

Okay. Yeah.

Okay. Good afternoon everyone. It's now two o'clock. If we can reconvene, I return back to Mr. Bruin. Thank you. Thank you. Um, I know I said before the break, we would move on to item six. Um, it did occur to me that we should have a representative from the Environment Agency on the, in the, in the hearing.

Could they? I can't. I've got nothing in front of me here, but, um, I think they were online earlier, weren't they? So, yeah. Ah, yes. I'll, good. Good. Would you like to introduce yourself, um, first just to, yes. Good afternoon. My name is Annette Hetz and I represent the Environment Agency. Um, so, um, could I just invite you to, to respond to the applicants, um, Uh, comments under the, how, how the waste would be controlled and monitored and, and, and the references made to the, the environmental permit.

Um, and, and if you've got anything to say about that before we move on, um, yes sir. Um, the operation will obviously need an environmental permit and, um, I have no issues with what the applicant actually said in that respect. Thank you. That, that, that's helpful. Thank you for that. Um, thank you. So I suggest we, now we do move on to item six, um, which is in summary about the mo, the multimodal transport, um, options.

Um, and I think, I think if you, if you got the agenda in front of you, um, as if we start with the. Use River Trent and the Wolf and then invite other parties to, to, to, to respond to that. And then there's the second part, discuss the railway and, and so on. Is that, would that, um, work? Uh, yes, sir. CLA on behalf of the applicant, that's absolutely fine and what we had anticipated, so, so I will, um, address you on the first item in terms of the use of the River Trent and the Flex Wharf.

And then Mr. Gallup, who is online and introduced himself at the outset, will deal with the second requirement in terms of dealing with the rail. And I, I should say that the key document that I will be cross-referencing is, um, an application document that's a p P 73, and that is the preliminary navigation risk assessment that addresses, um, That overview that you are requiring today.

What I would also say, um, if it's not obvious, I was not the author of that risk assessment, but Mr. Ogilvy, on behalf of Behold is the author of that document. Unfortunately, he was not available for this particular session, but hopefully we can address the overview as you require, and then if there's detailed questions that we're not able to deal with as a team, we, we can take those away, sir.

Okay. Thank you. Okay. So firstly, just to, um, reemphasize that in terms of the proposed operation and use of the River trend, And in particular the WARF itself. Um, as I think I mentioned earlier, there are no physical works that we are applying for as part of the DCO application. There are no works required in terms of the warf.

The WARF will remain, um, as existing in terms of how it currently operates. I'm also conscious that my, uh, representative is here from ABP as well. So if I get anything wrong in that respect, I'm sure I will be duly corrected. So, and, and I also should say that the navigation risk assessment, um, itself has been prepared, um, in close consultation with both ABP as, um, the Harbor Authority and Harbor Master, as well as RMS ports the current owners of the port.

So a number of meetings have taken place, um, with a B P in order to prepare. The overarching assessment and also the separate risk assessment that is included within that document. So if I briefly outline what's covered, uh, which will hopefully then respond to the, the question raised, chapter three of the risk assessment sets out the existing operations at Flex Bri Wharf.

Um, in particular the offloading of bulk materials, offloading and loading of steel, and then also dealing with the, um, import of pig iron as well, which has its own particular requirements. The capacity of the vessels ranges from 1500 to 2000 tons. I believe the maximum capacity is around 3000 tons per vessel.

In terms of the wharf itself and the, and the port. Our instructions are that that benefits from 24 hour operation as a consequence of original consent for the port. In terms of current capacity and how that is currently operating, that's within the hours of, broadly speaking, six till six, but I think it's six 6:00 AM till 6:00 PM But in recent times, it has been used to, its, its full extent on a, on a 24 hour basis.

I'd direct you in particular to table three three of a P 73, which outlines those current vessel movements, um, into and out of the wharf. And then ABP as, as Harbor Master control the relevant vessel movements. And there's a process of online booking through, I think, believe it's called Agents Online. I.

And that's the method used in order to book a vessel. Um, so in order for us to bring in either film material or waste materials, we would need to book that through, um, ABP acting as, uh, the Controlling Harbor Master. The assessment itself describes how those vessels, um, will be managed and, and how that system operates.

And then moving to the proposed operations for this development, section four of that assessment outlines the proposed operations, both in terms of construction and operation of our facility. So dealing first with construction. The majority of construction materials have been assumed to be delivered by road.

But it is likely that some film material that will be required can be imported to via the wharf. Um, during that construction phase, the maximum number of vessels that have been assumed at this point are 80 vessel movements. So that's 40 vessels that 80 in and out in, in total per annum over the four year construction timeframe, approximately a hundred thousand tons per Ann are estimated to be brought in in terms of film material.

As I say, these are estimates at this stage based on the information we have on the cut and fill requirements for the development site itself. In terms of abnormal indivisible loads, um, ail at this stage, um, based on the current wolf arrangements and the constrained navigation conditions that exist.

It's less likely that there will be significant material brought in. Um, in terms of those abnormal loads that will be revisited. I stand during detailed design. So for example, large items like the turbine, it will be looked into it a later day. It's part of final design and whether or not that is feasible.

But at the moment in terms of ensuring worst case assessments in the eia, um, the assessment is that that would be less likely to take place by means of the wharf. Turning then to operation of the proposed development and the assumptions that Tom made, there is, um, a flow diagram at Appendix D of a P 73, which shows that transport flow and the assumptions made, so you may find it helpful to cross refer to that.

And then in terms of specific assumptions made, in terms of firstly, uh, and just to clarify for Mr. Nicholson's benefit solely the import of waste. So offloading of containerized waste that will be brought into the facility that will equate to approximately 350 vessel movements per ann, or that's the current assumptions made, which is approximately 182,000 tons per annum.

In terms of the quantum, that can be, uh, transported on a per vessel basis. There will also be, um, the loading of, of empty containers, um, as well in terms of any material taken offsite, but in particular, um, for import as well, the ability to bring in bolt materials, um, in particular a. To be used in the concrete block manufacturing facility to blend with the ash and to make the concrete blocks.

An assumption has been made that approximately 2,900 tons, every 4.4 days will be brought in via the wharf.

