

File Name: ISH7 - 27 June 2023_Part 2

File Length: 00:59:48

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:06 - 00:00:08:07

Hello. Can I just confirm that everyone can hear me clearly, Please?

00:00:11:12 - 00:00:13:21

Andre, I hear you.

00:00:15:11 - 00:00:27:07

Thank you. Thank you very much. So welcome back, everyone. Now. The hearing is now resumed. Uh, before we move on, can I just confirm that the live stream is now running, please?

00:00:27:23 - 00:00:28:19

Yes.

00:00:30:03 - 00:01:09:13

Thank you very much. So before the break, we covered some topics and waste issues, and I would like us to move towards remaining waste issues, but move on to other topics. And I would like us to actually consider the information that the applicant has supplied in Appendix C of the Wafa. And I would also like to point out that DCS has asked a series of questions as part of the two questions in relation to this.

00:01:09:16 - 00:01:30:08

And I would start by asking the applicant to please explain and just provide a little bit of context in terms of the three main groups that form the tables, including in appendix C of the Wafa.

00:01:36:23 - 00:02:00:05

Clap round for the applicants. Yes. Appendix C of the fuel availability assessments. Looks in the round at capacity available capacity information. This is split into four key tabs or four key categories we have

00:02:01:22 - 00:02:22:24

consented and operational capacity. Um, and this is England based. Um, and it's broken down according to former planning region so consented and operational capacity. We have, um. With me. Uh.

00:02:24:24 - 00:02:36:17

We have capacity that is under construction or in commissioning, but effectively under construction. So that's capacity that's currently being built and not operational.

00:02:38:11 - 00:03:24:17

We then have capacity that is consented. So it has planning permission, but for whatever reason has not been built. And then we have a fourth category of capacity, which is capacity that sits in the planning system and has yet to be determined or various stages of the determination process. The initial purpose of preparing Appendix C was as a validation exercise or a checking exercise of other data that the fuel availability assessment draws upon around available capacity.

00:03:25:09 - 00:03:43:09

It was also intended to provide some narrative around those capacities that are consented and not built or in the planning process. So that's effectively a summary of what that appendix does.

00:03:44:03 - 00:04:03:06

But thank you. And in relation to, um, the questions that I have just mentioned now, and I'm particularly looking at the applicant's response to and to um.

00:04:05:01 - 00:04:17:16

Apologies. ESPN. 2.3 and 2.4 in 2.5 and 2.6.

00:04:19:13 - 00:05:08:16

Uh, in 0.7, which all relate to. And Appendix C? Um. DCS asks a series of questions in terms of capacity and how the capacity is calculated in light of the discussions that we have had today in terms of what is in scope and what is now in what is out of scope. Uh, could could the applicant just talk us through a little bit in terms of how it guarantees that for each one of the different categories included in appendix C that we have just mentioned? How confident not how confident the applicant is that there will be sufficient weight waste for the lifetime of the facility to actually fuel the facility Police.

00:05:15:19 - 00:06:02:03

Claire Brown for the applicant. So think the key point to note first of all in relation to all of these different types of capacity that we have highlighted in Appendix C and I'll deal first with the operational capacity is that the capacity is presented on a regional basis. So where we have a capacity for an operational capacity figure for the east of England, that is of direct relevance to the waste fuel availability assessment, because the waste fuel availability assessment includes all of the east of England, however, the same.

00:06:03:10 - 00:06:35:21

A relationship cannot be drawn between the East Midlands in that the appendix C of the fuel availability assessment groups as have said, groups capacity according to what's available in the East Midlands. However, um, that's very much um. Super worst case because the fuel availability assessment is only based upon part of the East Midlands.

00:06:35:23 - 00:07:08:04

So the, the five um, waste planning authorities that we really need to pull out of any capacity listed in appendix C is that that relates to Leicestershire, Leicester City, Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire and Rutland, because they are the five parts of the former east of England region that that sit within our study area.

00:07:08:12 - 00:07:40:10

So as part of our response back to the examining authority's questions in relation to operational capacity, um, and a sort of clarified version of the table has been provided. Um, the appendix C for East Midlands Total East Midlands capacity for consented and operational capacity is reporting 446,000 tonnes.

00:07:40:12 - 00:08:11:11

So should just stress that thousand tonnes, not not million tonnes, 446,000 tonnes. But when you remove those areas of the East Midlands that do not fall within our study area, actually the consented and operational capacity falls to 246,000 tonnes. So the key message here is that. In appendix C only.

00:08:11:13 - 00:08:46:04

Only part of that capacity relating to the East Midlands actually should be taken notice of because we are looking at only part of the East Midlands that forms the study area and can very, very briefly run

through. The same is true of the consented and under construction capacity. Appendix C of the fuel availability assessments reporting a global figure for the East Midlands of 520,000 tonnes.

