,000 tonnes to operate.

00:12:18:23 - 00:12:53:09

This is a large facility and it is disproportionately large for local need and the community that is being asked to host it. Development of this facility in this location will result in waste traveling further distances than if it was located closer to the main concentrations of waste. Those being in Essex and Hertfordshire to the south, which account for 1.2 million tonnes, and Northamptonshire and Leicestershire to the west, which account for 0.4 million tonnes of the available 2.4 million tonnes listed in that table. The spatial distribution is illustrated in the mapping we supplied in the local impact report.

00:12:54:15 - 00:13:23:02

And more localised energy recovery cities as envisaged in relevant local waste plans in the region, would not have the same scale of negative effect as this facility. Conversely, if this and the Peterborough Green Energy Project are both developed, this will concentrate 1.2 million tonnes of recovery capacity and a relatively small geographic area and that it would be sufficient to accommodate well over half of the areas the waste within this study area. Okay.

00:13:24:20 - 00:13:25:18

Mr.. Sorry,

00:13:27:07 - 00:13:44:05

just just just to clarify, just so that I'm certain in terms of the numbers that she was quoting, are those numbers that are included in your local impact report and the Section 13 waste policy matters, including waste availability and composition.

00:13:45:12 - 00:13:47:28

So can you repeat the second part of what you just said, please?

00:13:48:00 - 00:14:16:10

And are those numbers? So there is a table included in your local impact report and Section 13 of the local impact report, which is the section on waste policy matters, including waste, availability and competition. So those numbers that you are referring to or um, so the numbers that you are quoting now, where are they coming from?

00:14:18:08 - 00:14:37:03

And would need to double check that for you, sir. But they will either come from the local impact report, which is based on the 2019 waste data framework, and that waste data interrogated data which then turns up in the first version of the waste fuel assessment, or it will be in the later waste fuel assessment. Okay.

00:14:37:26 - 00:14:41:13

Now, so we have the documents. Okay, fine.

00:14:44:17 - 00:14:49:17

This is these figures are essentially sourced from table 4.4. This fundamentally.

00:14:50:13 - 00:15:02:09

Everyone can derive the same pattern of data simply by examining where the waste comes from as recorded in table 4.2 and then carry through to 4.4.

00:15:03:12 - 00:15:12:25

Right? Okay. Yes. I have those tables in front of me, so that's fine. Okay. Please carry on, Mr. Rees.

00:15:13:15 - 00:15:50:00

Thank you. The development of this facility in this location will result in waste traveling further distances than if it was located. Sorry, I've covered that already. My apologies. So a more localised energy recovery facilities as envisaged in relevant local plans in the region would not have the same scale of negative impacts as this facility. Conversely, if this in the of Green Energy project are both developed, this will concentrate waste in a relatively small geographic area and it would be sufficient to accommodate over half of that 2.4 million tonnes close to it.

00:15:50:18 - 00:16:28:02

The pattern of waste that we see now will be affected by future recovery capacity provision and government and market interventions in the waste production, all of which have a level of uncertainty attached. Think you covered quite in detail this morning. As an energy plant, it will require a steady and reliable source of fuel to maintain supply of electricity, and in the future should that residual waste reduce or other plants be permitted more locally to to existing waste sources, the negative effects associated with the facility will be amplified as it must look further and further for fuel.

00:16:28:18 - 00:17:06:29

Whilst this proposal provides significant benefits in terms of recovery capacity. It also comes with a large number of disc benefits that you've heard at already heard about from concentrating this capacity in one location. And on this point, the Council asks the examining authority to take very careful

consideration to the disc benefits that come with centralising this capacity in what is largely rural and spread out region and attribute the appropriate weight in the determination when determining this application. I think just to close on that, as you've heard from other participants this morning, we are expecting residual waste to potentially decline in the future.

00:17:07:11 - 00:17:23:15

Whether or not there's sufficient to fuel this, that is a more difficult case. But this is we are certainly getting to the edge cases and we will be putting a lot of eggs in one basket essentially by having so much capacity in one location. Thank you.

00:17:24:06 - 00:17:49:15

I think I think we have covered a lot of ground. So I'm actually going to ask the applicant to respond to the issues that you have raised so far and then will actually come back to you if there are any further issues as well that you still want to raise. But think that we have covered a lot of ground so far. So if I could just ask the applicant.

00:17:50:22 - 00:18:49:29

So before you turn to the applicant, it's just it's to summarize the substantial point. The first is in terms of this waste issue, waste proximity issue. The first is that even as of now, a large proportion of the waste is being drawn from what we might call the the outer fringes of the study area. Often in cases going beyond the two hour drive time. Metric. That's, as it were, 0.1 as of now. And the second point is that in the event that future facilities come forward closer to those existing waste sources, which is an entirely likely scenario over the period of time for which this development will exist, that will force this plant, which, because of its size and nature, requires in broad terms a lot of waste to look further and further afield to support itself with ever increasing dis benefits.

00:18:50:01 - 00:18:55:25

In terms of the proximity principle, that's the two different aspects of this argument. Thank you. Thank you.

00:18:56:06 - 00:19:05:02

Thank you for that summary. Mr. Andrew Fraser Now can I turn to the applicant to please reply on these specific points if I may?

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

Gary McGovern for the applicant? Yes, sir. I can certainly reply to points one and two which related to propose requirements which would go into schedule two of the DCO. And then I may pass to Mr. Kerry to pick up some of the points that were covered in the last item that was discussed in relation to the requirements. I can confirm that has been set out by Cambridgeshire County Council representatives that the applicant has been having productive discussions on the wording for a requirement that would be inserted into schedule two of the DCO and which would reflect some of the principles that have been explained by Mr.

00:19:52:11 - 00:20:27:20

Briggs in relation to proposed catchment area. The applicant is hoping to share revised wording with the council shortly with a view to working towards being able to submit that drafting into examination as part of the revised draft of the DCO at Deadline five. The applicant has also been considering the additional concerns and proposed drafting relating to the waste hierarchy requirement, which is requirement for of the draft DCO and again has been working on wording which it intends to put back to Cambridgeshire County Council.

00:20:27:29 - 00:20:32:19

Hopefully further agreement and can then be submitted into examination.

00:20:33:04 - 00:20:59:25

And Mr. McGovern, sorry, just for the sake, just for the sake of the record, can just highlight then the action for the applicant to submit the DCO requirement wording by deadline. I just wanted to make a note of that. And also I'm very mindful that Mrs. Makinson has raised her hand up now at this point. So, Mr. Mason, would you like to intervene now?

00:21:00:18 - 00:21:22:11

Just thank you, Mr. Pinto. Yes, just a very short point, really, just to say, can I just ask, as Cambridgeshire County counsel and the applicant are drafting potential requirements to please make sure that these are explicitly clear in how these requirements will be able to be monitored and enforced as you would with any any planning condition. Thank you.

00:21:22:29 - 00:21:46:19

Thank you very much for that point, Mrs. Sanders. Very helpful. Um, can we also can applicant please make note of that as part of the action, not just highlighted in terms of this requirements. So clear mechanisms for enforcing and monitoring. Um, apologies, Mr. McGovern. Um, would you like to continue then?

00:21:48:03 - 00:22:03:05

Thank you, sir. Gary McGovern for the applicant. Um, grateful to Mrs. Morgenson for her reminder as well. We certainly keep that in mind with the drafting. I was actually just about to pass to Mr. Kerry, who I think might have some further comments just in relation to point three.

00:22:04:06 - 00:22:04:27

Mr. Kerry.

00:22:05:10 - 00:22:39:15

Thank you. Paul Kerry for the applicant. Um, just to confirm, just last Wednesday we had a meeting with Mr. Breeze and his colleagues and I'm personally working on that with my colleague, Mr. Turner. And so we do expect to come back to Mr. Breeze with some proposals for some wording. And I'm cautiously optimistic that we can reach an agreement on that. Regarding the nature of this facility, it is by definition a regional facility and therefore by definition it will be larger than the capacity needed if it were a local facility.

00:22:39:17 - 00:23:09:17

So it is definitely going to draw waste in from further afield. And the reason for that is because and you may know this Norfolk County Council refused an application for a facility of roughly half this size in King's Lynn and Cambridgeshire County Council refused an application for a facility also half the size at Walter Beach in Cambridgeshire. And had those two gone ahead, it would have been, as a matter of fact, much harder for us to justify this project.