And then finally, in terms of future proofing and, and just to outline the option and ability to do so, there may be an option to also export carbon dioxide from the facility. And the assumption that's made at this stage is that would amount to 50 vessel movements, which equates to approximately 56,000 tons per annum.

And then finally, to highlight, uh, section 4.2 in part. , which is effectively a capacity assessment to demonstrate that the proposed vessel movements from the project in and of themselves would have a limited impact, uh, in navigation terms, but also that the proposed number of vessels and the vessel movements can be adequately accommodated within the existing two berths at the wharf itself.

There is then, and I don't think I need to address this for the purposes of this session, so a separate risk assessment, which looks at the safety aspect, um, and that risk assessment will also be finalized in, in detailed design as well, and, and that has been carried out in close consultation with both AVP and rms.

And I think the only other point to raise is if you have any specific questions in terms of what has been assumed within the EIA itself. We do, I think yes, we do. How have Mr. Murphy, Kevin Murphy from m who will be able to deal with, um, any particular questions on that aspect? Thank you. Thank you for that.

Um, well, I'll open it up to interested parties, but I think particularly given the specialty nature of this topic to representative and maybe to comment on those submissions. Uh, yes. Thank you sir Graham Ko Butson associated British parts. So firstly, uh, all understood, this is our bread and butter, so to speak.

So I'm more than happy with everything that's been presented by Claire and the team. My first point was going to be about, uh, potential WAF construction, which that's been answered now. Um, eliminates a, a particular element of my role, um, within the department. Um, one thing I would just highlight is on the p n a, that there are several discrepancies, very, very minor.

Some of it's just wording, some of it's just, um, uh, references within legends, et cetera. There, there's, there's no cause for concern. It's things that we can resolve very, very easily. Um, it's with regards to vessel movements and things like that, it's Tidal River, tide Road Church, roughly every 12 and a half hours.

There's two berths available. So the maximum, uh, on any particular day would be for moves. So there's no issues with, for a, with regards to pilotage allocation or anything like that, uh, the team are very aware of, uh, dimensions of vessels and what can be acceptable, um, et cetera. So from an a p perspective, we're, we're more than happy to support.

And from that perspective, we would, we would move towards working with, uh, the team on a statement of common ground.

Thank you. That's, that's, that's very helpful. Um, would anybody else like to, um, comment on, on this topic before we move on to the, the railway? Yes. Simon Nicholson from Rain. Can I ask a specific question? You say each vessel is gonna be carrying 1500 to 2000 tons. Is that just through the construction period or is that post construction feeding in waste as well?

In other words, is it that, um, the same weight per, per boat of waste rather than aggregate? And also how, how many containers per vessel? what weight per container? The reason I ask this is because previously I've been given some extremely spurious figures by the, the applicant. I just wanted to clarify.

Thank you, CLA Brook on behalf of the applicant. I think it would perhaps be safer if I check those numbers and that we reply separately just to make sure that we get that information, um, entirely accurate for your purposes. Thank you. I, I appreciate we've got a hearing tomorrow on the dco, but I think that one of the questions I have with regard to this at the moment, you have the preliminary navigation risk assessment.

Should there be a requirement within the DCO that, uh, means that the navigation risk assessment, the final, , uh, is submitted and suitable for ABP as the relevant to authority to sign off. So at the moment, I don't think there is anything within the DCO that would make that happen. So I suppose that question with both parties in the room,

Claire Brook on behalf of the applicant? Um, yes. Good spot, sir. I was also looking at that very point myself yesterday in terms of understanding the process from moving from the preliminary navigation risk assessment to the final form navigation risk assessment, which will clearly happen in consultation with ABP and RMS ports.

In terms of, um, the final design and the process to be gone through, my understanding is that it's, it's largely then dealing with, I suppose, commercial contractual arrangements in terms of booking in the vessels, so on and so forth, and satisfying. a p in terms of the, the detail on the risk assessment that's being carried out from a safety perspective and capacity perspective.

I think we'd be comfortable to add something in terms of a DCO requirement, should that be felt necessary. It, it's, it's not something that necessarily is essential in terms of being able to operate at the, at the port and to, to book vessels, um, once the development is built out. But it will be a necessary additional piece of work that will be carried out, um, in conjunction with avp.

So I, I'm, I'm relaxed, but I'll, I'll defer to, um, Mr. Kason in terms of his, his thoughts on that. Yes, sir. Graham s Andp, um, absolutely right. Um, we, um, the, the p and a is 99.9% complete. We're, we're almost entirely happy with it with regards to booking in a vessels out of. More than likely evolve into a completely different conversation.

Most vessels arriving on the hum have an appointed agent who do all this work for you. So whether you, uh, begin your own shipping agency company from within the port previously would use RMS Trent Port for doing this. So they would provide all the information or the documentation, all of the agents online information and, and book that pilot themselves.

So that's probably a conversation, maybe even beyond this, uh, what we're doing today. But, um, we're full of advice, so we're more than happy to help if you've got any questions with that. But it's that particular part of booking in vessels is a very, very straightforward thing that we would recommend, um, a local shipping agency to help you with.

I think perhaps if, uh, in the discussion on the statement of common ground, if you can consider how you would facilitate ensuring that final risk assessment is provided for. Whether it's through a requirement or some other form, uh, to give certainty, I think that would be helpful. And I think the only other final point I had on the navigation risk assessment, there is a comment from a b p on it, but it wasn't a hundred percent clear to me about the, uh, relationship to the other ports on the trend and also how, um, whether RMS ports, which currently operate spoor, how their role fits with the future proposals for this site.

So I wonder if you could explain those two elements to us.

We can certainly deal with both aspects, um, in our written follow up to this hearing, sir. Um, what, what I do understand, and others will correct me if I'm wrong, is that RMS ports are the current agent that we would seek to book, um, our online vessels via that Mr. Coon has referred to. In terms of our ongoing relationship with RMS ports, we are in discussions with them.

We clearly require some of their land in order to pursue the development, and so we are in negotiations with RMS ports around how we might work alongside them in the future in terms of their role, um, either alongside us or, or, or separately in terms of how that port will continue to operate.

Okay. Well, I look, I look forward to Clarifi.