00:08:46:06 - 00:09:23:14

But when you refine that down to only look at those five authorities that we're considering in the East Midlands, that comes down to 350,000 tonnes of available capacity that's consented and under construction. Similarly, the biggest change is with the consented and not built capacity. We have over and this is a million over a million tonnes, 100 at 1,099,000 tonnes of consented and not built capacity in the East Midlands.

00:09:23:16 - 00:09:49:08

But actually when you study that and look at it, what's available in those five authority areas for the East Midlands, that goes right down to 154,000 tonnes. So significant reduction there. And the in plant in planning capacity actually remains the same at a million tonnes. So there the if that's helpful there the differences.

00:09:49:21 - 00:10:53:17

Yes, that is that is very helpful. My question then in that is, is considering emerging policy and here I recognise that this policy is emerging, but nevertheless it remains an important and relevant consideration for the Secretary of State. That proposed plant must not compete with greater waste prevention, re-use or recycling, or resulting overcapacity of energy from Waste Treatment International, which think that we have covered extensively all local level. What work has the applicant carried out in order to ascertain compliance with this emerging policy? And am looking particularly at from the type of capacity that you have just explained? I'm looking I would expect the applicant to be able to provide information and evidence, particularly in relation to consented and operational capacity and consented in the construction capacity, particularly because obviously the level of certainty of those facilities being operational is higher than any other category.

00:10:57:08 - 00:11:47:11

Claire Brown for the applicant. So, yes, the, the local assessment, the, um, assessment, um, that we have set out very much focuses upon the operational capacity and the capacity in construction and commission. What we've done is we have first of all looked at the report produced by Vic dated May this year, which to keep a live database of operational and capacity under construction and have reported a total capacity of just under 18 million tonnes.

00:11:47:13 - 00:12:20:08

So it's 17.9 million tonnes. So that's a figure that they're putting forward as being by 2026 there will there will be 17.9 million tonnes of operational and capacity in construction or commission available. So what the what we've done is we have to check that and to provide a sort of robust analysis of that.

00:12:20:10 - 00:12:53:06

We've used the data in the in appendix C of the fuel availability assessment to to try and draw comparisons. Now, you may remember earlier Mr. Darwin quite rightly pointed out that Toll Vic do not regard um, permitted capacity as being the fully available capacity. They, they used to have the assumption that it's around about 88% of a plant's throughput.

00:12:53:14 - 00:13:37:02

Um, that that that occurs. So if facility takes 100,000 tonnes by and large it will take 88,000 tonnes. If it's permitted to take 100, it's generally going to take 88,000 tonnes. So what we've done is we have compared the data set out in the fuel availability assessment, um, to, to the toll Vic data. So if I just, for example, take the operational capacity. So toll Vic in 2023, um, are reporting that in England there's 13.9 million tonnes of available energy from waste capacity.

00:13:37:22 - 00:14:17:14

When you look at our fuel availability assessment data that's based upon. Permitted capacities. That's 15.8 million tonnes. We've then applied the 88% operational level and that actually then equates to 13.9 million tons. Therefore, we're happy that they told the data of 2023 marries up with our own findings, which is that there's 13.9 million tonnes of capacity available in England.

00:14:17:22 - 00:14:54:05

So it's been a checking exercise essentially. We've done the same for capacity and construction and commission where Total is reporting 4 million tonnes of capacity in England. Our fuel availability assessments reporting 4.4 million tonnes. But when you apply the 88% um, operational figure that takes us down to 3.5 million tonnes. So we're actually thinking that there's less capacity in construction and commission than Total have reported.

00:14:54:07 - 00:15:24:23

However, we have aired on the side of caution as we have throughout this entire document and adopted the higher figure, the total figure. Um, so generally to sum up total, Vic is suggesting that there's 17.9 million tonnes of capacity across England. Um, with the 88% calculation on our capacity set out in appendix C of the fuel availability assessment.

00:15:25:08 - 00:15:58:22

We've got to a figure of 17.8. We've applied the 17.9. Um. As published by Toll Vic. So that's been I hope that wasn't too garbled, but that's been a generally what we've done. It's been a sort of checking exercise and a validation exercise of the of the Toll Vic report. And we've come to the conclusion that actually we think the same as Toll Vic, that broadly there's 17.9 million tonnes of capacity across England in construction and in operation.

00:15:59:15 - 00:16:35:12

Thank you, Mrs. Brown. But my question was more actually linked with perhaps the geographical distribution of this. So as I have mentioned before, you know, considering the emerging policy, which is that new waste facility, new energy from waste facilities, treatment must not compete to with objectives or generate over capacity nationally or locally. I am satisfied with this response in terms of national and obviously the regional data that you have looked.

00:16:35:14 - 00:16:58:10

I just wanted to clarify, um, locally, if you have actually carried out any more detailed work in terms of analysing the regional data and how potentially the proposed development could potentially, um, dislocate some of the waste.