00:23:09:19 - 00:23:47:06

But they did not go ahead. And that is a matter of fact. And you could almost imagine that this is essentially those two projects brought together on this site in our proposal, um, regarding other facilities that might come forward in the future. That's entirely speculation. And I can I can assure you that we're aware of other sites that might be suitable further afield. Whether they come ahead, come forward for applications is entirely speculative. The Peterborough Green Energy project that was referenced earlier was consented some ten years ago and it has not come forward into construction.

00:23:47:08 - 00:24:02:00

So it's very difficult to judge whether these facilities will go ahead with with with in competition with us. But we're confident that should we get consent, we would be able to always secure the waste for this facility.

00:24:04:05 - 00:24:25:08

Thank you for that response. I note that Ms. has raised her hand. But before I bring you into this point, can I just ask Mr. Bryce, is there, uh, or Mr. Andrew Fraser, is there anything that you would like to add to this, to this point?

00:24:28:25 - 00:24:47:27

Well, we note Mr. Kerry's expression of confidence that they'll always be able to get the waste. That, with respect, is not really the issue. The issue is how far away would they have to go to get that waste? That's that's our point. So to an extent, that's not really an answer from from Mr. Kerry to that that particular issue.

00:24:48:11 - 00:24:48:26

Mr..

00:24:48:28 - 00:24:53:01

KERRY I'll say we were always

00:24:54:17 - 00:24:58:21

confident that we'll get the waste from when the study area of the woofer.

00:25:02:00 - 00:25:02:19

Right.

00:25:05:15 - 00:25:10:02

Uh, Mr. Andrew Fredericks. Um, does that answer your question?

00:25:11:21 - 00:25:15:05

Well, I've heard what's been said, as they always say.

00:25:16:23 - 00:25:36:27

Okay. Thank you very much. So in addition to this point, which think that we were sort of covering in terms of the proximity principle as well in origin of waste, and is there anything else that you would like to add now before bring other people that have raised their hands and want to participate on this point?

00:25:40:15 - 00:25:42:09

I think that sums up. Sorry.

00:25:43:13 - 00:25:48:24

Forgive me, sir. If that was to us. Sorry, we're just conferring offline. No, I think that concludes what we want to say.

00:25:49:21 - 00:26:00:12

Right. Thank you very much for that confirmation. Uh, Miss Barnett. Um, I think that you raised your hand first, and you would like to intervene at this point, I assume?

00:26:00:25 - 00:26:27:13

Uh, yes, please. Thank you, sir. Just a very quick one. Um, the applicant, I think Mr. Kerry mentioned the water beach facility in his comments just now and just wanted to point out that was a much



smaller facility, about 250,000 tons. But the reason it was refused at appeal, so the secretary agreed with the inspector was that there was potential for significant tonnage of waste to be transported long distances, which would be at odds with the application of the proximity principle. So I'll just I'll just leave it there.

00:26:28:16 - 00:26:34:21

Thank you. That's useful. Um, Mr. Michael Duale.

00:26:40:16 - 00:27:15:00

Like. Thank you, sir. Sorry, I'm struggling with my computer. With regard to the Willows site that Dr. Carey referred to. The contract was terminated by Norfolk County Council. So the application was not refused. It was left in limbo until the contract was terminated and there was no need to continue the the application, but would like to point out that then Secretary of State refused 169 million in credits for the reason that it was not needed.

00:27:15:02 - 00:27:15:22

Thank you.

00:27:17:10 - 00:27:27:15

Thank you for that. Um, Mr. Michael Duale. Uh, can I ask the applicant to come in? And if the applicant would like to reply?

00:27:29:14 - 00:28:01:25

Paul Carey for the applicant, to be honest. So I don't think it matters why they were refused. They were refused. They don't exist. And if they had been permitted as said before, it would have been harder for us to justify the need for this facility. But they were refused. It doesn't really matter why they were refused. They were. And on that basis, we're basically looking at bringing the capacity that those facilities would have offered to the Swan site, and that is therefore justifying the need for this facility.

00:28:01:29 - 00:28:03:16

This is one site. Apologies.

00:28:03:18 - 00:28:19:22

I'm so to the site in Wisbech it's as if we were bringing them not physically, but you know the capacity of those two facilities is being is driven, it has driven what we are looking for here with this facility.

00:28:20:07 - 00:28:21:06

Right. Thank you.

00:28:21:13 - 00:28:22:24

I make myself clear. Sorry.

00:28:23:09 - 00:28:32:10

No, that's fine. Thank you very much. Mr. Kerry. Mr. Michael, do you still have your hand raised? I think that probably this has now answered your question.

00:28:34:05 - 00:28:34:27

I assume.

00:28:35:10 - 00:28:36:06

Thank you, sir. Sorry.

00:28:36:15 - 00:28:39:09

Okay. Thank you very much. Um.

00:28:53:00 - 00:28:53:15

Right.

00:28:57:10 - 00:29:32:12

I would like now to actually invite the Borough Council of Kingsland and West Norfolk to, um, participate as well, because I am aware that they have raised some concerns regarding the wharf in waste as well. But before I do again, just clarify with Cambridgeshire County Council that in terms of the points that you would like to raise on this item, you have now raised them all before. Actually move us on to um, the Borough Council of King's Lynn, North Norfolk.

00:29:35:00 - 00:29:36:22

Just a quick yes or no.

00:29:38:18 - 00:29:39:03

On.

00:29:40:01 - 00:29:40:21

Yes.

00:29:40:28 - 00:29:48:28

Yes. Okay. Thank you very much. I think that in that case we have Miss Hannah would handy.

00:29:50:20 - 00:30:16:17

Hello, sir. Yeah. Thank you, sir. Hannah Wood. Handy for the borough Council. There are no additional comments, actually, that from a technical officer point of view, that the Borough council wishes to make. It set out obviously in our representations of the local impact report. There are matters obviously raised by relevant councillors of the Borough Council, of which Councillor Duale is on the call today. But you know, I'm not able to comment on on those matters because they are councillor comments.

00:30:17:08 - 00:30:57:12

Right. Thank you very much for that. And I think that Mr. Wallich has actually raised his concerns as well. So I would then follow my agenda and then I would actually ask um, the applicant to um, consider comments that were also made by the Right Honourable Stephen Barclay MP So that would be rep to zero six for particularly in relation to the information submitted in appendix two, which portrays particularly to waste.

00:30:57:14 - 00:31:20:18

So I know that the applicant has responded in writing to this and I think that that is reference rep 3-040. But could I please ask the applicant to just highlight the main conclusions, particularly how deep water has tried to address some of the concerns raised in that specific submission?

00:31:24:06 - 00:31:28:23

Yes, sir. Claire Brown for the applicant. I'll just sort.

00:31:28:25 - 00:31:30:08

Of summarize the key, key.

00:31:30:10 - 00:32:15:00

Points, really. One of the first key issues raised by Mr. Barclay was the fact that the proposed development would potentially undermine government ambitions to halve residual waste production in the future. We fully addressed this in our response to deadline three comments. However, what we are saying is that the updated waste fuel availability assessment, which will be prepared for deadline five and indeed it's also referenced in the existing waste fuel availability, fuel availability assessments that we do give consideration to future future ambitions to halve residual waste.

00:32:15:02 - 00:32:52:08

And there's calculations that we've set out which are based upon current population predictions. And the targets set out in the Environmental Improvement Plan are based on per capita residual waste levels. So we've set out a calculation which concludes that even even if these targets are achieved to to reduce by half by 2042 those ambitious targets, that there still would be the need for this facility.

00:32:52:10 - 00:33:13:07

And I'll reference back to a comment made earlier in terms of this is almost 20 years ahead, and we would make the point that we cannot rely on current capacity still being in play at 2042. And that forms part of our case and response to that.

00:33:14:06 - 00:33:22:00

Would you confirm for me I don't have that number present, top of my mind now. What is the life expectancy of the facility?

00:33:25:13 - 00:33:29:21

So. So I just had to take some advice. It's 40 years. 40 years.

00:33:32:14 - 00:33:32:29

Thank you.

00:33:34:07 - 00:34:07:24

Um, the other issue, there's actually two, two other key issues that I just wanted to mention in summary of Mr. Barkley's response to us at deadline three. One of the further key point, a second point he raised was that he said that it would be more logical for us to consider in the woofers the national picture first. And then once we've considered whether there's any surplus or shortfall at a national level, then consider the local assessment.