Is there any other input on them on this aspect before we move on one very quickly? Okay. Simon Nicholson, UK win. And how is the proposed operation going to affect current operations at the port? Hm.

Before you respond, Mr. Nicholson, you said you were UK win. How, how, how? I was just wondering whether there's a dual role.

Been a long day

Hi Brook, on behalf of the applicant. So in terms of current operations, the risk assessment looks in particular at that aspect to ensure that, um, in terms of the capacity that may be required for the proposed development, that will not interfere. Or preclude or prevent the ongoing operations at the, at the port, and to ensure that there is sufficient capacity in terms of vessel movements and the ability to bring two in, two out, um, by reference to the title requirements, uh, the assessment concludes that there will be no, um, adverse effects in terms of the existing and ongoing operations at the port.

Thank you. Right, so I There's nothing, oh, sorry, sorry, apologies. Yeah, it's my turn to be, uh, your turn going in. Yeah. There was just one other point. You made reference to the current operation of the port, uh, having consent for 24 hour operation. Are you able to, uh, advise what that consent was? Is it a planning consent or is it something else?

Um, so, uh, CLA book on behalf of the applicant. Um, I have raised that specific question with, directly with RMS ports to establish if they can provide confirmation of the consent that, uh, the 24 operation derives from. I suspect it's a fairly aged consent and hasn't been particularly easy to locate. Um, but, uh, we are confident that it, it does have consent for 24 operation, and as soon as we have confirmation of the precise, um, reference for that, we, we will provide it.

So thank you.

All right. There's nothing else on, on this. Um, perhaps we can move on to the, um, plans to be state by away and, and, um, if you could sort of give an overview and then invite your colleagues to, to, to, to, to provide more details as you think is, uh, necess. Uh, yes, Claire Brook on behalf of the applicant.

I'm looking at the screen and Mr. Gallop is online and I think he's ready to deal with the overview and, um, any more detailed questions that you may have. Thank you. Good afternoon, sir. Good afternoon everyone. Uh, Nick Gallop, uh, from intermodal on behalf of the applicant. Uh, I'll make two references to application documents, um, throughout this brief overview.

Um, document app 0 4 5 is the rail operations report. That sets out what I'm going to summarize now in the next sort of five minutes or so. There is also a network diagram, um, that you'll find at App 0 6 1 figure seven, which shows the, the previous extent of the rail network, uh, in the local area. But more importantly, it also shows what's left and what, what is still intact, uh, that would form part of the proposed development.

So to set overall context, The movement of waste material by rail. It's a long established process going back 45 years or so to 1977. Rail has and continues to be used for movement of containerized RDF from sites in West London, Manchester, and Merseyside, which no longer go to landfill, but now go to ERF facilities in Avon mouth, Runcorn and Wilton respectively.

The same model of operation that used to operate to Roxby Gullet, um, when they were bringing residual waste there to be put into landfill. In addition, bottom ash coming out of those ERFs has also been moved from facilities in New Haven and in Cardiff, and is used as a secondary aggregate in the construction industry.

And that's moved by rail to local distribution depots in West London and Bristol respectively. Now these trains sometimes run over quite long distances in excess a hundred miles. Sometimes very short distances, less than 50, typically one to two trains per day coming out of each site. But it's worth noting that none of the material, that, excuse me, that is generated is actually reprocessed within the same local authority area.

So Mercy side goes tot side, Manchester goes to Mercy side, and West London goes to seven side. Now, in addition to movement of of waste materials by rail, rail has an even longer history of moving bulk construction materials by rail, from suppliers, from quarries, factories, et cetera, to sources of demand and construction traffic is the second largest part of the rail freight market after the movement of containerized product such as rdf.

So turning to the proposed development, this has access to a disused row line owned by and linking RMS ports with the main. Last used in the mid 2010s for exports of bulk steel, which would be reinstated under works number three within the dco. This would in turn link through existing operational sightings at Dragon Be, which are owned by Volo Cofer over which RMS Ports has a right of access to an existing operational mainline connection with Network Rail.

Now deciding to Dragon be, you've seen occasional use by BOLO KO for moving rail track materials that they produce to sites elsewhere on the National Rail Network. So the existence of this rail access provides that opportunity to contribute to this multimodal approach, uh, for movement of materials to and from site where that makes operational and commercial sense as where it makes operational and commercial sense across the rest of the wider national rail network.

So in terms of operations, those would involve freight trains. Moving across the national network from other parts of the country to the proposed development, they would come off network rail infrastructure into track and B sidings with Voss Cofer. Once inside those sidings trains can be staged there.

Clear of the National Rail Network. A to to avoid impeding any other trains out there on the network, trains to and from Roxby for as long as they may still operate. But also to allow any trains that are still on site of the proposed development to exit the site and come down to track and be where effectively it's a passing place where inbound trains can pass outbound trains without each other impeding one another.

And in order to create that facility, we've included works number four within the proposed DCO to create those passing facilities there within the Dragon Presiding site and to give an indication of the scale of rail movements that we're talking about. If a hundred percent of the RDF was transported by rail, that would generate between two and three trains per day into site, um, depending on the number of days per week when the trains would be operated.

Now the applicant is engaged with network rail with Volo and more recently with one of the licensed rail freight operating companies that provide these services for other customers regarding the various rail opportunities presented by the proposed development. Now, although no physical works are required on network rail infrastructure

taken, various agreements will need to be in place with the various parties already mentioned before any trains can run to 'em from the proposed development. So on that basis, and it reflects the approach taken on on other nationally significant infrastructure projects that have a rail component in them.

In this case, two strategic rail freight interchange schemes. Now consented at East Midlands Gateway and West Midlands Interchange, where the timing of introducing the rail services is not hardwired up front as a dependency for that first phase of the program. And that's in part to avoid any external delays outside of the control of the applicant, then having any knock on impacts on the wider program.

And that is very much where another nationally significant infrastructure project, the North Hampton Gateway Strategic Rail Red Interchange, is now facing because it is in the process of trying to amend its DCO retrospectively in order to allow an initial phase of operations to commence on site ahead of the delivery of those rail services because it suffered external delays in securing that rail access.

