Medworth ISH4_17 May_PT3
Created on: 2023-05-17 12:32:22
Project Length: 00:50:36

File Name: Medworth ISH4_17 May_PT3
File Length: 00:50:36

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:07 - 00:00:08:07
Hello. Can I ask if people can hear me and see me?

00:00:10:12 - 00:00:13:02
I can hear you and see you, Mr. Pinto.

00:00:14:08 - 00:00:55:12
Thank you very much for that confirmation. So it is now 1234 and this hearing is resumed and we were moved. Welcome back to everyone. And we finished item three before the quick break. And now we're moving on to item four, which is air quality. And in this item, I would like to discuss air quality issues, mainly baseline assessment and methodology, construction and operational effects on human and ecological receptors, mitigation and monitoring and the impact on air quality management areas.

00:00:55:24 - 00:01:20:17
And again, as for the previous topic, it is quite a long list of key documents that have been identified by the XA that are particularly relevant for this specific topic. I don't propose that I go through all of them, but can I just check that everyone is in agreement with the list that has been provided in the agenda? And if you are not, please raise your hands or let me know.

00:01:24:09 - 00:01:53:00
I don't see any hands raised. Therefore, I propose that we actually. Oh, I do see. Oh, Um. Now my mistake. Apologies. So I don't see any hands raised is all saying. So I actually propose that I move on to my questions on this specific topic. And my first question is to the applicant. Uh, and obviously the methodology, um, uh, is set out in, um.

00:01:54:15 - 00:02:32:24
The Chapter eight of the equality that would be AP 035. And I would like the applicant to start by explaining to us today um, the identification of potential receptors. So within AP 035 and particularly looking at paragraph six, 8.60.5, where the applicant states receptors potentially affected by the proposed development comprise residents living in proximity in the proximity schools and recreational areas.

00:02:32:26 - 00:02:47:27
In addition, there are statutory non-statutory biodiversity sites in the locality which may be susceptible to direct exposure to air pollutants emitted from the proposed development and through indirect effects associated with nitrogen and exit deposition.

00:02:48:10 - 00:02:48:25
Um.

00:02:49:01 - 00:03:01:27

Can I ask the applicant to sort of, um, explain their rationale, um, in terms of identification of potential receptors, please.

00:03:05:25 - 00:03:22:04
Gary McGovern for the applicant. Our witness for this particular topic item was not present, sir, for the introductions at the beginning of the session, so I might just ask invite him to introduce himself for the purposes of the record before he then goes on to answer your particular question. Thank you.

00:03:22:09 - 00:03:23:20
Yes, please. Thank you.

00:03:25:07 - 00:03:37:12
Good afternoon, sir. My name is Sir Dr. Matt Sunderland. I have a bachelor's degree in combined science and a PhD in the policy implications of local air quality management and climate change.

00:03:38:13 - 00:03:42:25
Apologies. Can you just repeat your surname for me, please?

00:03:43:20 - 00:03:53:22
Yes. It's. It's urgent. Said. And the O has an unfelt on it. Uh, Dash Island land.

00:03:54:20 - 00:03:57:27
Okay. Dr. Island. Is that correct?

00:03:58:22 - 00:04:03:21
Uh, yes, it could be. It could be corrected later. There's no problem. Yeah. Okay.

00:04:03:23 - 00:04:11:12
Thank you very much. Then if you would like to then explain to us the approach to air quality, please.

00:04:11:20 - 00:04:46:11
Of course. Yes. Okay. So. So the the identification of receptors first requires defining the study area. Okay. So the so if we think of the potential air quality impacts in terms of road traffic, which could happen during construction or operation in terms of construction dust. And in terms of the of the, if you like, the the emissions from the from the chimney. Okay. So those can have an impact on both human human receptors and also ecological receptors.

00:04:46:26 - 00:05:31:19
So there is guidance which leads us to identifying, first of all, the the study area or defining the study area. So, for example, for for road traffic, we can refer to local, local air quality management, technical guidance, which identifies the the type of roads or the type of road traffic situations that we need to look at and the and the distances from them. Um, and we can refer to guidance issued by the Institute of Air Quality Management, which looks at the distance from a construction site within which we might expect dust impacts to, to need to be assessed.

00:05:32:13 - 00:06:09:06
And then for the chimney emissions, we can refer to guidance issued by the Environment Agency, which specifically refers to internationally designated nature reserves has to be considered within a distance of 10 to 15km and we've used 15km um, and for locally designated sites to be considered within two kilometres radius of the stack. Um, obviously that 15 kilometre distance, uh, we've included or human human health receptors have been included within that distance as well.

00:06:10:10 - 00:06:16:06

And how does that match with the zones of influence? Because that's terminology that you use in parts of your report.