00:17:03:17 - 00:17:43:18

Claire Brown for the applicant. The focus of the local assessment has been on the. Amount of residual waste that's currently sent to landfill and how that could be diverted from landfill. Um, and also on the needs, um, set out in the local plan evidence basis which. Which take into account available capacity in in an area as well as future needs.

00:17:44:03 - 00:18:16:10

Um. In terms of looking at the capacity set out in Appendix C and the local capacity there, the extent of the work done to analyze what's what's available in terms of East of England and the relevant parts of the East East Midlands. That's been presented more categorically in the responses to the examining authority in our in our last submission to you.

00:18:16:23 - 00:18:49:03

Um, but the conclusions are that even with the available the, the operational, the capacity that's operational and that that is under construction is there's still a shortfall in, in um, in requirements. Um,

we have looked at some detail around um, capacity for example that is in, that has got consent that's in the study area and has not been built.

00:18:49:05 - 00:19:19:20

And we provided a narrative around that in the West fuel availability assessment. And I'm thinking particularly here around the planning capacity and referring to Section 5.1, .23 of the waste fuel availability assessment, where we include some narrative around the significant care that must be taken when looking at what is consented capacity that's yet to be built.

00:19:20:01 - 00:19:49:10

I think particularly around the Peterborough Renewable Energy Facility and also other capacity that's in the planning system that sits in the study area such as that in North Lincolnshire, Flixbus and the Boston Alternative Energy Facility. And we've included narrative there and discussion there around um, why we feel that even why these facilities would not be able to meet the, the shortfall in need that there is.

00:19:50:19 - 00:20:15:07

At the. Thank you. So just to be very clear on this specific point, from the ones that actually compete directly with the same waste codes is the proposed development. Um, have you actually done any sort of assessment looking at the proximity of those competing facilities to the main sources of waste as per your regional data?

00:20:33:00 - 00:21:14:00

Claire Brown for the applicant. The extent of our work is that appendix C, as I've discussed, breaks it down. According to East Midlands and the east of England and the supplementary supplementary information that we provided as part of our response to the Examining Authority's questions. Pulls out that capacity that is relevant in relation to the the East East Midlands. So it's that part plus the east east, um, east of England, and that's the extent of the work that we've, we've carried out on a on a local level.

00:21:14:07 - 00:21:26:02

Um, in addition to analysing against local plant evidence based needs. So it's effectively the information in appendix C is where the work is, which.

00:21:26:04 - 00:21:55:09

Which is information that is regional. So in answer to my question, in terms of any more detailed localised work, in terms of assessing the proximity to the main sources of waste, we end with facilities that will compete from the same waste codes. You have only looked at the information regionally and taking that as a whole.

00:22:01:20 - 00:22:10:06

I think that that is the summary of your response. But I would just like to confirm that this is a significant point for us.

00:22:13:21 - 00:22:34:03

So the local assessment has been based upon the study area. That's what we regard the local assessment to be and that's what our assessment is based upon. So east of England plus those relevant sections of the of of the Midlands, and that's the basis of our our assessment.

00:22:34:05 - 00:23:06:20

Thank you. Thank you very much. Mr. Brown. If I could, just picking up on a specific point that you have also mentioned on your intervention just now in terms of capacity from local waste to authorities. So we discussed in previous hearings, I believe it was issue specific, hearing three on

waste matters that we would like some sort of evidence or would requested the applicant to liaise with local authorities.

00:23:07:04 - 00:23:15:12

Um, in terms of confirmation of reported or dissipated capacity, is there any sort of update that you can provide us on that specific issue?

00:23:20:23 - 00:24:01:16

Claire Brown for the applicant. Um, so the key the key information is set out in tables 4.6 and 4.7 of the fuel availability assessment which draws upon the, um, evidence set out by local or waste planning authorities in the study area on their likely future waste management needs. Um, as with all other parts of this fuel availability assessment, it is based upon published data data that is in the public domain.

00:24:01:22 - 00:24:44:16

What we have sought to do in the updated fuel availability assessment, however, is seek to make clear to the examining authority um where we have taken evidence directly from a waste local plan or its supporting evidence base, and that is direct quotes and information from tested policy and evidence. Um, and we've said that's, that's one area of sort to make clear, but where we've got, we've sort of differentiate that from um, where evidence bases are emerging and untested.

00:24:44:20 - 00:25:30:02

And we've also sought to further differentiate where we're applying our own interpretation and commentary against that evidence base or emerging local plan. So we've sought to do that in a sort of colour coded manner in table 4.6 and 4.7. So effectively anything in black text is taken from is the requirements taken from extant waste local plans. We have had test evidence spaces, anything in blue text is information that's taken from an emerging evidence base and anything in red is where we've put our own commentary interpretation against that.