So that, that's a, a fairly brief overview of the contents of the rail operations document. Um, happy to take questions at that point. I have a question here. Yes. Yeah. Council Elaine Marper. Uh, just a point of clarification in the latter part of, of, of your delivery there, um, you said there'll be two or three trains per day into the site.

That'll be at maximum capacity. Does that mean there's another three trains coming out? Yeah. So each train that comes in six. Yeah, so, so it's six train movements, but just three trains. And that, again, just to be clear, that assumes a hundred percent of the RDF would be delivered by rail. Yeah. Yeah. I'm clear on that aspect of it.

Um, and the other thing is you didn't say the working hours would be restricted to daytime only. Um, a again, I've got conflicting, um, opinions from residents in the area because on the original documentation the applicants put out, they said categorically there, there will be minimal increase in rail traffic.

Well, it's not working at the moment, so an increase of nothing at all is still nothing at all. And now we're looking at six trains. So I'd just like to be clear which way we're going on this, because that is gonna have a major effect on neighboring properties near, near the rail line. Thank you. I think counsel, to answer that question, I'm gonna defer to colleagues on that one.

I mean, at the moment we, we are at such an early level of engagement with the train operating companies and network, et cetera, that we, we are not anywhere near talking about when the trains would operate, but there is the white, there is the specific context of the development and the framework of conditions that would sit within it.

So as I say, I'll defer to colleagues as to what the proposal is, as to when those trains would run. Before we go on, can I, um, apparently it's been a bit of a technical glitch, so can we have a short five minute adjournment while we try and while we try and fix that? Sorry to interrupt you a bit there, but, but we'll come back to you after that.

Yeah. Thank you. Thank you.

To rejoin it. Um, can I seek any further questions on, on what we've heard? I'll go with, um, you first. Yeah. Thank you. Yes, thank you sir. Andrew la No thanks, council. Um, just a, a couple of quick questions. Um, matter of clarity, uh, please. Um, I think it was, it was stated that, um, the previous development consent order elsewhere in the country, um, there'd been external delays to the, um, gaining consents, uh, to direct traffic onto the, onto the rail network.

Um, therefore they'd had to retrospectively seek to amend the, uh, the consents order. I suppose my, my questions in two parts. Um, what is the sort of guarantee or security that such contents would, would be granted? Um, and what is the likely delay in granting of those contents? Could we expect the plant to be running for a significant period of time without the ability to, um, to use the railway network?

Can I ask the applicant to, to respond to that as best they can? Yes. Nick, Nick Gallop for the applicant. Um, I think firstly it's worth saying that the, the promoter in that case at Northampton Gateway Searo, uh, we don't know yet how or whether they will be able to secure any amendment to their dco. Um, it's been reported on the news in the last few weeks that, um, they are seeking, uh, possibly a one year delay in the, uh, arrival of the first rail services into site because network rail is unable to deliver the physical connection needed.

So that, so first off, we don't know yet what the outcome of that will be. They may well have to live with it. But, but for us, again, to reiterate, we don't need any physical works with Network Rail. So we are not in the same situation or in the same extreme situation as they find with no way of physically connecting their operation into the Rail network.

But it is worth noting that we do need to get in place a number of agreements with Network Rail, with the Office of Rail and Road with Volo, with the train operating company, uh, with the providers of the material. Um, and it's just making sure that we haven't tried to be, how can I put it to Clever in trying to hard wire all that together, assuming that it will absolutely all be there right up front from day one.

Uh, because a number of those agreements we can't actually start working on until the DCO is determined, until land ownership and cpa, et cetera, et cetera. So until the DCO is effectively determined, and if it's successful, is unwrapped and all the various provisions start coming out, that's the point at which we can start to apply for some of these licenses, license exemptions, access agreements, et cetera, et cetera.

And that will take time, um, not necessarily in years, but there is a, there is a concern to the program if we try to second guess how long it's going to take to get all of those in place.

Thank you. Um, I'll come to, um, rain Next. Yeah. So I'm Nicholson from Rain this time, not UK win. Um, , can you tell me the mode of t or the kind of truck that will transport the waste as it's going through? Um, populated areas and my main concern is that the, um, residents of Dragon be where trains will be parked, loaded or empty.

Um, may be, um, Benefits of, of waste being blown all over the place. Let, let's take the first, let's take Miss Holson. Let's take the second part of that first. Um, it's freshest in my mind, uh, and, and the point is made or the point is taken, accepted about wind blown waste. One of the key parts of this 45 year journey of moving containerized waste by rail is that it is in sealed containers.

And the reason those containers remain sealed when they're on the rail network is not necessarily to protect from windlow deposits, but actually to protect the integrity of the railway. So even the way the containers are loaded on the railway whacks will tend to be as far as they can engineer it, that the doors that would open at the end of the container are always facing into each other on the railway wagon with the ver with the sole reason for that being is to prevent any of those doors opening while in transit, because you can imagine the chaos that we ensue if that happens.

So the, these are very much sealed containers. They're sealed for a reason to, to assure network rail, that it would be a safe operation. In terms of the type of trains we would expect, they are very much the same trains that were running up to Roxby Gallo until fairly recently In terms of a diesel locomotive, a rake of flat railway wagons with each railway wagon, typically having three sealed containers on them.

Um, but we have set out within the rail operations document app 0 4 5 at section 3.3, the details of the type of locomotive, the type of wagons, the type of container and their respective weights empty and laden. Um, that will hopefully give you the information you need.

Anything more? Fine. Thank you. Um, anybody else before I ask a couple of questions on this one? So Clare, on behalf of the applicant, I can just add a couple of other references for, um, What was assumed in the EIA and what has been assessed in terms of worst case, um, assessments. So firstly, um, chapter three of the EIAs, that was a P 51 section seven point 11 deals in particular with the rail line and the proposed out of operation.

So whilst the upgraded rail line is capable of operating on a 24 hour basis, um, 365 days of the year in, in theory to support the ERF and the concrete block manufacturing facility, the reinstated sidings at Dragon be, as Mr. Gallup has referred to, will minimize the traffic down the railway line overnight.

Uh, freight tends to travel at night as opposed to during the day, given the commercial, um, rail that takes place during the day. That's not, not exclusively, but predominantly, and again, I defer to Mr. Gallup for the, the detail on that. We have though assumed, um, references made at paragraph seven point 11.2, that there'll be one movement approximately every four hours.