00:06:17:12 - 00:06:21:28
Uh, is that more to do with landscape? Um.

00:06:23:15 - 00:06:39:18
Uh, so, no. Um. So in paragraph, uh, in paragraph 8.6, point five. Apologies. 8.6.3 where you actually set out spatial scope, it states.

00:06:39:24 - 00:06:41:21
Oh, yes. Okay. So. So, yes.

00:06:41:24 - 00:06:50:03
So I'm just trying to actually understand, you know, the definition and how the different zones and areas that you have identified or play together.

00:06:50:20 - 00:07:04:00
Um, please accept my apology. I think in this case, zones of influence and study area would be much the same thing. So there's, there's only one influence would be the, the, the distances as defined by the guidance.

00:07:04:27 - 00:07:05:25
Thank you. Yeah.

00:07:06:12 - 00:07:40:23
Okay. So, so within those zones of influence or study areas, we then look at the types of receptors that we want to consider. And so again, local air quality management, technical guidance sort of identifies the type of receptors. So this might be individual residential properties, hospitals, schools and so on, and also where those where those receptors should be located. So for the and the key here is to consider representative receptors.

00:07:41:03 - 00:07:58:00
Um, there's a balance between, um, assessing the air quality impact of every receptor because that would take a long time and the need to make sure we've included sufficient number of receptors to, to have a good, a robust assessment of how air quality

00:07:59:17 - 00:08:03:19
may be changed. Um, so think sorry.

00:08:03:29 - 00:08:19:02
I was going to actually share Figure 8.3, which you actually have, um, if part of the figures or the air quality figures. So that would be A052 document.

00:08:19:04 - 00:08:21:18
That's a page four of eight. Yes.

00:08:21:20 - 00:08:53:04
A exactly four of eight which is the models receptors. So again, just to clarify some of the terminology. Can you just clarify how you arrive to those model receptors and how those model receptors then link with what you have now explained in terms of identifying the receptors that you can then use to model the air quality, your quality conclusions in monitoring.

00:08:53:22 - 00:08:58:28
And I will try and share the document now as well so that you all can see.

00:09:02:02 - 00:09:41:09
Okay. So so these receptors were used. So they first of all, as you can see, they they generally reflect the the urban or the more developed residential area. And importantly, it includes receptors that are near to or adjacent to roads on which construction and operational traffic would would travel. And it includes receptors within the designated or ordained air quality management areas which exist which are actually on the previous page.

00:09:41:11 - 00:09:47:16
It's a bit difficult to flick from one to the other, but it can be done would be figure 8.2.

00:09:48:05 - 00:09:52:17
I believe that shows the air quality management areas.

00:09:52:27 - 00:09:54:14
That's that's correct, yes.

00:09:57:02 - 00:10:02:25
Okay. So if you would like to continue, then please.

00:10:03:23 - 00:10:04:08
Um.

00:10:04:29 - 00:10:27:17
Well, I think I think that really does describe how the selectors were receptive. It's a it's a combination of making sure we include receptors which are representative in terms of type, but also representative in terms of location, um, understanding where we would expect the potential impacts to occur from different, different stages of the operation.

00:10:27:21 - 00:10:43:15
And just to clarify, did you do any sort of work in terms of narrowing this down for them to be representative or this actually reflects the ones that you have considered representative? So can you just clarify that just for the sake of this recording?

00:10:44:01 - 00:10:53:17
Yeah. There's there's no formal process for determining the exact number of representative receptors. So it is a it is a it is professional judgment.

00:10:55:03 - 00:11:03:00
So you have carried out some work from that from that figure that we have just seen in order to identify which ones are representative.

00:11:03:26 - 00:11:28:24
We see No, no. Well, we've just we've we've modeled the air quality and impacted all of those receptors. And what we do is we obviously report the worst or the the the the receptor. We report the values at the receptors with the with the greatest difference or greatest change between the the base case baseline and the with the development.

00:11:29:01 - 00:12:12:00
Right. So just very quickly as well. Um, so obviously you have now talk us through in terms of how you have arrived to the models receptors, which is the models that are included in the figure 8.3 that I

have just recently showed. And I would now like to move us on to in terms of the assessment methodology. And that would be around 0.8.8.8 of 035. And my question is, can the applicant please talk us through the assessment methodology, particularly the determination of significance that then links with Table 8.18 of Chapter eight of DSS, which is AP 035.

00:12:22:22 - 00:12:25:05
Just. Just let me catch up with your notes.

00:12:26:05 - 00:12:38:26
So 8.8 if it's helpful. Table 8.18 is on page eight. It's on page 834. Legislative all of Chapter eight.

00:12:42:29 - 00:12:53:19
And it is the table where you actually identify how you divided the sites into the different categories.