00:34:08:18 - 00:34:42:23

mean, our response to that is that the ordering of the waste fuel availability assessment has been set to reflect existing and emerging national policy. Um, I won't go over national policy with you. I'm sure you're very well aware of what's in national policy, but the existing national policy refers to the need to check there's no local, um, exceedance in capacity. And then the emergence policy talks about national. So the reasons for the ordering in the assessment very much reflect the the provisions of national policy.

00:34:43:01 - 00:35:13:26

And again that's detailed in full in our response um will be will be detailed in following our response. Um, final issue, um, related to one of data. One key issue that he raised in terms of whether the assessment should reflect the availability of updated data. And actually in his Mr. Barkley's response, he referred to needing to refer to the May 2022 report.

00:35:13:28 - 00:35:56:20

Well, we know that even on this call today that that's been that's been updated even further. We've got May 20th, 23 and we know that we are going to be preparing an updated version of the Wafa for Deadline five. He does allude to other reference to other sources of data, particularly, um, HMRC, landfill tax data, and whether we could, we could look at that. Um, effectively that is the data source we've considered, but it doesn't give us the granularity that the data sources that we've relied upon do in that it's very difficult to sort of break that data down according to um, areas in our areas, in our study area that we're looking at.

00:35:56:22 - 00:36:27:24

So again, there's a full response built in there to our, our deadline to these deadline. Three comments. Um, it's always helpful to receive suggestions around alternative data, but because on this occasion the data didn't, um, didn't give us the level of detail that we needed. So and that really summarizes there's a full response quite clearly to Mr. Barkley's response already with you. Okay. Thank you very much for that.

00:36:28:13 - 00:36:45:14

Right. I would like to I would like to bring in now win, uh, who have also expressed a desire to intervene on this specific item of the agenda. Um, so I have Mr. Shlomo down.

00:36:46:14 - 00:37:22:29

Yes, sir. Thank you very much, sir. Slow mo down for the win. So Win does not consider that the applicant's methodology is robust or that they have adequately considered the comments made to date. We'll go into a bit more detail on that in our main comments. But first, we have just five specific observations based on what has been said earlier today. The first is that the applicant says that they considered cement kiln capacity by using figures from to report on the 2021 statistics.

00:37:23:01 - 00:38:00:05

Presumably this is a reference to their use of the report's 19.4 million tonne figure for operational capacity as set out on page 15 of the report. That 19.4 megaton figure is based on the operational capacity of the facilities listed in their appendix. One of that document. Appendix one only covers incinerators and does not include any cement kiln capacity, which is instead set out at figure 39, which is not part of appendix one.

00:38:00:07 - 00:38:15:08

This means that despite the reassurances we were given earlier today, the applicant does not appear to have considered cement kilns at any geographic geographical scale. Would you like me to go on to make my second of these five points?

00:38:15:10 - 00:38:19:15

Or maybe if I'm mindful of.

00:38:19:17 - 00:38:24:18

Five points, maybe, maybe we'll take each one of those in turn, if that's.

00:38:24:20 - 00:38:27:00

If I'm happy for that. So, yes, I think that that.

00:38:27:02 - 00:38:46:10

Might be helpful because the information that you have just provided us with, it's quite technical. So in order to not lose any of the information that you are giving us, maybe will actually bring the applicant now. So can I turn to the applicant and ask the applicant to respond to the first point? Just raised?

00:38:48:00 - 00:39:19:23

Claire Brown For the applicant. Um, certainly. And I would like to go back and check the report if I may, but certainly our reading was that that the capacity figure provided by the Vic report, the 2022 report included, uh, the material that was sent to cement kilns for the, for the first time and that it was the capacity is based upon the information set out in appendix one.

00:39:19:25 - 00:39:26:10

But I would like to go back and just check the report myself for clarity rather than just be put on the spot, if that's okay. Thank you.

00:39:26:27 - 00:39:27:12

Thank you.

00:39:27:14 - 00:39:41:26

Very much. Can I get an action then for the applicant to come back on capacity from the traffic report included in relation to cement kiln.

00:39:43:12 - 00:39:46:27

UH, Mr.. Mr. Dhawan?

00:39:47:14 - 00:40:20:03

Yes. Shlomo Dhawan. For wind apologies. That's fine. That's fine, sir. Um, my. My second point, which has already been made, so I'll just say it very quickly, is that the applicant's notion that Essex would send residual waste to the med worth incinerator rather than the 595,000 tonnes per annum Riven Hall incinerator in Essex itself seems pretty far fetched, but if it did, it then raises the question about where Riven Hull would then source its waste.

00:40:20:05 - 00:40:55:19

Displacing capacity at rival incinerators can hardly be presented as a benefit of the proposed scheme for med worth, especially as it may force competitors to source their waste from further afield and or to narrow the range of materials that are considered economic to recycle so as to maintain incinerator feedstock. And that is one path towards the proposal Harming recycling. But I know that the applicant has already engaged with that question, so I'm happy to either pause or to move on to the third point.

00:40:55:24 - 00:41:01:29

I will just I'll just ask the applicant to confirm if they would like to add anything on this point further.

00:41:02:03 - 00:41:02:19

Certainly.

00:41:03:21 - 00:41:34:05

Yes, sir. Paul Carey For the applicant, just to correct. Mr.. Mr. Owen didn't say that all of the waste for Essex would come into Bedworth said it would be a scenario whereby the contractor that might win that contract would choose to send part of it to Medway and part of it to Rivendell. And that would be a very feasible and realistic scenario, knowing the vagaries of the waste management industry. So it wasn't we're not suggesting that all of us, Essex Waste will come to the Bedworth facility.

00:41:34:07 - 00:41:41:07

It may do. That would be a decision for the contractor and for Essex County Council. It would not be our decision.

00:41:43:02 - 00:42:16:10

Uh, thank you. Um, I think that that's clarifies again alongside with the previous answer on that specific point. Um, I think that we might not actually reach an agreement today in terms of that. So think that we might actually have to pursue this in terms of written representations further down the line. But please. Mr.. Mr.. Shlomo Dhawan um, do submit, do submit it to us in writing. Now, if you would like to then set us on your third point.

00:42:16:20 - 00:43:11:05

Yes, sir. Thank you. Thank you, sir. Shlomo doing for when the applicant talks about 2017 scenario for 2030 as aligning with the government's 65% recycling target. But for the avoidance of doubt, when the government proposed halving residual waste by 2042, they stated that this represented a municipal recycling rate of up to 75%. It is important to consider not just recycling even at 75%, but also waste reduction as 2017 scenarios for 2030 were premised on an assumption of significant increases in waste arising rather than on the government's intended reduction in waste arising which post-dated the study.

00:43:12:29 - 00:43:18:16

Um, thank you very much for that. Now, if could turn to the applicant to reply to this point as well, please.

00:43:22:10 - 00:43:28:27

Gary McGovern for the applicant? Yes, sir. Miss Brown will respond to that comment. Thank you.

00:43:31:29 - 00:44:12:20

Claire Brown for the applicants. Um, I mean, certainly in terms of the 75% target, I'm sure that reference is certainly in the Government's environmental improvement plan, which was published earlier this year, and from which the, um, the figure and the commitment to halve residual waste by 2042 is laid out in that same document. Um, on with page 150, it talks about achieving a municipal recycling rate of at least 65% by 2035.

00:44:12:22 - 00:44:33:24

So that's where the 65% comes from. Um, and I do believe I will check it's referenced elsewhere, but certainly the Environmental Improvement Plan talks about is 65% municipal recycling rate alongside halving, um, residual waste by 2040.

00:44:34:29 - 00:44:42:24

Mr.. Shlomo, can, um, can I ask you if there is any further point that you would like to make on this specific issue?

00:44:43:12 - 00:44:45:13

Yeah, just doing from wind here.

00:44:45:15 - 00:44:47:22

Just just to clarify the, the figure of up to.

00:44:47:24 - 00:45:12:28

75% recycling is set out in differs consultation document on the target where they propose the harvest in the first place. So effectively they said if we halve residual waste by 2042, that would represent a recycling rate of up to 75% and then off. Obviously they subsequently then did adopt the target to halve. So that's where we got that figure from or happy to put that in our written submission, Right.

00:45:13:16 - 00:45:17:19

Mr. Dolan. So you mentioned it's a document out for consultation.

00:45:17:27 - 00:45:29:06

Well, it was the original consultation document from DEFRA, which then resulted in them adopting the target to halve residual waste. So it's a historic document from DEFRA?

00:45:30:03 - 00:45:40:16

Right. Thank you for that clarification, Mr. Dawson. Uh, can I ask the applicant, I assume, Mrs. Brown, to come back on this point?