00:25:30:11 - 00:25:49:24

Um, so that's how we've sought to sort of, um, flesh out and push forwards our work on the local plant evidence bases and the requirements of future need that the local plans and the waste planning authorities have indeed themselves and highlight it.

00:25:50:17 - 00:26:16:07

Thank you. Um, and also one a specific action, which was action three that came out of issue three, which was for the applicant to provide the Excel with evidence of expressions of interest from waste companies and always planning authorities with an interest in redirecting waste to the proposed development. Um, do we have. Would the applicant like to comment on that specific action point?

00:26:17:20 - 00:26:30:21

Claire The applicant and that information is provided in appendix A of the applicant's written summary of the oral submissions. That is three and that's reference number rep 4-019.

00:26:31:09 - 00:26:32:15

Okay. Thank you very much.

00:26:34:10 - 00:27:12:16

Uh, right. So I would now like to actually ask a specific question to Cambridgeshire County Council, and this is particularly in line with their response to the question to point to point one in Rep 545 in relation in relation to reduce the variability of waste. So can I ask Cambridgeshire County Council to perhaps present their view, um, as highlighted within that specific response? Could you ask him to repeat the rest?

00:27:12:21 - 00:27:15:04

Can we just have that reference again, sir, so we can be.

00:27:15:15 - 00:27:18:16

Sure and I can probably, um.

00:27:24:15 - 00:27:34:16

So the reference is to responses to the County Council's response to execute, and that is web 5045. Believe.

00:27:39:00 - 00:27:42:03

The question is, which question is the question?

00:27:56:02 - 00:27:58:22

So can you just read which question it was you're referring to?

00:27:59:13 - 00:28:25:07

Yes. So I can actually if you just bear with me for one second, I think I'll probably be able to actually share the information that I'm after. Um, and that I would like some comments on. So it is response to planning policy questions. So 2.1 and will actually be able to share this now.

00:28:27:18 - 00:28:58:10

And I'm particularly interested in terms of the information that you have in the last two paragraphs, which is um, particularly in relation of insufficient fuel to keep one or more lines of facility running. So I would just like to give the opportunity to Cambridge County Council to sort of explain a little bit more if they can, and the detail on that specific question and sort of introduced it issue.

00:28:59:08 - 00:29:33:24

So this was something which I raised earlier in today. Exactly. In so the source of your question here is essentially whether there was sufficient fuel to fuel the facility. We from the information we have at the moment. But there is a view there sufficient fuel to fuel the the facility presently. Predicting the future is a very difficult thing to do and I'm sure you'll have the applicant confident that there is in the future. And but there is also a less certain t that that may not be the case as well.

00:29:34:01 - 00:30:03:09

So where this is coming to is how would if you did permit it, what would happen if that fuel availability reduced? And so in other terms the fuel would need to come from further afield. But within the catchment restrictions, as we previously discussed and as the applicant set out, they are able to their facility could respond by reducing their throughput as well. So this is where this question arose and was intended to help this conversation.

00:30:03:11 - 00:30:33:11

So thank you. Thank you. That's, that's, that's really useful. If I could actually then in that case go back to to the applicant and just ask if in in addition to the reduction of the hours and obviously take into consideration the requirement of no less than 80% from zone two, has the applicant considered any other forms on which they could deal with a reduced amount of waste?

00:30:42:03 - 00:31:08:21

Thank you, sir. Mike Turner, on behalf of the applicant, our answer is the same as given previously. We don't envisage running out of waste whilst complying with the requirements of the DCO and the agreement on waste areas one and two. Should that happen, there is the potential to reduce ours

through increased outages, reduce loading as highlighted previously by Mr. Kerry. So our answer remains the same.

00:31:09:11 - 00:31:22:00

And can just clarify then following from that answer, will the CHP component will be able to be continue to be operational? If you do have reduced hours and you have a reduced amount of output?

00:31:27:05 - 00:31:29:15

Paul. Gary for the applicant. Yes, sir, it would.

00:31:32:06 - 00:31:35:21

Um, is that stated somewhere within your document?

00:31:38:06 - 00:32:04:05

Come on, Paul Carey. I'm not sure, but you should remember that the amount of heat that would be supplied to prospective users would be only part of what would be supplied by the facility, the rest being electricity going into the grid. So if anything was to be reduced, it would be electricity going into the grid rather than heat going to customers.

00:32:05:13 - 00:32:37:06

And thank you. I think that my question in terms of the CHP is obviously linked with the benefits of the proposal, which is the electricity, but also the CHP. Um, obviously in this eventuality, we would like the applicant to sort of consider what the impacts are going to be because obviously that might have an impact in terms of the benefits in the way that we actually look at the benefits. So in light of your question and apologies in light of your answer. Can I actually ask you, Mr.

00:32:37:08 - 00:32:53:02

Carey, if you accept an action for this issue to be further investigated in terms of what the consequences of the different of a reduction in the outputs is going to be, particularly for those two components in terms of the electricity and CHP.