00:12:54:28 - 00:13:31:06
Okay. So there are four four types of potential impact that we've assessed. There is the the impact of construction and operational traffic. Um, the impact of the, of the chimney emissions and the impact of odour during abnormal operations. And they're also those impacts are also experienced by human receptors and by ecological receptors. So that means there are there are different significance criteria that we've, we've used, all of which are described in the in this chapter.

00:13:31:08 - 00:14:07:23
But Table 8.18. Um, this is a table that's specifically used typically for, for urban air quality assessment. So for primarily road traffic impacts. Um, but it also enables us to look at the, the long term or the annual mean impacts or changes in air quality. So it has also been used looking at the, the pollutants from the chimney which have an annual mean or long term air quality assessment level associated with them.

00:14:07:25 - 00:14:47:11
So if you take nitrogen dioxide, for example. So nitrogen dioxide is both, um, we would, you know, is emitted from road traffic, but it's also emitted from, from the chimney. So the, the assessment of the, the long term impacts of nitrogen dioxide, i.e. the the annual mean is considered using these significance criterion table 818 and the short term impacts i.e. the one hour or the one hour standard is assessed using criteria that's published in environment Agency guidance, which is in the technical appendix.

00:14:47:21 - 00:15:18:01
So this, this table. Um, but think, think on this table. What's important to note here I think is that is on the left hand side. Um, as you get closer to or even exceed the air quality assessment level, the air quality standard, um, then the, the percentage change in concentration as a result of the proposed development becomes more critical, which makes sense as we, as we approach the standard, we, we would expect the situation to be more sensitive.

00:15:18:03 - 00:15:19:24
And that's what this table shows.

00:15:21:04 - 00:15:53:07
Right. Um, thank you very much. So in layman's terms, you actually set out the significance. You you defined your area. You identified the the receptors, you set out, your significance, you applied table and you applied your professional judgment in terms of assessing that, which once it's refined in this in this is the point that I want to get at after the process and I'm going to actually ask you to talk us through that process.

00:15:53:09 - 00:16:04:16
You finally arrive at the final table, which is table 8.35. Summary of significance of Effects.

00:16:06:09 - 00:16:11:12
And so can I ask you to

00:16:12:27 - 00:16:32:21
explain to us briefly in terms of, um, how then those, um, the summary of how you arrived to the table listing those specific receptors and summary of the predicted effects that you have included?

00:16:36:29 - 00:16:37:14
Um.

00:16:49:09 - 00:16:58:07
Okay. So. So, uh. Okay. So would you like me to go through every. Because this. This could be a very long answer to. To your question.

00:16:58:09 - 00:17:28:11
Exactly. Exactly. I'm trying. Well, I'm trying. I'm trying to I'm trying to take us to the summary of significant effects. But obviously, through the key process that you had to go through in order to get to that specific table. But I want us to look in detail in terms of the summary of the significance of effects, particularly, obviously the ones that you have identified where, um, where there is going to be, um, um.

00:17:30:08 - 00:17:46:25
Where there was going to be a higher sensitivity and higher magnitude of change as well. So can you explain to us, um, how. You got to that specific table.

00:17:47:15 - 00:18:21:19
Okay. So let's let's start with the first two. So we have industrial receptors within 350m from the construction routes or the construction site and the residential receptors within the similar distance. Okay. So first of all, those those distances are as defined in the guidance issued by the Institute of Air Quality Management, which we've referred to earlier. So those those distances are the zones of influence or the or the study area limits that we we previously discussed.

00:18:21:21 - 00:18:52:01
So the first step in, in looking at construction dust is to is to determine the the sensitivity of the receptor. So if we take a residential property that is deemed to be highly sensitive to to to to nuisance dust. Okay. And if we take a commercial or industrial facility now, if the commercial and this is where it is, where professional judgment is required.

00:18:52:03 - 00:19:29:05
So if we if we take, for example, a commercial facility, which is a car showroom, then clearly dusty position on all the nice shiny cars is is is going to be considered a problem. And that sort of commercial receptor could be deemed to be highly sensitive as well. However, if the if the commercial or the industrial development is a, um, a brickyard, for example, then that that receptor would not be deemed to be highly sensitive to, to, to dust nuisance.

00:19:29:07 - 00:20:11:15
And so there is a there is a there is a pragmatic approach to determining the first of all, the sensitivity of the receptor. Okay. Um, then the methodology then requires you to look at the, um, the propensity of the, of the, the activity. So whether it's construction or demolition or earthworks and the and the extent of those of those activities to, to, to generate a potential impact and combining those two

together, the propensity of the of the activity and the sensitivity receptor enables you to determine the risk level in terms of construction dust.