00:45:41:03 - 00:46:01:00

Yes. Thank you. Claire Brown for the applicant. That's certainly very helpful to understand where that 75% came from. It's clearly predates the environmental improvement plan in that the Environmental improvement plan now talks about 65%. And it's the adopted plan that we've referred to in our submissions.

00:46:01:05 - 00:46:03:03

Yeah. Okay. Thank you very much, sir.

00:46:03:20 - 00:46:34:26

Excuse me. So just to make very clear, I think we're talking about two different years here. The 65% target is by 2030. It's the up to 75% would represent the target for 2042. So both are correct. And what we're saying is with a facility that would be operational for 40 years, then the target for 2042 is roughly.

00:46:34:28 - 00:46:35:13

Two.

00:46:35:27 - 00:46:40:14

And well beyond. That's right. 2065, in fact.

00:46:41:25 - 00:46:42:18

Mrs. Brown.

00:46:46:08 - 00:47:04:28

Claire Brown for the applicant. The only comment I'd come back with here is that the targets set out in the Environmental Improvement Plan, the adopted Environmental improvement plan is 65% by 2035. Right. And the halving of residual waste is by 2042.

00:47:05:00 - 00:47:05:15

Right.

00:47:05:27 - 00:47:41:09

I feel that perhaps this might be an issue that would be better resolved offline. So if I could ask Mr. Dawson to actually submit, um, this relevant information and resources as part of the written representation of your submission today, that would be really helpful. And then the applicant can actually check, um, then the dates and the percentages quoted today. Um, so I would like us to actually get that please done as an action.

00:47:41:19 - 00:47:42:05

Um.

00:47:43:04 - 00:47:43:28

Certainly. So.

00:47:44:14 - 00:47:49:23

Um, I believe that you still have one final point that you would like to. Two more quick.

00:47:49:25 - 00:48:26:26

Points. Um, thank you, sir. Shlomo doing for win as set out in wins Evidence 12 2017 assessment did not just look at waste arising, but also at waste treatment capacity. And unlike the applicant's equivalent Wafa Assessment 12 2017 work did consider non incineration capacity such as cement kilns, biomass plants, plants and the like, which would also treat the waste that scenario anticipated might arise.

00:48:27:01 - 00:48:47:18

The fact that the applicant is using the residual waste from work whilst ignoring the treatment capacity from that work highlights the internal inconsistency of the applicant's approach, which is far from the worst case scenario that they claim. Right.

00:48:48:25 - 00:48:53:11

And offered to the applicant to reply on this specific point, if I may.

00:48:54:29 - 00:49:26:28

Uh, Claire Brown for the applicants. So in the updated woofers, we have attempted to look at alternative treatment capacity. When you look at the study area, however, we talk about things like, um, sustainable aviation fuel. We talk about lime kilns, we talk about MBT. So the updated woofers does look at capacity of which is very limited capacity in, um, in the, in the study area.

00:49:27:14 - 00:49:58:18

Um, in terms of, um, in terms of sustainable aviation fuel, there are that we've responded in detail on this point in relation to the sort of the viability of that to begin with. But not only that, pilot projects sit out with the, the study area that we're we're looking at. And then the, the other area, which is in terms of kilns, cement kilns, when you look at the incidence of cement kilns across the UK.

00:49:58:20 - 00:50:40:23

Um, and this is, this is something we've put in detail in our written submissions ready for the deadline for there are a number of cement kilns up and down the country, of which only one quite small small kiln occurs in the study area. Um, now we have no data to tell us how much, if any, residual waste that that cement kiln takes. Um, so it's something we are addressing in detail as part of our next round of submissions, but we would argue that yes, we have most definitely included alternative forms of treatment, of which at the moment only is a alternative form of treatment in the study area.

00:50:40:25 - 00:50:46:05

I'm just going to defer as well, if I may, sir, to my colleague Paul Carey, who wants to add a point.

00:50:46:23 - 00:50:48:19

That's Paul.

00:50:48:21 - 00:51:21:16

Carey. Paul Carey for the applicant, just a matter of technical fact, cement kilns cannot take residual waste as it is delivered or as it is collected by local authorities. It needs to be processed through a facility to a very high specification with a very low moisture content. In other words, a very sophisticated facility which are few and far between. So you cannot compare cement kilns with an energy from waste plant taking residual waste as um, as collected by local authorities.

00:51:23:06 - 00:51:26:21

Okay. Thank you for that point as well.



00:51:28:09 - 00:51:29:03

Mr. Dhawan.

00:51:30:04 - 00:52:04:25

Thank you, sir. Shlomo Dhawan, for you win a question for Mr. Curry is for him to confirm that it takes more than one tonne of waste to produce one tonne of or RDF. So actually, the point he makes strengthens the case in relation to overcapacity because if a cement kiln is processing 100 tonnes of refuse derived fuels, that would require more than 100 tonnes of residual waste.

00:52:04:27 - 00:52:07:21

Is that something Mr. Kerry could confirm? Perhaps.

00:52:09:00 - 00:52:40:22

And Paul carry for the applicant. That's true. There is a loss of moisture in order to to reduce the moisture content. So in terms of tonnages, the amount of residual waste that would be needed to be fed into the facility, that would then the output of which would go to a cement kiln, it would be higher going in than coming out. But those facilities don't exist. And therefore, you can't just assume that you can simply take a residual waste, as we call it, that's collected.

00:52:40:24 - 00:52:53:08

You can't just send it without having those intermediate facilities. And not only are they no, only one cement kiln in the area, the intermediary facilities are not there either.

00:52:54:04 - 00:53:29:00

And understand. Thank you for that, Mr. Kerry. Um, may I suggest, uh, Mr. Dhawan, that if you still have any queries on this point, then again, I think that it might be useful for us to actually have those in writing. I think that this issue is getting very technical. Obviously, there'll be still some aligning of data and aligning of information that actually needs to happen, and I understand that. But perhaps that will be actually be done better and more efficiently in writing, I would suggest.

00:53:29:07 - 00:53:33:24

So if I could ask you for your your final point then, please.

00:53:34:16 - 00:54:06:02

Great. Thank you very much, sir. We're doing for a win. Just a quick point, I suppose, about looking ahead to 2042 without jumping in a time machine. Obviously, there will be a lot of intervening years. The applicant talks about the situation in 2042, but they have less to say about the pathway to reaching the halving. We won't be at the same level of waste now in 2041 and then suddenly halve it in 2042.

00:54:06:04 - 00:54:45:27

Waste needs to be significantly reducing in terms of arising from now right the way through to 2042 for us to achieve the halving target. The applicant speculates about the decommissioning of older plants by 2042, but this could be more than outweighed by proposals that are currently in development actually moving ahead towards being constructed. And obviously the phrase in development is one that is used in the emerging IAN three as relevant to a consideration of overcapacity, not only those that are operational or currently in construction.

00:54:46:12 - 00:55:17:00

Um, and obviously there are many facilities that would replace existing plants, including some where there's an organised replacement. So the point is that the applicant's assessment of the situation in 2042 doesn't adequately consider how a significant portion of the residual waste stream is not suitable

for incineration, may well be going to other facilities and may not be available to the met with proposal.

00:55:17:02 - 00:55:48:11

And this relates not only to local but also or if you like, the study area, but also to the national picture because of course waste has to come from somewhere. So if it's if it's going to a facility outside the study area, that doesn't mean to say that the waste doesn't originate in the study area. So again, there are a lot of problems that concerns that we have raised and that we will be putting in writing. And we hope that the applicant will be able to take these on board for their deadline.

00:55:48:13 - 00:55:51:08

Five Waste Fuel Availability Assessment.

00:55:51:20 - 00:55:57:20

Thank you. Mr.. And if I understand correctly, then it's about the trajectory towards.

00:55:57:22 - 00:55:58:25

Exactly right. So.

00:55:59:06 - 00:56:06:06

2042. Can I ask the applicant to please, um, reply to this specific issue?

00:56:09:05 - 00:56:50:24

Yes, sir. Claire Brown for the applicant. I think the the position that we're currently would take is that, yes, we have looked ahead at the the the end game, the 2042 position, and demonstrated that even by then at the end game, it is our view that there is still a need for this proposed development. Um, I can't envisage a situation whereby, you know, sort of the pathway to get there would certainly that there's going to be if there's going to be a need then then that need is, is is there through the, through the, the trajectory to that to that point.