00:32:54:12 - 00:33:06:04

Airport care for the applicant? Yes, I'm happy to take that as an action. If we may produce a technical note on the effects of reduced output of the facility, I'd be happy to do that.

00:33:06:20 - 00:33:08:09

Thank you. Thank you very much.

00:33:10:23 - 00:33:19:15

Uh, now if could actually revert back to Cambridgeshire County Council. Um, in this is, um,

00:33:21:03 - 00:33:36:00

in their response. So it's the same document, Mr. Andrew Fraser that we were looking at before, but it will actually be the response to .2.1. So that would be. Um,

00:33:38:06 - 00:33:42:14

it's, I'm just trying to find the page.

00:33:45:14 - 00:33:47:07

Back on script again.

00:33:48:05 - 00:34:31:22

Which would be quite a, it would be at the beginning of the document 2.1. I think it's page five of the PDF of the document that you have. It's relating to the principal nature of the development. And it's your first answer to that specific question which was linked with the memorandum of understanding that is in place between the West planning authorities of the East of England. And again, can can County Council please comment further on how the proposed development will potentially impact on Cambridgeshire County Council's waste planning? And also, if you can, at the signatories of the Memorandum of Understanding.

00:34:32:20 - 00:34:33:10

So.

00:34:34:17 - 00:35:06:18

The memorandum the signatories of the memorandum of the of Understanding. Ah, sorry. Let me restart that one again. So. So the East of England waste technical advice body. Is a regional body made up of the waste planning authorities of the east of England, the former region that is. I will have their names up shortly. I believe the they are listed in the response. I believe actually off the top of my head. Um, if they're not, I will find them.

00:35:06:21 - 00:35:07:11

Yes.

00:35:07:13 - 00:35:09:23

Yes. I believe that they are listed. Yes. Okay.

00:35:10:10 - 00:35:11:00

Um,

00:35:12:11 - 00:35:52:13

I've since been in contact with the secretary for the East of England Waste Technical Advice body called Deborah Sachs, who has confirmed that all the waste planning authorities did sign the memorandum of understanding. And this memorandum of understanding sets out that the waste planning authorities will plan on the basis of net self-sufficiency, which I believe I've explained in the answer yes. One of your previous questions. And as a result of this proposed facility, it would mean that other areas which would then send waste to our Cambridgeshire, it would be unable to to meet that commitment.

00:35:52:18 - 00:36:17:07

In terms of the capacity, there would be an excess of capacity in one area, but not in others. So they would not be able. So if they would propose, they say they've got a they're sending X thousand tonnes of waste from Norfolk to Cambridgeshire. They would not be able to suggest in that plan that they could provide that recovery capacity more locally as it would already been provided by this facility.

00:36:20:00 - 00:36:56:02

Um. Can I just clarify for the general understanding on this specific issue? So in terms of the waste planning authority is what you are saying now, I'm sorry. Is it that, um, if additional capacity in a surplus of capacity in terms of dealing with certain waste codes within an area, uh, they, they can then take. Waste within those codes from another signatory of the memorandum of understanding or not.

00:36:56:04 - 00:36:58:18

I'm just not 100% clear on that. Please.

00:36:59:08 - 00:37:34:06

The idea behind that self-sufficiency is that sufficient capacity is provided within a waste planning authority area. It does not need to necessarily be of the same type required. So an area may have a more landfill capacity than required and less recycling capacity than required in that area. But another authority may have more recycling capacity and less landfill. This allows for that movement of waste between the authorities, but at the baseline they need to provide at least capacity whether or not it's the right type for their local area.

00:37:34:08 - 00:37:37:13

So there is not an area which is under providing.

00:37:39:16 - 00:37:57:23

Uh, certainly. So in terms of if local capacity, if there is a surplus of local capacity in terms of energy from waste on certain specific waste codes, then how would the Waste Planning Authority deal with that?

00:37:59:04 - 00:38:30:06

In short, sir, with difficulty. What would result is Cambridgeshire and often with Peterborough would have an excess of capacity in our area, and then the surrounding authorities would be may all say, Well, there's excess capacity in Cambridgeshire, we can use this, but is there any certainty that we can use this? And they get into this quandary when making their local plans. Okay, so we need to provide this capacity. Can we rely on the Cambridge capacity? What's going to happen in the future? We don't know.

00:38:30:08 - 00:38:39:14

And so you get in a circular discussion of we can't provide it because it's already over there, but we can't rely on it either, which undermines the deliverability of their plans.

00:38:40:17 - 00:39:13:14

Thank you. Thank you very much. If I could, in that case, now ask for the applicant to comment on what we have just heard from Cambridgeshire County Council, particularly obviously in terms of, again, the emerging policy in terms of not resulting in over capacity treatment at local level. Um, obviously considering the information that we have just received and heard from County Council in terms of issues with waste, I do understand that the that nature of facilities, regional.