00:20:11:17 - 00:20:26:26
And that is then interpreted is then used to determine the level of mitigation that's applied so that that feeds directly into the construction environmental management plan or the the dust management aspects of the construction environmental management plan.

00:20:27:18 - 00:20:29:03
So so you are.

00:20:29:05 - 00:20:53:25
You are basically explaining that there are some measures that are built in within the process already, which would be those predicted within the outline construction, within the outline, construction traffic management plan and and outline local air quality monitoring strategy. And that has actually influenced your overall assessment of.

00:20:53:27 - 00:20:54:12
No.

00:20:54:19 - 00:21:25:29
No, it's not. No, no. For construction dust, the what? The assessment. The assessment is a risk based approach. So it it determines what is the level of risk of there being dust, nuisance or health effects from construction dust and depending on the level of risk that then is used to determine the level of mitigation that's applied. Okay. So if it was a very low risk, then the, the dust management uh, aspects of the construction environment and management plan would be quite thin.

00:21:26:21 - 00:21:47:13
Um, but if it's a if it's a high risk conclusion, then the, the dust management elements within the, the construction environmental management plan will be quite extensive and the guidance actually sets out three, three tables that that, that that provide the, the specific types of mitigation that should be applied.

00:21:49:01 - 00:21:53:08
So that's that's construction dust. If we if we go into the next um,

00:21:54:28 - 00:21:55:23
uh

00:21:57:19 - 00:22:03:26
yeah, if we go into the next one, which is the residential receptors, um, increased air emissions from chimneys and traffic.

00:22:06:08 - 00:22:06:23
Yeah.

00:22:09:23 - 00:22:54:15
Um, so the, um, uh, the sensitivity is, is high. It's a residential property, and we're looking at human health impacts. So that's, that's a that's a highly sensitive receptor. Um, the magnitude of change is based on the percentage change. And that's, um, in the, in the previous table, we, you saw that there was the percentages shown on the, on the top row of that table when we looked at the, um, and then you can use that, um, by, by knowing the baseline level of air quality, the existing level, um, you can then determine the level of significance using that, that, that, that table.

00:22:57:11 - 00:23:11:16
So that then. So from knowing knowing the level of significance, you know, we come to the conclusion that the the air quality impacts on those residential receptors is, is not significant.

00:23:12:24 - 00:23:55:27
Um, yes. Um, and so to press on this point, but in terms of the summary of the rationale that we have on that specific table, so table 8.35, you do mention the implementation of the camp and consistent with the outline camp. So can you please, uh, I'm assuming that that is linked with, um, mitigation of some of the impacts that were then overall considered as part of the overall impact in your overall assessment of the impact on those residential receptors and this and industrial receptors as well?

00:24:36:17 - 00:25:08:02
Okay. So thank you for your patience. So the way the the assessment of construction works is a risk based approach. Okay. So what you do is you you determine the the potential significance. Okay. Which in this case is or the potential risk with these cases is medium risk. And then you apply appropriate mitigation measures which are prescribed in the construction environment and management plan to to reduce that risk to negligible.

00:25:08:04 - 00:25:33:25
So the the assumption is always that you can manage the risk to ensure that the the residual impacts are negligible. And so it's a question of, um, making sure the construction environment and management plan is, is implemented. So I think there's potentially a bit of confusion between what's embedded and what not, which might be my, my confusion, which is what.

00:25:33:27 - 00:25:51:14
I'm trying to clarify. Sure. Yeah. So, so when, when, when you mentioned embedded mitigating measures, what you actually mean by those and where are those set out? And and this is to lead to the question, which is, um.

00:25:53:02 - 00:26:21:00
Fight. By finalizing that assessment, you you also mention at the end of the assessment that no further mitigating that led to the consideration of optional additional mitigation and compensation and just wanted to get to that difference between what is embedded, what is not embedded, what was considered as optional and why it was then not pursued. That is what I'm trying to clarify.

00:26:25:03 - 00:26:55:09
So David Kenyon for the applicant. So just just to respond to your point there, really. So, um, the embedded measures are set out in the chapter, and the process of assessment is that those embedded measures, which are basically a form part of that of the application, they're inherent with the application. They are considered as part prior to the undertaking effectively of, of the assessment.

00:26:55:11 - 00:27:30:27
So in this case, in respect of equality, it is the outline. Kemp For example, it's the outline construction traffic management plan, um, and it's the documents which support those. So for example, the dust management plan that sits within the Kemp. So they are embedded into the project, they're delivered, as you'll be aware, through the requirements and the conclusion of significance assumes and works on the basis that those, those measures are inherent and embedded within the development.