00:56:51:09 - 00:57:21:12

So certainly as part of the deadline five submission on the waste fuel availability assessment, um, we we certainly could address some of the interim targets. But ultimately the end game, there's still a a shortfall. And that for us demonstrates that there is currently a need and in 2042 there will be a need and that meets the test of government policy. Um, and that would be the position.

00:57:21:25 - 00:57:52:06

Thank you for that. Mr.. Brown Can then in that case, get an action please, for the applicant on the next appetite of the wharf to address, um, um, to address the targets and pathway and provide a little bit more clarity in terms of the pathway for the 2013 to 2042 objectives, please. Um. Mr. Dhawan. Anything else that you would like to add or those are your five key points that you wanted to actually raise today.

00:57:52:24 - 00:58:17:09

Right. Thank you, sir. Shlomo Dhawan for win. Those five points were intended to be preliminary points. We had pre-prepared a summary of our evidence, however, for time management purposes were very we're content, shall we say, mean. I'd be happy to read through them, but we are content to put them in writing. And as part of our submission, if you.

00:58:17:11 - 00:58:52:01

Could, if you could just for the sake of brevity, please. Thank you very much. I would. I would welcome that. Thank you. And now, finally, I would actually like to ask, um, understand that we have representatives from within, um, if there is any further issue that within would like to add, considering

that we, we have actually raised in their comments to us in writing a lot of queries regarding the West fuel availability assessment, I think.

00:58:52:03 - 00:58:53:09

Mr. Howlett.

00:58:59:15 - 00:59:00:00

Hello.

00:59:02:01 - 00:59:13:05

Joseph Heller from Lisbon. I think those elements are going to be covered by either written submission or at a later date. I certainly don't have that information to hand.

00:59:14:10 - 00:59:19:10

And thank you, Mr. Hallett. Um. Okay. Um.

00:59:21:05 - 00:59:27:17

Are there any comments anyone would like to make a further on item three of the agenda?

00:59:31:21 - 00:59:32:24

Uh, Miss Barnett.

00:59:35:15 - 01:00:17:08

Thank you, sir. I'll make this quick, because I realize we're under pressure. It's just we spent a lot of time today talking about the residual waste needs coming from the the various data sources. But what we haven't looked at is actually the future waste requirements included in waste local plans. And I just wanted to make just a very quick observation in Table 4.7. The title is is talks about the summary of waste planning. Authorities forecasted future residual waste requirements, which I think is a bit misleading because in a number of cases and and Norfolk and Hertfordshire being a case in point, the applicant has brought its own assumption as what the requirement is, which is more than the local authorities themselves.

01:00:17:10 - 01:00:28:05

So just wanted to kind of raise that as an issue and think that could be made clearer in the table. That is not the waste planning authorities. It is the applicant's interpretation of the waste planning authorities requirements.

01:00:29:12 - 01:00:37:21

Thank you for that. Ms. Barnett, did you say table 4.6, 4.7, 4.7. Thank you.

01:00:41:25 - 01:00:50:04

So particularly if you look at Hertfordshire and Norfolk, they don't identify a capacity gap, but the the document does.

01:00:50:24 - 01:00:57:07

Yes. Um, can I ask the applicant to comment on this specific point?

01:00:59:24 - 01:01:43:15

Claire Brown for the applicant. Yes, I think that certainly would be something that we can accommodate. The table 4.7 is is our reflection and there is a narrative alongside the each each waste local plan and the provision clearly as well. I mean, Ms.. Barnett specifically refers to Norfolk and Hertfordshire, and there's quite an extensive narrative around those two waste local plant evidence

bases which have taken a very recent shift from a significant surplus of significant deficit to there being no need for any future waste management needs.

01:01:43:17 - 01:02:11:15

But they are evidence bases that have yet to be tested through the waste local plan process and be the objective of examination like this. So all I would say is certainly yes, we can change the title of that table to reflect that. It is our interpretation and a narrative, but it is underpinned by the as well the status of those evidence bases, specifically Norfolk and Hertfordshire, which are very new, untested evidence spaces.

01:02:12:05 - 01:02:41:27

Thank you for that response, Mrs. Brown. What what I was going to ask as well in terms of this specific same table is, um, what steps has the applicant taken, if any, um, to actually contact the local waste authorities present here to sort of double check or sense check some of the narrative and numbers that are included in this table?

01:02:44:19 - 01:03:16:03

Claire Brown for the applicant in short wave. No direct contact has been made with the planning authorities. This is all been derived though from publicly available data sources and I guess to an extent this process is testing those, some interrogating some of the this interpretation of those data sources. Um, but in short, it's derived from publicly available data sources. Um, and that's it.

01:03:16:26 - 01:03:27:24

Thank you for that confirmation, Mr. Brown. Uh, Ms.. Barnett, I and I see that you still have your hand raised. Um, I don't know if you would still like to intervene or.

01:03:28:26 - 01:03:57:09

Just briefly, if you don't mind us. Okay. I just want to say, I mean, one of the responses was that the evidence was untested at examination and would make the same point. More so is the evidence that the applicant is relying on that has not been tested either. So don't consider it has any more weight or not. But what I don't really understand is so for example, if Hertfordshire and Norfolk say they don't have any capacity gap because they're exporting it elsewhere, why is that not okay? But it is okay to export it to the facility in Cambridgeshire.

01:03:59:05 - 01:04:01:28

And can I ask the applicant to reply?

01:04:07:04 - 01:04:38:02

Claire Brown for the applicant. I mean, certainly in terms of the data that we presented in the waste fuel availability assessment, where we're where we're drawing upon extant plans, then that data has been tested at examination in terms of movement of of waste across local authority boundaries. This come back comes back to the point of making provision for the sort of the net equivalent of your waste arising.

01:04:38:23 - 01:05:09:04

And you know if you're a figure just pulled out of nowhere if a local waste planning authorities net arising out of household industrial commercial waste are X, then they should The policy expectation is that they provide for X in their in their local plan rather than simply assume that transfer out of county is making adequate provision for their waste requirements, which is clearly not.

01:05:09:25 - 01:05:10:10

Um.

01:05:10:19 - 01:05:29:15

In light of that answer, can I please get an action if the applicant agrees to actually make it clearer? On to table 4.7 where the applicant believes that the information has actually been tested and where it has not been tested, and that could actually be submitted as part of your next update of the offer that you have already mentioned. Deadline five.

01:05:30:07 - 01:05:33:10

Claire Brown For the applicant. Yes, that's absolutely fine. Thank you.

01:05:34:06 - 01:05:36:17

Uh, Mr. Andrew Fraser. Okay.

01:05:38:08 - 01:05:41:25

Thank you, sir. Just. Mr. Breeze has a point he wants to make. Just on that last exchange.

01:05:42:22 - 01:05:44:00

Certainly, Mr. Rees.

01:05:45:07 - 01:06:25:16

Thank you. Just to highlight to you, the council has made comments at Dublin three on table 4.6 in particular in reference to that Norfolk County Council entry on that table where the applicant has interpreted the waste needs assessment that the County Council has undertaken. Sorry, Norfolk County Council has undertaken in a way which we do not think is accurate or fair on that in that respect. I just in this context, I think one, I think it would be helpful if the applicant could set out in the waste framework as waste fuel assessment, what their understanding of these waste needs assessments are.

01:06:25:18 - 01:07:00:09

And for your understanding, it is important to understand that when local waste local plans are prepared, the question that is being asked is what is the waste need and what capacity is available? So in areas which do have landfills such as Cambridgeshire, you quite often get a response coming back saying there is sufficient or only minimal amounts of capacity. Additional capacity is required. So as a helpful tool for this examination, it does need potentially more explanation so that it could be clearly understood by the integrated.

01:07:00:17 - 01:07:01:02

Yes. Yes.

01:07:01:10 - 01:07:14:13

All of this actually is in the case of taking liberties with Norfolk. That is definitely something which I would frown upon. Mr. Andrew, do you have anything to follow from that?

01:07:14:19 - 01:07:17:00

No, thank you. Thank you, sir. That's that's what we wanted to say on that.

01:07:17:18 - 01:07:25:08

All right. Thank you very much. Okay. Can I just go very quickly to the applicant then, if the applicant would like to comment on this specific point.

01:07:27:20 - 01:07:38:04

I mean, in the interest of time. So I think all I would say at this stage is that we will fully address our interpretation of the Norfolk position and our take on that in the next submission.

01:07:38:16 - 01:07:39:29

Thank you. That's helpful.

01:07:41:25 - 01:07:52:23

And right. Anyone else would like to ask any other questions before we move on to the next item of the agenda, which will be item four Alternatives and Design.