And principally to address Miss Mark's point, the reference to, um, the noise and potential impacts from the use of the railway, um, has been taken into account in, uh, chapter, I just find the number, uh, not sure which chapter it is, but it's a P 55 and that's the EIA chapter on noise. And in particular, table 21 of that chapter makes assumptions around the service on a one train every four hours basis, which we regard as, as worst case, given that the likelihood is that only three trains per day.

Are likely in terms of meeting that full extent of capacity, assuming that everything did come in via rail itself. So I just wanted to sign, paste those references. Yes. I have a question here in the moment. Yeah, yeah. Sorry. Cancer Elaine Mar. I'd just like to come back on that then. Claire. I mean, did I just hear you right?

Are you saying that the Ments are more than likely to take place at night and there's gonna be one movement every four hours. Does that mean that there's likely to be two trains during the night?

On, just apologies, Claire, on behalf of the applicant. Uh, just to clarify, in terms of the freight coming into Dragon, be sightings, that's more likely to take place, um, overnight, but the freight will be held at the sighting. In terms of its transit, then across into the facility on the reinstated railway.

Um, and again, uh, Mr. Gallup will correct me if I'm wrong in, in that regard.

Uh, Mr. Gallup for the applicant, um, trains can run to and from Dragon and beat now at all hours of the day and night. And while a lot of freight does move at night, um, there are opportunities to move freight trains during the day. All of the trains that currently run carrying, um, RDF to and from ERFs run throughout a mixture of daytime and nighttime paths.

Uh, albeit they may be sitting around in various places on the network waiting for their next hop to their next recess point. Um, and it's also worth just clarifying that nighttime point that if a train does come in at night, it's not gonna sit there with this engine running for hours because given the price of.

And the train operators wanting to be much better neighbors than they perhaps used to be. That there is a strict policy with train operating companies now that you shut your engines down when you are not going to be using them. Because if nothing else, it saves an awful lot of money in terms of fuel.

Thank you. Um, one more in November here. Um, I wonder if you can reference the agreement where the trains are allowed to move all times of day and night to Roxby, as it's my understanding that they are limited to daytime currently, and that's part of the planning application to operate the tip. Um, well we, we, we have access to network rails, um, real time, time table data, and we've seen over the last few months, um, trains that have arrived in or out of Roxby at five in the morning and, and maybe half past 10 at night.

So it may be that there are conditions in the planning, um, that restrict when the trains are unloaded or reloaded once they're on site. But because the branch line forms part of the National Round Network, and this is an issue that's been tested all across the country, right the way down from where I started my career in Ken County Council with the channel tunnel traffic, we as a local authority tested the can you run trains whenever you like and as many as you like on the National Railway Network.

And the answer from British Rail at the time and supported by government was terribly sorry. But yes, you can. That's not to say that, that we would invoke that as far as, as Dragon be or indeed the private branch line, which doesn't form part of the national rail work. But, but I say from looking at the actual times that trains have moved to and from Roxby, they have moved and continue to move at all hours of the day and night.

Um, just, just looking at the paths that are in the timetable now on screen I that in fronted me. They can operate on network rail infrastructure at any time of day or night. But as you say, there may well be things in the center roxby that restricts when those trains can actually move or be handled once they're clear of network rail infrastructure.

Another question. I'm so sorry, that's raised another question with me now. Council a marper, you are talking about the dragon bay dragon be leg of it. Um, I'm particularly interested in the leg from the wharf up to Dragon Bay Thera rail line. Well, that's not owned by network rail is it? So would that's right.

That therefore suggest that there would be no constraints whatsoever on the operation of that little railway line behind the houses in FlexPro. Can they just do whatever they want there? No rules and regs. I think council, we've probably confused you in. The ability to run trains in theory, at any scale, at any time of day night, is very much contained to the National Rail Network because it goes right the way back to some of the enabling legislation that allowed those railway lines to be built in the first place.

The, the test of whether you can run trains, um, when you like on a piece of railway infrastructure has only ever been tested in the context of the National Rail Network and the government through the courts and through British Rail, concluded that she could. Um, but it, it's given, given the idea here is to minimize the environmental impact of, of the proposed development.

As I say, I'll defer to colleagues on this one who no doubt will want to sort of come in now with the various references in the application, but, but we're treating the bit from Volo to the wharf in a different context to what network rail or Voss Load may choose to do out there on the main line.

Thank you. Um, Can I just confirm a couple of points? And I, I've just, just, um, interest just for clarity, um, from what you said, there's, there's no or virtually zero likelihood of the, of the line being used for the construction of the, of, of the works cause of the timing of, of the things.

Can you just confirm that again to, to, to, to avoid some confusion and it gives some clarity on this one. Um, Volo have made limited use of the, the dragon be sightings because they make very specialist piece of railway track that occasionally will get put onto network rail wagons and taken off to where they're needed.

Um, because the sidings are operational because they have, uh, a mainline signal connection with network rail that's operational because they have road access as well. There is the opportunity, there is scope for part of dragon be sidings to be used as a bridgehead. If, if the consensus is that, that would be.

Supportive of the aims of the construction logistics plan, then there would be scope by agreement with Volo for Dragon, be sidings to be used as a staging post, um, prior to the branch line to site being commissioned.

Okay. Thank you. Um, my other questions were really, um, sort of recognizing that some of the other interested parties aren't in the Vermont here. Is, um, going back a few steps in a sense this, I mean, who would, who in fact have you, have you established, um, with Officer Rail Rosevale that they would be regulating your railway, if you like, the applicants railway or, or who would sign off the, the, um, the construction of it or the being statement was to a suitable standard.

Those sorts of things would be helpful if you could comment on, on those or response to those. The, the re the reinstatement works because, I mean, it's similar to a project we did with Bristol Port Company back in the early two thousands where they took a much longer branch line, um, nine miles long that was in a similar condition and took it back into service for, for port related traffic.

And it's operational to this day where you've got something like Dragon be sidings, where you might just be doing some localized work. Uh, invariably it'll be the train operator acting as a acting on behalf of the rest of the rest of the railway family that will look to sign off on the, the appropriateness of the works that have been done.