00:27:31:11 - 00:27:58:02
Um, I think the confusion has been over risk and significance. So if we look at the table we were just considering before with regard to dust, as Mr. Ireland explained, the risk is medium. But with that,

um, those embedded measures such as the Kemp, which is referred to in table 8.35, the conclusion of significance in the terms is negligible.

00:27:58:24 - 00:28:00:23
Okay. Thank you. Um.

00:28:03:11 - 00:28:09:17
And my question is, have you considered any optional additional mitigating measures or not?

00:28:12:07 - 00:28:15:04
In terms of construction dust just to.

00:28:16:05 - 00:28:18:17
In terms of air quality impacts.

00:28:20:04 - 00:28:20:26
Okay, dude.

00:28:21:19 - 00:28:52:27
So the additional US would be the local air quality management strategies. So if you recall that that wasn't an initial document with the application that wasn't submitted as part of the the, but in discussions with both local host local authorities, principally Fenland and King's Lynn, it was clear that they they would like to see a local air quality management strategy. So that is in addition to the embedded mitigation that is presented within that chapter.

00:28:53:25 - 00:29:12:14
Thank you. So following then the implementation of that air quality management strategy, the applicant is fairly confident that it has mitigated against all of the air quality impacts that has been identified may be older or or dust or general air quality issues in terms of pollution.

00:29:13:08 - 00:29:14:09
Yes, that's correct.

00:29:14:25 - 00:29:15:18
Thank you. Thank you.

00:29:27:18 - 00:30:04:13
Now, can I please invite, first of all, the Borough Council of Kingsland in West Norfolk to present to comment on this item and on this specific point linked with the concerns that were raised in terms of air quality issues and drawing particularly from their relevant representation, which is round one. And then also the local impact report and comments also on the adequacy of the applicant's response to these issues so far, which I have also picked up.

00:30:04:15 - 00:30:16:21
But if you could please, um, focus on the main areas of disagreement that would actually be really helpful. And if I could ask you to introduce yourself before you do, please.

00:30:19:02 - 00:30:19:17
Yeah.

00:30:21:14 - 00:30:22:09
Yeah. Can you hear me?

00:30:23:07 - 00:30:24:29
Can hear clearly. Thank you very much.

00:30:25:09 - 00:30:36:19
Yeah. My name is David Alford. I'm a senior environmental quality officer specializing in air for Kingsland West Norfolk Borough Council. Um.

00:30:39:20 - 00:30:40:21
In terms of the.

00:30:43:25 - 00:30:46:20
You want. Sorry. Can you just ask the question again? You want.

00:30:47:01 - 00:30:50:00
So. So I have obviously reviewed.

00:30:50:03 - 00:31:33:14
All of the information and submissions that the Borough Council has submitted previously, and I notice that obviously on your local impact reports, particularly on your relevant representation, relative representation to reference would be R-001 and then to local impact report or library references. 1-064. And I have noticed that particularly on those two documents, you have mentioned concerns in relation to air quality. So my question is, would you like to pose those questions to us so that we can analyze any outstanding points that there might be still in concerns that might be still from the Borough Council in terms of equality?

00:31:33:21 - 00:32:14:26
Yeah, fine. Um, well, the relevant representative representation that we that we made, we updated and expanded within the So the layer was the sort of the most relevant document for this hearing. Um, we recognize that the overall impacts are not considered of significance in terms of air quality, for example, with annual means represented as negligible impact when based on background air quality for the area, the results being um, being assessed as cumulative that they take account, as mentioned already with traffic and chimney emissions being combined, which is good.

00:32:15:04 - 00:32:41:07
But however, we did pick up that in terms of traffic that the traffic input data into the modelling differs from that. What's what was explained within the transport based on um, apportioning the payloads for the, the capacity of the site. Um, these points were explained within our within points 9.269.38 of um.

00:32:43:21 - 00:33:08:26
Previously in the. There were significant or sorry, substantial minus values represented in the traffic input data. But in the updated. Technical report for air quality. They're now showing positive values, which which is good. And we did clarify in

00:33:10:16 - 00:33:13:03
section 9.36 within our.

00:33:16:11 - 00:33:36:15
That this that the impact for traffic, the difference between the air quality input value and the traffic would generally impact nitrogen dioxide and to a lesser extent PPM. So the point was that due to this uncertainty of traffic movements in the air quality input data to the modeling.

00:33:38:13 - 00:33:45:16
What we were seeking and has raised at the previous hearing was a contribution towards existing monitoring.

00:33:47:27 - 00:33:57:04
Though it wasn't picked up within the draft, within the requirement 27 because that's to do with the applicant delivering. Um.

00:33:59:01 - 00:34:31:03
The air quality monitoring strategy. Um, but since we've now agreed that mainly to prevent air quality monitoring schemes to be delivered separately via a contribution with both Fenland and this council's area, but it would still need to be agreed between both authorities that it's better that it is delivered. Um as part of the draft DCO under requirement 27.