00:39:13:23 - 00:39:23:22

Nevertheless, if we could actually comment on that place in the context of not creating, um. Over capacity locally, please.

00:39:56:17 - 00:40:14:07

Claire Brown for the applicants. I think the first point we would make is that N3 doesn't define what is meant by local and certainly our interpretation of local has been based upon the study area that we've defined

00:40:15:22 - 00:41:02:22

in the waste fuel availability assessment and think if N3 had meant to define local as being the waste planning or the waste planning authority level, it most probably would have done that. So we've we've interpreted that in our way and in a way that is fully auditable and transparent in the fuel availability assessment. Um, and additionally, I think the applicants agreement to comply with the new requirements around the catchment to take um, proportion of the waste from a, a close as close to the facility as possible reflects that commitment to comply with the proximity proximity principle.

00:41:04:20 - 00:41:05:10

Thank you.

00:41:07:00 - 00:41:33:03

Thank you very much. If I could turn back then to Cambridgeshire County Council as well. In terms of what we have just heard from the applicant on response, and again, considering the application of the memorandum of understanding, how would in Cambridgeshire County Council's view as the local waste authority, um, would this affect the proposal?

00:41:36:09 - 00:41:38:20

I'm sorry, sir, could you please rephrase your question?

00:41:38:22 - 00:41:58:07

Just Yes. So in terms in terms of origin of waste and considering the nature of the memorandum of understanding and signatories of memorandum of Understanding. Would you like to comment in terms of the availability of waste for the applicant to source from the signatories of that memorandum of understanding?

00:41:59:03 - 00:42:44:04

I think there's two parts here, sir. The first part is I would disagree with the applicant on the definition of local in that there is beyond the waste planning authority level, there is no further well, the waste collection authority below that, but it's certainly regional. I would not consider to be a local area. And then secondly, in terms of waste, availability would direct you back to that plan which we had up earlier from our local impact report in terms of the main sources of waste are concentrated in Essex and Hertfordshire in the east of England, and the applicant has headed off into the East Midlands, as others have described to source their waste.

00:42:44:24 - 00:42:48:02

Think I'll stop that point there.

00:42:48:20 - 00:42:56:08

Okay. Thank you very much. Uh, would the applicant like to comment on this specific point further?

00:43:01:06 - 00:43:33:10

Thank you, sir. Mike Turner for the applicant. Would just draw everybody back to the conclusions that the waste fuel availability assessment makes, which is that there are substantial volumes of suitable residual waste in landfill within the area that would be suitable for moving up the waste hierarchy. With regard to specifically where waste comes from, if we are successful in terms of the application, that really is not able to be known at this moment in time because.

00:43:34:16 - 00:43:55:15

We don't know who we will be able to approach. We don't know what will happen with local authority tenders which local authorities control. But the waste fuel availability assessment confirms there is a significant surplus within the waste area of suitable residual waste being landfilled to move up the hierarchy via the facility.

00:43:56:02 - 00:43:56:17

Thank you.

00:43:59:14 - 00:44:02:14

Ms.. Perriman, I believe that you have raised your hand.

00:44:12:14 - 00:44:13:04

Yes, sir.

00:44:17:20 - 00:44:22:00

The applicant says they're not envisioning a shortage of waste,

00:44:23:14 - 00:44:27:13

but think a shortage of waste and a reduced calorific value.

00:44:29:06 - 00:44:30:09

Is somewhat linked.

00:44:31:23 - 00:44:42:03

If you take the case of Suffolk County Council. Sorry, The great Blake. An incinerator in Suffolk. With a 269,000 capacity.

00:44:43:15 - 00:45:03:21

In 2020. The operator Suez applied to increase the capacity by 10% to 295,000 tonnes because the residual waste did not have a high enough calorific value to maintain the level of electricity it provided to the grid. Despite stopping the recycling of Tetra packs in order to burn them.

00:45:10:08 - 00:45:49:13

As a knock. This has a knock on effect. It needs to source more waste from the region. Their region was expanded. To allow them to source their waste from a greater area at the same time. Now, Suffolk also burns 52,000 tonnes of recyclable food waste annually. 35% of the incinerators feedstock, which adds to the calorific value. If when food waste will be removed from this waste stream. Which will be before this facility could even be built, it would be decreasing residual household waste by around 30 to 35% and decreasing its calorific composition.

00:45:50:00 - 00:46:11:15

Now, this will affect every energy from waste incinerator across the country, not just this region. And they'll all be looking for around 35% more waste. And it's not just that in order to get that waste, it would have to be the same or higher calorific value, which is probably unrealistic. And this is before plastic is removed. So.

00:46:14:03 - 00:46:27:22

They are potentially going to be in the same situation as Suffolk, where they're applying to increase the size of their facilities and therefore requiring more waste accordingly. So.