Because frankly, if he's not prepared to take his train over it, there's clearly something wrong with it. For his bigger schemes like reinstating six kilometers of branch line, we would by necessity bring the office of rail and road in to authorize the works once the railway line had been rebuilt. I mean, there, there are some distinctions here because the railway line is largely, it's not, if it's a completely disused.

Formation with no track whatsoever, and it hasn't been trained in 20 or 30 years. The branch line formation is largely still there and, and we have done projects that have involved railway lines that have been disused for many years that have been brought back into use without authorization because the train operator, again, is acted as a proxy.

But for the purposes of this application, if the DCO is determined positively, we would as a matter of course, inform the office of Rail and Road and go through their processes and go through their safety regime. Because ultimately, as the operator of a railway line, be it network Rail or anyone else, you have to have a safety certificate.

You have to have a safety management system, you have to have various network licenses or exemptions. So there's a whole basket of things that, that you would agree with the Office of Rayland Road prior to any trains running across the infrastructure.

Okay. Thank you. Any, any follow up questions to that from anybody?

Just one from myself, Mr. Gallup. Thank you. Um, in terms of, uh, committing to that sort of, uh, process that you've identified, does the DCO commit you to that process? I'm, I, again, I would probably have to defer to colleagues on that one. Um, certainly with all the other dcos that we've been involved with for, for strategic rail rate interchanges, it's a given that because you are creating a mixture of reinstated and or new rail infrastructure, it will be highly unusual for projects of that scale, not to require notification of the ORR and prior approval from the ORR on the, on the condition of the track.

Um, and a method of working, um, agreed not just with o r but also with Network Rail, who will take an interest in this even though it's not their network. They're a connecting party, but also the train operator as well, who will be. Absolutely on top of this to make sure that things are in place. So, so I, I'd find it inconceivable that the DCO wouldn't, if we move ahead to, to deliver that with works package three and four, that the ORR would be informed if, if only as a courtesy to let them know that we will be coming to them at some point because we need a safety certificate.

Okay. Thank you. I'll, I'll ask your colleagues in the room then if, if there's some form of commitment there, then to that process. Claire Brook, on behalf of the applicant, um, there isn't a specific DCO requirement that currently addresses that point in terms of our interaction with the orr. Um, but re recognizing that clearly those separate consents and agreements are required out with the DCO process, but we, we can certainly give some consideration to, um, a potential requirement if.

I mean, I, I'm not sort of suggesting that there is a necessity, but I'd just like to understand how the components work together and if it's an explanation as to how they work together as opposed to a requirement, then again, that would be helpful. But equally, if, if it's a requirement, then again, uh, understand the, the reasoning why.

Uh, yes, certainly so we can produce a follow up note to clarify, uh, how they interact in terms of their separate processes.

Thank you. Okay. Um, thank you very much, Mr. Gun. That was very informative, very helpful. Um, I found it very helpful. Um, if there's nothing else, um, can we

add some helpful feedback from my colleague? Um, thank you, Mr. Go. Yeah. Um, we'll, we'll, we'll move on then. Um, to item seven, I think. Okay. Um, so video, this is about the potential interaction. I think that's what I call it, that of the, um, development with proposed development with, um, um, new modified pipelines of transport, CO2 and hydrogen.

Sorry,

it wasn't on the agenda as such. Yeah.

So we'll, we'll carry on with item seven. Um, I'd invite the applicant to, um, introduce that if they, if they could. Uh, certainly sir. Uh, thank you Claybrook on behalf of the applicant, I'm going to pass over to my colleague, uh, Mr. Beza from Fitchner to deal with these items. I, I'm also conscious that we, we do have, uh, Still with us, Sarah Clark, um, from b2b, bdb, uh, representing National Grid Carbon Limited, um, in respect to their separate project.

But I'll, I'll pass over to Mr. Beza in the first instance.

Hi, all. Callen Beza, um, represents the applicant. Um, I'm gonna refer to the East Coast Cluster location plan. Can we have that on the screen please?

Thank you. So the, the first thing to note is that the Zero Carbon Hunger Pipeline, uh, which is shown in purple on this diagram on the screen, is a separate project from the North Lincoln Green Energy Park. Uh, we do include for carbon capture utilization and storage as discussed earlier on in the day. At the moment, the design is for around 50,000, 55,000 tons.

We secure the net carbon benefit and act as a demonstrator and commercial prover of this technology on energy recovery facilities. At the moment, we have the option to export CO₂ from the site, fire, river, and Road and Rail, as well as, um, some users of Carbon dark cyber facility. The intention is to use as much CO₂ as possible within the facility and export the balance for commercial uses elsewhere via the three methods outlined.

Um, should carbon capture become more fe uh, commercially feasible? There is the potential to expand the size of the development.

Uh, expanding the size of the carbon capture facility will reduce the electrical efficiency and the opportunities for electrical export somewhat. At the moment, this is entirely a cost. There is not a revenue path through this, we've allowed for, um, space within. New access road for a CO₂ export pipeline.

Linking to the residue handling treatment facility, uh, there is space within the access road for this to continue to the bottom of the new access road to the, uh, new roundabout with Ferry Road West. Any extension to the network linking to the zero carbon number pipeline would go beyond our role limits.

It'd be required to follow one of two route, which are shown on the diagram on screen. Um, a green route which follows the southern route of the district heating private wire network through the site past the Lincoln Chi Lakes development, past the, uh, M 180 1 motorway and then crossing another motor before linking up the pipeline.

A second route shown in the plan drives the pipeline through Scunthorpe to the British steel site, again, following the northern route of the district heating and private wire network, but extending further a third route, which may be explored links to this second route via the railway line, and is not shown on this plan.

Um, invite any questions on the links between the two facilities. Thank you. Um, can I invite any comments, particularly National Grid Carbon? Have we got them on the line? Representatives of National Grid Carbon? Good afternoon, sir. Sir Clark from b2b. Pitmans is indeed still here. Um, thank you. I, we don't really have anything further to add to, um, what has been said on behalf of the applicant today.