00:34:31:08 - 00:34:32:10
So

00:34:33:26 - 00:34:38:10
you don't believe it's still adequate addressed and that that specific requirement, is that the issue? Mr..

00:34:38:12 - 00:35:16:13
Alford We the, we agree with the air quality monitoring strategy. In principle. We agree that it's that it's an adequate response to the mitigation. Um, so we the contribution aspect is, you know, we, we'd rather have the scheme delivered specifically by, by the applicant. Um. So yes, there aren't any if the specific outstanding items, because ultimately the air quality impacts are deemed negligible.

00:35:16:15 - 00:35:28:20
But the air quality monitoring strategy is necessary to help reassure the public reassurance going going forward. And that's quite an important aspect.

00:35:30:21 - 00:35:40:06
Right. Um, can I ask the applicant to comment then, in terms of where we are with conversations with the borough police.

00:35:41:13 - 00:36:16:04
Team marks for the applicant, as Mr. Orford has mentioned? Well, since in summary, since deadline three, where we've obviously been reviewing the local authority representations, we prepared a further updated outline local air quality management strategy. We've circulated that to the to the to Mr. Orford and his colleagues at the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk, and also had some some email exchanges with Fenland District Council and the the environmental health officers there.

00:36:16:16 - 00:36:56:06
And we have reached a point where we have got an agreed outline, local air quality management strategy, and this will be submitted at deadline for. This is this has been updated to reflect the comments by Mr. Orford about particulate monitoring on the local highway network, the agreement of locations as part of the detailed management strategy. And we've also agreed between parties that the right mechanism to deliver this strategy is through the draft requirements, number 27, and that's a Section 106 or other agreement is not required.

00:36:56:08 - 00:37:03:00
So I believe that is a short summary of the position. And as I say, this will be submitted at deadline for. Thank you.

00:37:03:17 - 00:37:10:28
And I'm guessing that the statement of common ground with the Borough Council of Kingsland and West Norfolk will also reflect.

00:37:11:00 - 00:37:11:15
That.

00:37:11:25 - 00:37:19:11
In due course. Yes, the the Joint Statement of Common Ground is currently with the host authorities. So when we receive that back, we will be updating it.

00:37:19:13 - 00:37:23:03
Thank you. Thank you very much. Now, can I.

00:37:23:17 - 00:37:29:27
Is there any other consideration that you would like to put forward, Mr. Alford? What is that? Um.

00:37:31:01 - 00:37:45:25
No, that's the. The detail. It's only an outline. Air quality monitoring strategy. So the details, like locations and stuff can be agreed at a later date. That's just fine. Thank you.

00:37:46:06 - 00:37:48:28
Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Alford. Now, can.

00:37:49:00 - 00:38:04:19
I ask Cambridgeshire County Council and Fenland District Council? They have also identified some concerns in their joint local impact report. If they would like to actually come on this point in terms of issues with air quality, please.

00:38:05:08 - 00:38:17:20
Thank you, sir. Yes, I'll call Penny Wilson onto the screen. She's not with us physically, so she'll be joining remotely. Invite her to come on, introduce herself and outline where the councils are in terms of air quality.

00:38:18:09 - 00:38:25:10
Thank you very much, Mr. Circuit. Um, Mrs. Wilson, if you would like to introduce yourself, first of all, please.

00:38:28:23 - 00:38:30:14
Apologies. We can't hear.

00:38:30:16 - 00:38:31:01
You.

00:38:31:03 - 00:38:33:12
You might be on mute.

00:38:35:15 - 00:38:36:09
And maybe now.

00:38:36:25 - 00:38:56:18

Yes. Can hear you now? Yes. Good afternoon. Not a problem. Good afternoon. Would you please then introduce yourself for your record and confirm judge in the state representing? And then if you would be so kind as to put them in your point forward across in terms of air quality issues would be good. Thank you. Sure.

00:38:56:20 - 00:39:24:08
So I'm Miss Penny Wilson. I'm a technical director at Air Quality Consultants Limited. I'm acting on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council and Fenland District Council. Um, my first point to make really is a couple of times in the last few minutes, the applicants have mentioned a local air quality management strategy. As far as I'm aware, the only document I've seen is an outline local air quality monitoring strategy. Can they clarify that, please?

00:39:25:17 - 00:39:29:03
That certainly can ask the applicant to clarify that, to please.

00:39:31:27 - 00:39:38:21
Tim Marks for the applicant. Just bear with me one second. There are several documents for this application.

00:39:40:09 - 00:39:46:03
It's the outline local air quality monitoring strategy.