01:07:58:13 - 01:08:49:21

I don't see any hands raised, so I propose that. Then we conclude item three and move on to item four. So in this item we want to explore how the applicant arrived to the current proposal. What other options and alternatives were. Consider this part of the development. What work was carried out to assess the environmental impacts of those other options, and on what basis were those other options dismissed? We might also, if we have time question ask some questions in terms of design of the current proposal. So first of all, can I ask the applicant to provide a brief overview of the alternatives considered, particularly focusing on technology, location, size and scale? And maybe because we have actually covered some of the size and scale and previous one, then particularly technology and location in time design as well.

01:08:58:22 - 01:09:00:12

Clear project with the applicant.

01:09:02:27 - 01:09:36:11

Before I hand over to Mr. Kenyon, who will be able to talk through the detail that's contained in the applicant's environmental statement, Chapter two, which is reference AP 029 and the accompanying appendix, which is reference AP 069. We just wanted to refer back to some of the information that was provided at issue specific hearing, one which is set out in our written summary, which was rep 1-057.

01:09:36:28 - 01:10:20:03

And during that hearing, Mr. Kerry set out the two main criteria that were used for selecting a site for the CHP facility. We also provided some more detailed answers in the response to relevant representations, and that's references. REP 1-028 and Rep 1-029, where a number of interested parties raised points about the site selection process and the applicant set out in those documents the approach to site selection in terms of both the key criterias that were used.

01:10:20:08 - 01:10:50:13

Mr. Kenyon will provide an overview if it would be helpful of that information. Again, I just wanted to point out that we did we did provide some of that information at issue specific hearing one, but we can set out more detail in terms of the site selection process if that would be helpful Before going on to explain in more detail how how decisions were made in terms of the design and alternatives considered for various elements of the proposed development.

01:10:50:27 - 01:10:53:15

So it's just what would be the most used, best use of time?

01:10:53:21 - 01:11:08:20

I think it would be helpful just very quickly, but it would literally be a very brief overview. Um, because we are going to go into more specific questions then that have on some of the documents that you have mentioned, but just as introduction. Yes, please.

01:11:13:22 - 01:11:52:23

Good afternoon, sir. David Kenyon for the applicant. I'll. I'll be brief, but please stop me and I can expand as appropriate. I'll briefly just cover site location. I'll touch on design. Um, and I'll touch on

technology, but probably bring in Mr. Kerry and colleagues at that point as well. Um, with regard to site location, as we discussed at a previous, um, issue specific hearing, the applicant identified a number of essential and desirable siting criteria, um, against which it compared this site.

01:11:53:05 - 01:12:32:08

Um, in other words, the applicant did not consider alternative sites. Um, this site met the criteria that the applicant looks for when selecting a site. And briefly that is a site located in an area which has a waste management capacity gap. Um, a site which is close to potential users of heat and electricity. Um, and then going on from that. So a site which is close to the strategic road network and these three criteria are adequately reflected in the relevant national policy statements as well.

01:12:33:06 - 01:13:17:06

Um, in addition to that, um, a series of preferred criteria were also, it was sort of assessed against that is a brownfield site already in use for waste related or the commercial activities. Um, or a site allocated for such uses. And then finally a site being free of environmental designations. And those three criteria properly reflect the Cambridgeshire Local plan. So the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and West Local Plan, which actively encourages sites within settlement boundaries and sites which are in employment use or other commercial uses as well.

01:13:17:14 - 01:13:26:07

If I may, just to clarify, so what in terms of criteria that you have just mentioned to us now? So, um.

01:13:28:23 - 01:13:40:23

No further work was actually done in terms of finding or searching for sites where at the locations where those criteria might actually be met. Just to clarify on this point.

01:13:41:05 - 01:13:42:23

That is correct. Yes.

01:13:43:07 - 01:13:46:00

Okay. If you would like to continue, then, please.

01:13:46:27 - 01:14:22:05

If I can just touch on the design of the of the project now. So the proposed development. Um, I'm sure you're very familiar with Section 4.5 of one, which sort of explains what design means. And it's not just about, um, aesthetics, but it's also about sustainability and other items as well. Um, if we actually look at the design of the main part of the that is the facility, then we considered four options and these are set out in the design and access statement.

01:14:22:12 - 01:14:58:20

Um, application reference app 096. Um, and those four options initially looked at different roof profiles and the extent to which the plant and machinery could be enclosed or left exposed, um, as well as different approaches to cladding styles and materials. Um, we looked at each of those, um, um, options from, from various locations using some of the photo montage techniques that you will have seen in the landscape and visual assessment.

01:14:59:07 - 01:15:52:10

And we also compared them with the surrounding area, the context within which the site is located. Um, at the moment, um, the conclusion was that, um, the most appropriate option was one, um, which involved a series of flat roofs. Um, because that reflected again, the adjoining cold store and other buildings in the area, whilst the choice of cladding again was one that, that reflected sort of the predominant style of material, um, in the area following that, um, our, our preferred option at that, at

that point in time was then consulted upon a statutory consultation and as I'm sure you're aware, so we had, we had a number of comments back on design at that point.

01:15:52:28 - 01:16:27:21

We then reassessed and reevaluated the design of the facility. Um, and we, we looked again at how it could be clad, um, and the proportion of cladding to the use of other materials. Um, and also the ability to use what is termed over cladding. So that is, um, a separate, um, sort of skin to the building which allows for the use of more um, tiles which are more reflect the atmospheric conditions.

01:16:27:28 - 01:16:59:22

Um, tiles that you can actually use and create images. Um, for example as well. Um, just, I'll just turn to administration building and then have it only quickly on the administration building. So, um, that's a building which has been very much the design of, that's been very much predicated on being green and sustainable. So whilst the facility itself would be very, very good, the administration building would be a excellent development.

01:16:59:29 - 01:17:32:24

And there we, we looked to introduce as a result of consultation, green walls, um, green roofs, brown roofs, grey water recycling, for example, as well. So, so again that, that design developed, um, tried and tested and in relation to consultation responses. Um, there are a number of other alternatives which could go into and I'd be happy to do so, which are set out in, um, chapter two.

01:17:32:26 - 01:18:07:16

They include the land that we use both for the construction compound, but also some additional land that we needed to accommodate the facility. And then of course there's the grid connection itself as well, where we looked initially at a technology which was overhead, um, to a substation in Walpole some 19km away. Um, and over a period of, um, revisiting that informed by environmental surveys, principally logical surveys and also discussions with UK.

01:18:08:01 - 01:18:26:16

We ended up with a much shorter um, connection to Walsall and, and one which is wholly underground. So in terms of environmental impacts, removing those visual and landscape effects that you would have had otherwise with an overhead connection. Um.

01:18:29:05 - 01:18:40:21

Sir, is there anything else in in terms of high level that you would like to add? I'm just mindful of the time. I think I think that that's probably a good overview. But is there anything else that you would like to add?

01:18:42:09 - 01:18:46:03

No. So think that's fine. But think. Ms.. Roderick wants to say something.

01:18:48:00 - 01:19:24:09

Claire Project for the applicant. I see that you have the plan that forms part of chapter two to the environmental statement on the that you've shared on the screen there. And I wonder if it might be helpful for the applicant to describe in a in a bit more detail the process that was undertaken because there was a slight selection process that was undertaken looking at the criteria that Mr. Kenyon mentioned that led to the identification of the site as being suitable and as a consequence meant that

01:19:25:26 - 01:19:29:15

another site was not identified as being suitable.

01:19:29:27 - 01:19:30:26



Yes, that.

01:19:30:28 - 01:20:13:14

Might be helpful. Ms.. Mr. BRODERICK But maybe would suggest it actually might be an opportunity for me to actually ask my questions and then hopefully, while I'm asking my specific questions, will actually cover that point. But that will be very helpful. Thank you. Just want to say, Ms.. Barnett, I also noticed that you have your hand up. I'll bring you in shortly as well. But just want to ask a couple of questions first. So the image that have shared on my screen now, as you can see, it's, um, I think it shows the heap loads is starting graphic to point one.

01:20:13:24 - 01:20:28:13

Um, can I just ask the applicant to confirm in terms of the site selection? Because obviously, as we can see here, this is part of the site selection process that you have included on your, um, on your.

01:20:28:15 - 01:20:29:00

Um.

01:20:29:22 - 01:20:45:13

On your chapter two of the alternatives. Um, in, in terms of the essential criteria, you do mention, um, heat loads cannot just clarify with, with the applicant. Um, can you please explain why?