Um, we, we noted that we were invited to attend the heating and obviously wanted to be here in case there were any questions for us. As has been mentioned, the two projects are distinct. We are undertaking statutory consultation on our project at the moment, and that project does not currently include provision for a direct connection between the pipelines and, um, the project that you are, you're considering.

Okay, thank you. I, I think, can I, can I clarify then if, if there is, um, if National Grid Carbon's proposal doesn't facilitate a connection and that's not part of your current thinking, how does the application before us today create a connection? Otherwise,

Claire broke on behalf of the applicant? I, I think I can respond, uh, first and foremost to that question. , I think it's fair to say in terms of the timing of the pro respective projects, as Ms. Clark has just outlined, um, they've been through a process of identifying a preferred route for the pipeline, which they're now in the process of, um, going through statutory consultation on.

There have been a number of options that have been contemplated in terms of the timing of our application and, and lodging that clearly there wasn't a defined route, um, that, that we could, uh, take into account and assume would come forward in terms of, uh, that CO2 pipeline. So it's, it's fair to say that we, we couldn't have done that within our DCO application.

We are clearly anticipating that prospect in terms of how we might then achieve a connection and, and a separate, um, link into that, that would require additional consent out, out with the two respective schemes that are before you today. So we would need to secure. A separate consent to link in and make that final connection.

Uh, sorry. Yes, by all means. You thank, thank you. Sorry, very conscious of being on the screen. Um, thank, thank you. Uh, just, just to, to add and reinforce what, what Claire has just said. Um, you know, in our consultation documents, we have made clear that the pipelines will include capacity for future connections to be made to them, and it is possible that the project may be connected in the future.

So I should have made that point clear when I gave my initial summary,

uh, that, that's helpful. I, I, I think what I'm trying to get clear in my mind is, um, uh, to a certain extent what weight we could attribute to the potential for a future connect. Whether there is going to be anything within this DCO that would, um,

provide a, some sort of assurance that, um, yeah, I'm just, I'm struggling to see how far it'll take us when obviously there is so much up in the air from the DCO yet to be submitted. And also that our DCO doesn't actually have a physical connection to the potential route that that is yet, yet to be certain.

So, um, I'm just trying to get clear in my mind how we would present this possible opportunity to the Secretary of State and what weight might be attributed. Wow. So CLA Brook on behalf of the applicant. Um, absolutely fair points and certainly points that we are considering in, in, in terms of how we, uh, best present that, uh, to this examination.

And also at the same time we'll be making representations to, um, the separate project that, um, Clark is, is addressing today in terms of the pipeline. So there will be interaction and ongoing, uh, process in terms of the timeframe within which we operate under our examination, and then anticipating the subsequent examination for the pipeline.

I think we can provide additional information as well in terms of the weight that you might be able to attribute to the prospects of connection. And clearly a factor that will be highly relevant is the proximity of our project to the now preferred route that is being pursued, at least at statutory consultation.

In terms of the viability and the prospects, uh, the potential roots for connection, um, which clearly we have looked at on a preliminary basis. Uh, and I suspect throughout the course of the next six months during our examination, it may be that further information can be brought to the fore in terms of enabling you to determine how much weight you can attribute to that prospect, um, in your own decision.

Thank you. Um, it's a follow up point really slightly to one side of the items, but it was taking on from what was said in that I think, um, you implied that CO₂, um, extracting it from the process, uh, reduces energy, electricity generation. So again, it would be helpful to understand the, uh, the balance of benefit of removing CO₂.

Versus the loss of the electricity generation and how, uh, you know, if, if, if it's a graph that shows a straight line or whether it's, uh, not a straight line, it gets harder and harder. The more you are extracting to understand the balance between the two, I think would be helpful. Call bees are on behalf of the applicant.

So the, the carbon capture process requires energy in two forms. It requires heat in the form of blood pressure, steam typically around three and a half bar absolute, and in the form of electricity, typically for the compression and operation of pumps. Uh, that kind of equipment within the facility. Um, the demands as you scale apart fairly linear.

So you need a, a set quantity of heat, a set quantity of electricity, a ton of CO₂ captured. Typically, um, the amount of, uh, electricity generation reduction happens twofold. The direct. Export of electricity from the RF to the CCS facility rather than to the national grid and in the form of lost electrical generation from the steam that was not expanded all the way to vacuum within the steam turbine.

Uh, the second form again follows a fairly, fairly linear structure in the form of the parameter ed factor, which relates to how much lost electricity generation there is per unit of heats extracted. Um, it's difficult to say without running the calculation what the difference would be on the carbon balance.

You'd be generating less electricity, but a much lower carbon intensity. So it it the case of back to you, I think with the final numbers, graphs, anything that would be required. No, that's fine. It's just, um, be helpful to understand that dynamic. Of course. Yeah. Thank you.

Is there anything else on this? Particular subtopic. Yeah. Okay.

Simon Nicholson from rain, you said 55,000 tons per annum would be collected. What percentage of that is the overall admissions from the site?

Uh, Calen beers on behalf of the applicant, um, that, uh, a combusting, a ton of waste generates roughly a ton of co2. So it's 55,000 redivided by circuit, six 50,000. It's between seven and 10% in that range.

So, can I, I can ask a question Is what's limiting that at them in your current proposals then?

Uh, Cal Bees are on the behalf of the applicant. Um, limitation is a drive for energy, EF. And, uh, commercial consideration. So carbon capture is, as I, as I referred to in my response initially, entirely a cost at this point. So committing to, to large scale without, um, at the time of the application, certainly any established business model that would, um, obviously affect the viability of the skin.

If there's nothing else, I, I suggest we happy to move on from, from that on onto maybe later areas, aren't we? Um, which we did touch on a bit before, I think you already to some extent answer actually is, is, um, and again, is about how much weight we can give to the potential for injecting hydrogen into the local gas network.

If you'd like to sort of clarify what you described earlier or expand on it a little bit, that, that would be helpful. Yeah. Thank you sir. Um, s on behalf of the applicant, um, as I, as I discussed earlier, there. Gas agis for the purposes of hydrogen injection within the scheme, um, which are adjacent to different pressure gas mains, and that's to provide flexibility.