00:39:47:02 - 00:39:49:20
By which I believe that the latest.

00:39:50:21 - 00:40:01:06
Version of that document is the track version is rep three, dash 034. And then there is a clean, no tracked version which is web 3035.

00:40:01:18 - 00:40:06:07
Correct, sir. And the updated version that I just mentioned will be submitted at deadline for.

00:40:06:22 - 00:40:07:10
Thank you.

00:40:08:10 - 00:40:42:09
Okay. That's that's that's really important then. So, um, as, as you were discussing with Mr. Ireland, um, what's actually the impacts of the scheme is their conclusions are negligible. Um, and the air quality monitoring strategy is required to provide reassurance and transparency to the public. And there's no additional air quality mitigation being put forward other than controls on emissions from the stack itself.

00:40:42:22 - 00:40:58:16
So there isn't a local air quality management strategy being proposed. What is being proposed is an outline local air quality monitoring strategy to provide information. Um, can I just clarify that and make sure that that's correct?

00:40:59:17 - 00:41:00:21
So think, think.

00:41:00:23 - 00:41:02:06
We have just clarified that.

00:41:02:14 - 00:41:02:29
The.

00:41:03:01 - 00:41:30:06
Okay document is an outline local air quality monitoring strategy. Um, I if I understood your point correctly, is that it does seem that you are of the opinion that perhaps management strategy rather than just monitoring strategy would be um, would be useful to consider. Is, is, is that, um, the point that you're trying.

00:41:30:08 - 00:41:31:06
To get at?

00:41:31:08 - 00:41:39:04
No, I'm just don't think it's necessary, but I'm just clarifying that there isn't anything else to address those emissions. Right.

00:41:39:06 - 00:41:42:08
Okay. Okay. Can I go back to the applicant.

00:41:42:10 - 00:41:53:07
And please clarify if there is any other strategy? Is there a management strategy in addition to the monitoring strategy that we have just highlighted and went through the reference.

00:41:55:01 - 00:42:22:07
Two marks for the applicant? Yes. In terms of management strategies, there are several management strategies or outline management strategies accompanying the application. These include the outline operational traffic travel plan, the outline operational traffic management plan, the outline construction traffic and traffic management plan and the outline odor management plan.

00:42:23:22 - 00:42:34:24
This also is the environmental permit application that we've submitted and that will obviously have its own management requirements. Thank you.

00:42:37:05 - 00:42:43:24
Is pending. Mr. Wilson. Ms.. Wilson. Pardon me. Sorry. Ms.. Penny Wilson, Would you like to come in now?

00:42:43:26 - 00:42:44:17
Thank you.

00:42:45:02 - 00:43:27:07
Sure. So, broadly speaking, the at outlying local air quality monitoring strategy is welcomed. And there's just one outstanding point, and that is that in response to the deadline, the comments on deadline, two submissions. Rep. 3042. In response to comments five eight the Council has asked for information on on what the response would be in terms of measuring and exceedance and what would be done to identify the sources and how they would be resolved and mitigation to ensure that didn't happen again.

00:43:27:16 - 00:44:00:01
And the applicant's response to that specifically is that that information would be as part of quarterly reports. The issue with that is that doesn't really allow the council to respond in a timely manner to any issues. So the request is that in the event of exceedances of thresholds being measured at those

monitoring stations, within the outline monitoring strategy, there is a requirement to to report to EXCEEDANCES in a timely manner and also report the investigation of sources and response to that.

00:44:01:02 - 00:44:03:00
Right. Can I ask the.

00:44:03:02 - 00:44:05:29
Applicant to reply to this specific point.

00:44:06:01 - 00:44:06:16
Please?

00:44:07:12 - 00:44:40:03
Tim Marks for the applicant. Yes. The outline local air quality monitoring strategy was circulated, updated and circulated to the host authorities. This comment wasn't picked up at that time or reported back to us during that discussion. We'll have a look at this point and see if any further updates are required. But we I suppose one one. We also have the the monitoring under the environmental permit for the facility itself.

00:44:40:11 - 00:44:58:14
And that will be in place. We'll have to regularly report to the Environment Agency, um, the emissions and any exceedances that would that could occur. And there is a there is a there's a regime in place there to to suitably control the proposed development.

00:44:59:08 - 00:45:08:10
Thank you, Ken. In that case, please get an action for the applicant to come back to the examining authority following that review, please.

00:45:11:14 - 00:45:13:24
And Mr. Wilson. Is there anything.

00:45:13:26 - 00:45:15:07
Else that you would like to add?

00:45:16:03 - 00:45:17:09
Nope. That's all for me.

00:45:18:01 - 00:45:19:02
Thank you very much.

00:45:21:09 - 00:45:22:06
And I.