01:20:47:07 - 01:20:51:24

Why it is important and. And what is understood by Hitler. Please.

01:20:56:18 - 01:21:29:08

Clear project for the applicant. Yes. Before we just go on to that, I think it's important to just reiterate that the first step that was taken by the applicant was to identify an area in the country that had that had residual waste capacity. Um, and so when the East of England was identified as being an area that had, um, availability for residual waste to be treated further up the hierarchy that began the beginning of the site selection process.

01:21:29:10 - 01:22:05:29

So the next criteria, essential criteria that was being applied was the identification of potential heat users, and that is based on the policy position in relation to the provision of combined heat and power as being a preferred element of energy from waste facilities. Mr. Kerry can explain how the heat map fed into the identification of potential users, which then led to the identification of the Wisbech site.

01:22:07:22 - 01:22:42:02

Thank you. Paul Kerry for the applicant. Um, when we take the the energy that's in the waste and we burn it, if we generate just electricity, then we, we turn only a proportion of that energy into useful energy in the form of electricity. And we call that normally fully condensing mode. It's a very technical term, but in those in that mode, our efficiency will be something just under 30%. So of the energy waste energy in the waste coming in, only 30% is turned into useful energy.

01:22:42:14 - 01:23:20:08

If, however, you can supply steam to a potential or to a steam user who is already using, for example, natural gas to provide his own steam or heat for a building, then your energy efficiency will be much, much increased. Now, just as an example for our facility in Plymouth, where we supply heat to the Royal Navy and the Devonport Naval Base and Dockyard, when we are in condensing mode only producing just electricity. Our efficiency is a shade under 30%, but when we supply heat we are talking about efficiencies of 50%.

01:23:20:10 - 01:23:55:04

So there is a clear energy efficiency advantage to having a heat supply as well as electricity. And this is what we call combined heat and power. And that's the the CHP in the title of this project is The Energy from Waste Combined Heat and Power Projects. So it is always an advantage to find heat users who will take that heat to increase the overall energy efficiency of the facility. So as a company, that is always our policy to to have facilities that are capable or actually do supply heat as well as electricity.

01:23:55:06 - 01:24:25:07

In this fabled CHP mode, we do that in Plymouth and we also do it. We'll be doing it up in Dundee where we have another facility. So that is the reason why we look for heat. And having established that, it's a question of where is the largest concentration of heat and in our view, the various industrial businesses in the southern half of Wisbech on this industrial park represent an ideal opportunity to supply that steam in the future.

01:24:26:14 - 01:24:30:21

Thank you. So can you please explain to everyone what is heat loads please.

01:24:31:28 - 01:24:44:27

Sorry. What is it? Loads. Heat load is the. Is the heat demand. It's another demand of in megawatts thermal, though rather than heat demand. Yeah. Sorry. Yeah.

01:24:45:00 - 01:25:19:28

Thank you. So if that is the heat demand, which as you have mentioned, is understandably one of the essential siting criteria that you have actually looked at. And surely the existence of businesses which have a requirement for heat in the form of steam and or electricity, as you have just now explained, Mr. Kerry, as well as the ability, will be highly desirable in terms of considering your ability to actually export not just electricity, but also steam and or electricity, as you have highlighted just now.

01:25:20:01 - 01:25:20:28

So.

01:25:22:26 - 01:25:25:14

If that if that is one.

01:25:25:16 - 01:25:43:19

Of the essential criteria that you have identified in terms of selecting the site? And can the applicant please provide us with some clarification in terms of what potential users of that heat and power have been identified as well?

01:25:54:28 - 01:25:56:09

Paul Carey for the applicants.

01:25:58:26 - 01:26:36:11

It's just the very type of industries that you see in that part of Wisbech. Food processing industries would be ideal, papermaking industries would be ideal and petrochemical industries would be ideal. Obviously there aren't many petrochemical industries in the area and there's one paper facility, but it's at King's Lynn And have that King's Lynn project gone ahead? It would have been an ideal opportunity to supply heat to that paper factory. But in the site that we're talking about, there are a number of large heat users that today use tremendous quantities of natural gas which produce carbon dioxide.

01:26:36:13 - 01:26:43:27

And I know we've discussed this point already, but, you know, they do represent potential steam users.

01:26:45:04 - 01:26:45:27

Thank you.

01:26:47:03 - 01:27:06:15

Ken, is it possible as well for the applicant to please confirm actually the location of the proposed facility within this map? Particularly would like to just confirm if it is on one of the areas identified in yellow or outside of that area.

01:27:18:22 - 01:27:46:20

Claire project for the applicant. Um, you can see Peterborough just faintly behind the orange shaded area. Um, towards the north of that, yes, just there. And then you've got three blue, three blue markers and most beaches. The middle one. Yes, yes, that one there. The question is that you've got three in a row from the orange area and it's the middle market.

01:27:46:23 - 01:27:52:13

The mouse is currently on King's Lynn, if you go slightly to the left. Yes, that is Wisbech.

01:27:52:17 - 01:28:13:06

And then the plan on the the next graphic graphic 2.2 in the document that you're in zooms in on that area that that middle marker and shows the three the sort of individual he uses within the Wisbech area. Um in more detail.

01:28:14:05 - 01:28:47:27

Right. Thank you very much for that confirmation. Um, so guess that's my point here and it's something that we have actually covered before, um, in this session today. But I just wanted to highlight that in terms of planning, weight and benefits, if this is one of the essential criteria that you have identified for the selection of site, this is exactly the reason why we would require and we would like to have a little bit more evidence in terms of possible usage.

01:28:50:22 - 01:29:06:24

Just to note that point, because clearly you have actually identified potential usage of combined heat and power within your own information and systems of alternatives. I don't know if the applicant would like to comment on that.

01:29:08:26 - 01:29:25:29

Claire Broderick, the applicant. And yes, the point is noted. Mr. Kerry has obviously provided earlier in the hearing the reasons why more detailed information is not available or can't be provided at this stage. But we will give further consideration as to

01:29:27:17 - 01:29:38:22

whether there is anything else that could be submitted into examination, whilst also bearing in mind the policy requirements about what is actually required to be demonstrated at this point in the process.

01:29:39:02 - 01:29:51:04

I accept that. Thank you. Now, could I actually move us on to technology? And actually, before I do, apologies, Ms.. Barnett, would you like to come in on this specific point?

01:29:52:28 - 01:30:28:17

And thank you, sir. Yes. I just really wanted to go back to the site selection process and looking at the essential criteria. One of them was that the he was looking for a site with a capacity gap. And the

point I'd like to make is it's not a site with a capacity gap. It's a region from what we were discussing this morning, with a capacity gap. So that need can be met anywhere in that region, which covers most of east of England. So when it boils down to it, it's not just that that's not really a driving force. It is really the the transport connections and the potential for heat, which as we discussed this morning, is is not exactly clear.

01:30:29:16 - 01:30:53:26

And the other point that they mentioned as well, this just now was that they looked at sites that were free from environmental constraints and just wanted to clarify what they meant that and whether they would include sites within flood zone three as an environmental constraint, because I'm sure that the applicant will be well aware of the requirements of the sequential test. And they need to look at alternative sites that are not in sites in an area at risk of flooding such as flood zone three.

01:30:54:25 - 01:31:20:27

Yes. Thank you. That last point probably links as well with some of the hearings that we have scheduled for later on this week that will deal with hydrology issues. There might be some linkage there, but I think that that's a useful point for us to explore now. So if I could ask the applicant to actually come back on those two points that Ms.. Barton has raised, please.

01:31:28:04 - 01:31:58:19

So David Kenyon for the applicant. The point regarding environmental. Environmental designation. So the site isn't designated. For example, it's not a triple C, It's not in a conservation area. With regard to the flood zone. And then when the site I'm you are quite correct. We'll probably come into this in a day or two. Time But when the site selection process was underway, the site was allocated for waste uses.

01:31:59:08 - 01:32:00:16

And if you follow

01:32:02:04 - 01:32:14:20

the NPF and or the national policy, it's quite clear that you do not need to undertake the sequential test for sites allocated in the local plan and in the relevant local plan.

01:32:15:09 - 01:32:40:03

Yes. We'll want to actually touch on that on the next item actually. But think I don't know if you would. The applicant would like to comment on the other issue that was just raised in terms of capacity gap identified, which think that the point that was made was that it is regional gap, not a more site specific local gap.