Our intention is that if hydrogen injections, the gas grid is, is feasible, if the, the metallurgy of the pipes in that area are, uh, suitable, that, um, there would be injections to the gas grid at at date when that becomes feasible. I said that is slightly speculative at the moment and dependent on lots of other moving parts.

I'm sorry. Thank you. Is anybody, anybody would like to comment on that? Me again? Um, are you going to be able to give us a sort of timeframe or what the government or gas distributors are doing in looking at allowing hydrogen to be a proportion of the gas within the system so that we can. Again, have some idea of the relationship that you are trying to create, uh, relative to when it may actually happen.

Just just give us an overview of that, of that relationship and the arrangements. Yeah, of course. Um, Calum Bees on behalf of the applicant. So in 2021, the UK government provided a hydrogen strategy, which discussed the, the broad roadmap for producing hydrogen, dealing with it in the economy. Uh, there are several projects which explore hydrogen network infrastructure.

Particular interest is project union, which is considering, um, the reuse of a lot of the network around 25% of the current network. Um, the aim of that is to inform National Grid on how they can convert pipelines, but they only begin doing that in 2026. The conversion, the study is ongoing at the moment in terms of larger.

inputs that have been the sort of 2030s, 2040s up times scale. Okay. Thank you. And I think finally, , um, can we just ask you to say a little bit more about, um, again, perhaps a bit speculative, but, but whether, whether your hydrogen production could connect into the hydrogen pipeline, um, has and when that is available.

Yeah, absolutely. So, um, as I've just noticed, noted rather the preferences to, sorry, I'm to introduce call B on behalf of the applicant. As I noted in my previous response, um, the intention is to connect the local gas grid in the first instance. Um, the distance to the east coast pipeline on the, the relatively low quantities of hydrogen reproducing in context of that pipeline.

Make that a second choice primarily. But as I noted earlier, um, existing network has methodological issues, those sorts of things, capacity. A dedicated hydrogen pipeline would obviously not have those problems. Users would be used to using hydrogen. Um, but as relates to the earlier point on carbon capture, it's, it's not in our scheme at the moment, we don't have a direct route.

It would follow the same route as the carbon capture pipeline if it was to be included.

Thank you. Yeah, that's helpful clarification. Um, any questions those others on, on, on these, on the spine item? Just an observation. Simon Nicholson from rain. Just an observation. If the hydrogen into the gas network isn't available till 20, 20, 30 to 2040s and the hydrogen network, the, uh, salty hydrogen network, um, that's possibly proposed some time in the future, maybe.

what's gonna happen to the hydrogen in the meantime? And it is the plant where, uh, going to be viable. Looking at that. I'll let you respond to that. I think. Um, yeah, that's fair. Okay, thank you. Um, Cal PE are on behalf of the applicant. There. There's another use for the hydrogen within the scheme we've already discussed, which is the hydrogen vehicle refueling area.

There are also proposals, again, somewhat speculative about the creation of virtual pipelines in which high pressure hydrogen is, is loaded into, uh, tanker vehicles. And these are used to move the hydrogen around the country to to users effectively. Thank you. Okay, thank you.

I think looking at my agenda, I think that brings us to the end of the, um, what should we call the substantive items. , I think we could press on and perhaps could I, would it, could I ask perhaps the applicant to, um, we've made our notes probably you made your notes. Can we, can we sort of agree on what the actions are that, um, um, you're gonna, I think mainly yourselves probably gonna a takeaway from, from today.

Shall I go through the list I've got and then hopefully that's agreed. Um, first one was to have a look at the inconsistencies in the description of the development, Claire Brook on behalf of the applicant. Just, just on that point, sir, did you want to identify specific inconsistencies that you have picked up?

It, it specifically within the application form, the draft development, consent order, and chapter three, the description of the generating station. It doesn't use the same form of words and so, That leads to a degree of confusion as to exactly what it is that you are proposing. So, um, I'm assuming the wording in the DCO is what you are after, but, uh, that's why I want that clarity cuz I may be assuming incorrectly that that's helpful.

So, we'll, we'll certainly look at that specific item and how it's described. Um, I suspect the source of truth may be the draft dco, but we can confirm that, um, and have a look at it. Okay, thank you. Uh, the second point was to respond to Mr. Nicholson's concern about whether landfill waste would be generated from the operations going on at this site.

Uh, the third point was, uh, in response to a question we raised about the weight to be attributed to, um, hydrogen injection into the glass. Gas supply system. Uh, the fourth point I have is the, uh, breakdown of waste composition. Uh, the fifth one is to consider with a p how the final navigation risk assessment would be, uh, facilitated and I think probably signed off by a p.

Um, and to consider whether that's needs to be within a requirement or some other mechanism. Uh, the next point I have is to look at whether a planning consent for the 24 hour operation of the wharf can, can be found. Um, if not, what evidence you're relying upon for the 24 hour operation.

The next one I have is the relationship to the operation of FBR Wharf and FBR Wharf Limited and RMS ports. Quite how that's working. Its way through. Um, a note on the role of the office road and rail in respect of the rail connection, um, and whether, again, that needs to be having any mechanism of being secured or whether it's delivered through a, a different permitting regime or whatever it happens to be.

And then I think the final one is, uh, just a note on this relationship between the, uh, removal of CO2 and electricity generation and how those two work in or pull, pull apart.

Is there any comments on that? Anybody got any different understanding of,

I'm trying to remember, did we cover the actual, the revised RDF supply assessment list?

I didn't refer to that, but the applicants committed to that being provided at Deadline one in any event. And so I didn't see that directly as an action point from what was raised today. More a point that the applicant was offering that at the outset. So

if there's nothing else, I I, I think I'll, I'll am back to Edwin.

uh, Claybrook on behalf of the applicant. I just going back through my notes and, and checking with my colleagues, that sounds like a reasonably comprehensive list to me. Um, but we will, we will double check. And if there are any, um, documents that we have promised that we, that is not incorporated your list, we we'll still endeavor to deal with those, um, as a follow up.

Thank you.

I think, um, on just a final element then, any other business, has anyone got any additional elements that, uh, they feel they need to be covered, which haven't already been covered within the agenda today? Um, and if not, then, uh, just thank you all for your attendance and the questions and the assistance you're providing to us.

Um, Uh, bring the hearing to a close, so thank you.