00:46:30:06 - 00:46:31:12

35%.

00:46:33:02 - 00:46:57:14

Becomes a very significant figure to those authorities tied into very long incinerator contracts like Suffolk County Council and others across this east of England region where they're tied into contracts. Sourcing more waste is more important to them than someone like this, this applicant who aren't tied into any contract with anyone in that same respect.

00:47:00:12 - 00:47:11:07

For the proposed development loan that will be almost 220,000 more tons per year, the equivalent having to feed another energy for waste incinerator next door.

00:47:13:04 - 00:47:45:04

And this will be increased when when plastic is recycled because of the calorific value. So the energy this proposed development is designed to handle 520 3500 nominal tons of residual waste. At 10.9kg.

Sorry. Calorific value of 10.9 and a low calorific value and high availability conditions. The throughput needs to increase.

00:47:45:13 - 00:48:05:17

So what happens in in the case of when food by the time this comes online when everyone is looking for a higher amount of waste and a higher calorific value composition. What is going to happen to this? This facility alone.

00:48:08:11 - 00:48:10:17

Is that kind of clear, Mr. Pinto?

00:48:11:05 - 00:48:13:18

Yes. Yes. Thank you.

00:48:13:23 - 00:48:18:02

Mr. Perriman has not addressed this at any point.

00:48:19:12 - 00:48:25:12

Uh, if I could ask the applicant to reply and state how they have addressed these points, please.

00:48:26:22 - 00:48:32:09

Uh, the applicant. We're just going to decide who's best to respond to the various points that have been made. Bear with us one moment.

00:48:32:18 - 00:48:33:21

Certainly. Thank you.

00:49:05:19 - 00:49:42:06

Claire Brown for the applicants would just like to draw attention to the fact that the waste fuel availability assessment and specifically Appendix E of that assessment in relation to local authority collected waste does carry out a and sort of high level analysis around which local authorities within the study area already collect separately collect food, waste and plastics, and the majority already do so.

00:49:42:08 - 00:50:06:04

On that basis, we would not expect for local authority collected waste to see a big change in the composition of that waste stream in the immediate and over the longer term as well. Because the fact of the matter is, is that that material, it's already taken out at source by the collection authorities and.

00:50:08:03 - 00:50:20:06

In terms of the second point. I can't remember. The second point was, to be completely honest with you. That's all I want to say there. And don't think I'd add anything else to add anyway. Ellison lasted.

00:50:22:11 - 00:50:39:08

Thank you, sir. Mike Turner for the applicant with regard to what other facilities may or may not do. We wouldn't wish to comment at this point in time, but the position is clear in the waste fuel availability assessment regarding composition and any changes in the look forward.

00:50:41:05 - 00:50:55:16

Thank you. I think that's the other point was in terms of applying for increase amount of weight of waste, um, within within the region, I don't know if anyone would like to pick up anything on that or if you are content with the answer.

00:50:57:03 - 00:51:39:13

Clare Brodrick For the applicant, the draft development consent order that's being sought sets out in Schedule one, the tonnage, the maximum tonnage that's being sought for as part of this application. Um, if in the future the applicant for whatever reason wanted to increase that figure, they would need to make an application to change the development consent order. And at that point in time the Secretary of State would need to consider relevant policies, including the policy in the draft three regarding capacity and all of the other environmental topics that we're discussing as part of this application would be relevant at that point in time.

00:51:39:15 - 00:51:58:03

So there would be a formal process that would need to be satisfied in any circumstance where the applicant wished to apply to change the maximum permitted tonnage that's currently being sought in the application. So that would be decided at that point in time when a change was applied for, if it ever was. Thank you.

00:51:58:12 - 00:51:59:12

Thank you. Thank you.

00:52:01:06 - 00:52:18:06

Um. Can I ask if there are any other interested person persons, any other IPS that would like to comment on waste issues before we close Waste. Mr. Berryman, would you like me just.

00:52:18:09 - 00:52:21:03

Sorry, ma'am. Just come back on that. On that point.

00:52:21:15 - 00:52:22:05

That's me.

00:52:22:17 - 00:52:27:17

And I appreciate that the applicant wriggled their way around that.

00:52:29:11 - 00:52:57:15

But the. Food waste is just one part of it. There's also upcoming the plastic removal from the waste stream. This is all affecting calorific value. This will all have a knock on effect of other facilities in this area. Regardless of what? Is contained in the water. This facility must not have an adverse effect on other facilities. And it will.

00:52:58:03 - 00:53:07:00

Thank you. Thank you. Would the applicant like to respond to this last point? Please.

00:53:09:23 - 00:53:40:03

A clever run for the applicant. Just just to reiterate that when we were looking at the arrangements of local authority collected waste, we looked at how much how many authorities were separately collecting food waste and separately collecting plastics. So the plastics issue is considered as well, and the overwhelming majority are already taking plastics as well as food waste out of the waste stream. So it was it was kind of both points. So apologies, Ms..