01:32:42:10 - 01:33:25:04

Clare Project, the applicant? Yes, I think the applicant has been clear that the facility is designed to meet a regional capacity gap, but then the next stage in the site selection process was the identification of potential users for the combined heat and power. And that is what led to the identification of the of the Wisbech site. So it is quite correct that we were looking for potential heat, combined heat and power users within the region and that's what led to the identification of the Wisbech site as being a potential potentially suitable to meet those essential criteria that have been identified.

01:33:26:08 - 01:34:03:09

Thank you. Thank you for that. I will now then in that case, move us on to technology. So any terms of alternatives. So in answering the first set of written questions and. And that would be with aggression. 1.5 Rep two zero 19. I have I have the answer here. The applicant stated that in relation to technology it has considered other alternatives such as gasification and paralysis.

01:34:03:11 - 01:34:34:05

But the two systems were dismissed and these are difficult to make work at the scale of the proposed development and with the mixed residential residual waste that is anticipating will be used. It also mentioned a system using enzymes, but this was dismissed as thought to not work on a commercial basis. Can the applicant please provide us a little bit more information regarding these systems? And I'm particularly curious in terms of the enzyme system and why.

01:34:34:15 - 01:34:39:09

And it was dismissed as not working on a commercial basis.

01:34:42:11 - 01:35:23:15

Paul Carey for the applicant. Before I hand over to my colleague, I just want to stress that has been in the waste business for well, since the 1960s. And over that period of time, especially in Germany, we've developed a lot of experience and knowledge of different waste systems and there are lots of different waste systems out there that could deal with residual waste of the type we're talking about. So we've been here in the UK as well for the last 17 know, 16 years now almost, and we've been watching the UK market almost repeat the same mistakes that might have been made in Germany in the past.

01:35:24:05 - 01:35:56:09

So we do have a lot of experience within our team. We have two colleagues here today that were introduced earlier, James Ashton, our Head of engineering, and Dr. Sven Bauer, ahead of innovation and proposals. And the clue is in the title of his job. His main job is to look at innovative systems and to assess them and to decide whether these are in fact, worthy of further consideration. So I'm going to hand over to Dr. Sven Bauer to give you a bit more detailed explanation in particular about enzymes.

01:35:56:11 - 01:36:14:22

And most recently I asked him to attend a visit with with Mr. Ashton on the UK's only enzyme based facility to give us a full assessment of what it was capable of doing. So I'll hand over to Dr. Sven Bauer, if I may.

01:36:16:07 - 01:36:16:22

Dr..

01:36:17:25 - 01:37:11:18

Yes, Hello. My name is Dr. Bauer. On behalf of the applicant. Um, well, I drafted a technical note which will be submitted at deadline for going into more detail why we have selected energy from waste and why we have excluded alternative treatment technology. Um, so but to summarize this here, in this hearing, um, you can separate alternative technologies either in thermal technologies, which is then called advanced conversion technologies or advanced thermal treatment technologies, which would be gasification or pyrolysis or you can use a cold system which is mechanical biological treatment.

01:37:12:08 - 01:37:49:12

Both systems have shown in the past it's not feasible to treat efficient and economically residual waste, which lies in the nature of waste. Water waste is a very inhomogeneous material. There's no specification for it. Residual waste changes over the year. It's more wet. Um, in the in the winter time, it's more dry in the summer time, it changes over the years since the consumer behaviour changes and packaging changes and other things change.

01:37:50:03 - 01:38:27:27

There's a lot of contaminations and chemicals in the waste, which makes it difficult to, to deal with kind of novel technologies. So what's needed to treat residual waste? Basically, it's a very robust

technology to cope with all the changes in the residual wastes. Also changes in the characteristic of the of the fuel specification basically. So gasification and pyrolysis, it's a more sensitive and more complex, but also a more efficient technology.

01:38:28:25 - 01:38:50:09

But it needs really extensive pretreatment to work. So and, and basically on residual waste it it never worked as a report um made for the UK government. A recent report from 2021 which which I refer to in my technical note which says

01:38:51:24 - 01:39:01:13

gasification is not or pyrolysis is not suitable at the moment to treat to use on a big scale

01:39:03:12 - 01:39:39:24

project. It needs much more work to to bring this kind of pilot plants up to a big scale treatment facility um with is a mechanical biological treatment process where mechanically you try to separate materials which can be used for recycling. Um, and any organic materials will then treated by a biological treatment process which can either become composting or unavailable attraction.

01:39:40:03 - 01:39:41:14

Well. He

01:39:43:01 - 01:40:26:12

has been thought as a real alternative. But the point is the output of the facilities. So what you do, you sort the waste and you extract some plastics, you extract some metals, you can extract some class, and then you also have some kind of organic reaction which you can send to it Further, all this output streams you receive from residual waste are highly contaminated. So the organic reaction, for example, where you can generate a compost like material out of it, you can't find really a market because there are plastic particles in and you can't use it as a compost to put on your plants or bring it to the files.

01:40:27:04 - 01:41:00:25

Similar for the plastics you extract. The plastics are contaminated with organic particles and so on with with heavy metals from batteries or whatever. Um, so it's really hard to find the market. And you can see that, for example, on the water beach facility, there was a recent report from 2022, um, made for the Scottish Government where data of several facilities have been collected and water is listed with a with a landfill rate of 90%.

01:41:00:27 - 01:41:45:02

So basically it's a 100% residual waste which goes in 90%, comes out and goes to landfill. So basically what we're saying also is systems are not going to work for the residual waste. It might work if you have a really specific form of waste, sort of kind of waste for manufacturing facilities or a really good specification on that, but not really for residual waste. Um, we also looked on this one kind of the art enzyme based treatment facility because this facility is for sale at the moment, because it's economically not really working.

01:41:45:21 - 01:42:15:25

Um, so this enzyme technology basically washes waste. It's basically a big washing machine where you put water and enzymes into it. Enzymes are used everywhere. It's in, in fabrication or also in your detergent. If you buy a, um, detergent, which is bio, since there are enzymes in, um, so the enzymes basically separates organic matters from, from waste, from the plastics.

01:42:15:27 - 01:42:39:27

So you get a kind of a liquid and this liquid you can use to generate biogas, which is done in this facility. And then the remaining solid fraction is then be sorted by a mechanical treatment facility. But in reality, the biogas output from this enzyme treated, um, liquid, which then comes out is not really,

01:42:41:17 - 01:43:25:17

um, really create sufficient output. You have a great income. Um, and the solid fraction which is then separated into plastic and films, into metals, into glass and fines and other things. Most of this organic production and most of the solid production, um, can't be really recycled. Well, you have some plastics you can recycle, but there's a lot of rubber and other kind of, um, material in which in the end ends up again in energy from ways to basically more than 50% of the enzyme treated waste and up again in waste facility as well.

01:43:25:19 - 01:43:55:28

So that's why the question is really why do we need all these complex and novel technologies if they can just, um, increase the fraction of the recycling and you have to consider they need a lot of energy, they need resources for the, for the materials, for the equipment, the equipment must be maintained. Um, so you have steel and other things. It has also has an environmental impact, even it's only a mechanical sorting facility.

01:43:56:11 - 01:44:37:14

You need materials for it. You have to replace the motors, the pumps and so on. So basically that's the reason and we have seen such things in the past. As we mentioned, um, we had all this gasification and facilities, this alternative technology facility we had all in 2022 years ago in Germany and nothing has been established and. A similar way, followed up here in UK, we had more than 30 kind of advanced conversion technologies gasification projects in UK, but says most of them didn't work.

01:44:37:16 - 01:45:08:04

And you see the same facilities we mentioned before it shut down. We have seen the water beach facility in Cambridge as a 90% of the output goes to landfill. And so all these facilities facilities have heavily underperformed because residual waste is not a specified fuel and such alternative technologies need specified. Yeah, input materials.

01:45:08:22 - 01:45:11:15

Thank you. Thank you for that answer.

01:45:11:18 - 01:45:48:12

Ms.. Mr. Bauer. Um, can I just get, um, an extra note, please? For as Mr. Gross has actually mentioned, to submit, um, the technical notes on this specific issue, a deadline for, um, with this question, I'm just mindful of the time and did say that we would have a break now at around 230. It's now a 2:45. So I will perhaps have a break now and adjourn a a small comfort break and if we could actually resume it.

01:45:48:14 - 01:45:51:07

Um, a 3:15, perhaps.

01:45:53:26 - 01:45:58:27

And if anyone has any objections to that, please raise your hand.

01:46:02:12 - 01:46:13:16

I don't see any hands raised. So will adjourn this meeting quickly for a comfort break and we will resume at a 3:15. Thank you.