00:45:22:22 - 00:45:23:20
Can see.

00:45:23:28 - 00:45:25:09
That we have.

00:45:25:19 - 00:45:30:16
Mr. Martin Little that would like to come in on this specific point now.

00:45:33:18 - 00:46:14:09
Thank you, sir. My name is Dr. Martin Little, and I'm the chair of King's Lynn without incineration. I just want to add a technical point to that last discussion on the LCM, which has been agreed to run for one year before and four years after the operational commencement. We were very pleased to see that the villages were going to be instrumented until we noticed that the instrumentation will be indicative monitoring In this context, indicative monitoring is monitoring with a much lower data quality which is unsuitable for issuing alerts or for determining exceedances.

00:46:14:17 - 00:46:16:05
I just thought you'd be interested.

00:46:17:18 - 00:46:19:23
And thank you for.

00:46:19:25 - 00:46:33:00
That specific comment. Um, you mentioned the air quality monitoring areas. Is there a specific one that you are particularly concerned about or is it all the air quality monitoring areas?

00:46:33:21 - 00:47:08:24
Now we have a concern that many of the. Original sampling points for the baseline in the application were well within the shadow of the stack. You'd have to be 900m out from the stack for the plume to even impact the ground. So anything short of the Clarkson school would be unlikely to actually be meaningful. We wanted much further out monitoring, so we're very pleased to see the ring of villages included in the agreement to have an LCMS.

00:47:08:26 - 00:47:19:20
It was just that we see it as a huge missed opportunity not to have instrumentation of the right standard that could be used to determine exceedances. So it's.

00:47:19:22 - 00:47:21:06
About monitoring.

00:47:21:20 - 00:47:35:20
It's the location and the technical spec, and I think it's a big missed opportunity. And I regret to say that the comment about reassurance of the public being the purpose, um, does worry me.

00:47:36:07 - 00:47:39:23
Okay. Thank you very much for that clarification. Dr. Martin.

00:47:40:03 - 00:47:40:26
Can I ask.

00:47:40:28 - 00:47:44:06
The applicant to reply to this point? Think. Thank you.

00:47:44:15 - 00:48:20:20
Tim Marks for the applicant since just to be to be in terms of the latest version of the the strategy that we're discussing. It was previously updated to actually accelerate the period of monitoring, not from just one year prior to operations, but actually to the start of construction. So we're building up that additional data and information from the point of construction through to four years post operations, also through engagement with the environmental health Officer at the Borough Council of Kingsland and West Norfolk.

00:48:20:22 - 00:48:52:24
We've including a particulate monitor with weather weather monitoring capabilities as well. So we've increased the amount of equipment that will be in place. And in terms of the locations for the actual positions for the final monitoring, this would be agreed with the environmental health officers as as part of the detailed scheme that would be have to be submitted under the requirement draft requirement number 27. So I believe we've addressed the points that Dr.

00:48:52:26 - 00:48:53:22
Little has raised.

00:48:54:19 - 00:48:57:25
Thank you very much for that clarification. Right.

00:48:57:27 - 00:48:58:24
Is there anyone else.

00:48:58:26 - 00:48:59:15
That has any other.

00:48:59:17 - 00:49:02:15
Question on this specific point that would like to.

00:49:02:17 - 00:49:03:12
Ask now?

00:49:06:17 - 00:49:08:08
Dr. Martin Little.

00:49:08:10 - 00:49:17:06
I notice that your hand is still raised. Can I just ask you to please. If. If you don't have any further points to lower your hand, If that's all right.

00:49:17:13 - 00:49:19:28
My apologies. I'm new to this system.

00:49:20:04 - 00:49:20:19
That is.

00:49:20:21 - 00:49:22:10
Fine. Thank you very much. Thank you.

00:49:27:10 - 00:49:27:28
Right.

00:49:30:14 - 00:49:35:05
I would like now to hand over to Claire.

00:49:35:07 - 00:49:37:05
Makinson, who is going to cover.

00:49:37:09 - 00:49:39:06
Item five.

00:49:39:08 - 00:49:43:23
Of the Agenda. So if I can hand over to Mrs. Makinson, please.

00:49:47:07 - 00:50:09:03
Thank you, Mr. Pinto. Just giving the given the time that we had allocated. Um, I'm wondering whether it would be a good opportunity to break now for the longer break over lunch. Um, I think this item, we could pick this up at 230 and. And as this is the last item that we've got to deal with today.

00:50:12:07 - 00:50:14:20
I would I would be content with that approach.

00:50:16:04 - 00:50:30:24
Okay then. So if we can adjourn, it's now 1:24 p.m.. If we can adjourn the hearing now until 230 where we'll pick up item five, climate change. Thank you, everyone.