00:53:40:05 - 00:53:44:14

Pearlman, if I didn't make that clear. But yeah, it's both plastics and food waste. Thank you.

00:53:45:05 - 00:53:49:06

Thank you. That. Mr. Dhawan.

00:53:51:12 - 00:54:26:15

Okay. Yeah. Mr. Josh Stone for win. Just coming back to the the accumulation to plastics that are kind of both a kind of local, strict regional and national level UK win did provide evidence in rep 2-066 on this topic where we noted that the reduction reduction in the amount of plastic would increase the effective capacity of UK incinerators by between 21 and 31%. The 20 The reason for the range was because it depends on how much food waste is also decreased.

00:54:26:17 - 00:55:07:03

Obviously, if the area already has a high level of food waste collection, that means that the the government well, there may be some level of plastic collection. The government is proposing a lot of removal of plastics from the waste stream. And if that does come to pass, it won't be as counteracted by reduction in food waste due to increased food waste collection as in other areas. We actually therefore means that the potential impact in this area would be more to the upper end of the range or the potential impact within this kind of within the kind of zone of the issue or the removal of plastics, increasing fabric value not just for this facility.

00:55:07:05 - 00:55:39:16

So reducing the value and therefore increasing the effective capacity not just for this facility but for other facilities in the area which will then effectively free up capacity and mean that they can take more waste, which means the kind of the functions about 88% of the permanent capacity being what they will incinerate no longer hold true if actually they were potentially having to increase their permanent capacity and go even beyond their current level of permanent capacity to deal with the issue of reduced value from reduction in plastics.

00:55:39:18 - 00:55:57:14

I think this is an important issue that was raised in the past and hasn't been satisfied with the applicant's responses to date on on the topic. And we believe it's relevant both on the local level and at a national level in terms of feedstock availability. Thank you.

00:55:57:24 - 00:56:03:06

Thank you very much. Um, can I revert to the applicant to reply to Mr. Dolan, please?

00:56:19:09 - 00:56:43:22

Thank you, sir. Mike Turner for the applicant. The comments are noted. However, we would draw people back to the fact that the Waste fuel availability assessment considers future ambitions for recycling and improvement in terms of the 2028 and 2042 target. And the conclusion remains the same A significant surplus of residual waste in landfill, which the facility can move up the waste hierarchy.

00:56:46:23 - 00:56:48:09

Okay. Thank you very much.

00:56:50:09 - 00:57:01:07

I don't see any further hands raised. Can I just ask if anyone else would like to ask any questions about waste matters before we close this specific topic?

00:57:06:08 - 00:57:45:12

I don't see any hands raised. Therefore, I. If there are no no further comments, then I would move us to close. Um, this specific item on the agenda. I'm mindful of the time and I'm mindful that we did say that we would have a lunch break at 1:30, and it's now 1:27. Um, also considering some interventions that we have had, um, earlier, it might be that, uh, will consider, um, shorter lunch break.

00:57:45:20 - 00:57:50:22

But before I do, Mister Shlomo, don't believe that you have not raised your hand.

00:57:51:01 - 00:58:05:00

Yep. This is Mr. Jordan from wind. Just wanting to ask if we are needed in the next session. Because think after lunch, because we've covered all the issues that we wanted to cover. Um, or if we were kind of free to go.

00:58:05:08 - 00:58:33:09

And on the, on the, on the next item will be covering cumulative effects. I believe that most of the comments that you have raised with us and that I have reviewed as part of your representations, actually linked with the waste issues that we have just covered. So if you are happy to not be present at cumulative effects, I don't anticipate asking specific questions in relation to contributions that we have made.

00:58:33:18 - 00:58:34:17

Okay. Thank you. Thank you.

00:58:34:19 - 00:58:35:19

For that. Thank you.

00:58:37:15 - 00:58:47:22

Right. Can I ask then, if everyone would be happy with a slight reduced break of instead? One hour, perhaps 45 minutes.

00:58:50:03 - 00:59:02:14

If I could just ask. Um. Temperature County Council, particularly because you have requested for you have mentioned earlier timing issues, if that would be acceptable, if you could just confirm, please.

00:59:03:24 - 00:59:06:18

Yes, of course. I am most grateful for your consideration.

00:59:07:10 - 00:59:14:16

Thank you. And can I just confirm with the applicant as well that they would be prepared to accept a 45 minute break?

00:59:17:02 - 00:59:19:15

Clare Project. The applicant. Yes. That's acceptable to the applicant.

00:59:19:17 - 00:59:20:15

Thank you. Thank you.

00:59:20:17 - 00:59:43:06

Thank you very much. In that case, now it's 1:30, so I will adjourn this hearing and we will return at a 2:15 for the rest of the items in agenda specific. Issue seven. Thank you.