

00:00:05:21 - 00:00:44:20

Unknown

Welcome back, everybody. I'll make it. 12:00. Who are we? Are we all here? We just. We all. Has the livestream commenced, please? Might well carry on. I'm at. Item see on my my agenda, which is about sustainable transport policy and how that might be secured.

00:00:48:11 - 00:01:08:27

Unknown

There. Again, a couple of policy references I think are probably just reminding ourselves of, again, three, 2.5.24. If a plant that uses 500,000 tonnes of fuel per annum might require a large number of heavy goods, vehicles or heavy goods vehicle movements, HGV movements per day to import fuel.

00:01:09:30 - 00:01:34:34

Unknown

And another against the reference just to remind us of 2.5.25. Government policy encourages multimodal transport, and the IPC should expect materials, fuel and messages to be transported by water or vale routes with possible. So I just summarize. The proposal was as we as we just we see it.

00:01:37:25 - 00:01:52:16

Unknown

It would be capable of converting up to 760,000 tonnes of non-recyclable waste into energy. It includes an existing wharf adjacent to the conversion facility. It also includes reinstatement of the railway line, which connects the wharf to the National Rail Network.

00:01:52:38 - 00:02:17:43

Unknown

And the wharf has capacity itself to receive a portion proportion of the of the waste as fuel to be converted. So I'll go first here to. Interested parties. And I actually direct my question directly to. North Lincolnshire. What would you wish this to include?

00:02:17:43 - 00:02:41:41

Unknown

A requirement aimed to maximize the use of rail and river transport. And that's why rail and river transport. The waste is fuel to the proposed development. Thank you, Sir Andrew Law for North Lincolnshire Council. As an authority, we promote the use of sustainable modes of transport and we would like to see the use of the river and

00:02:41:42 - 00:02:58:00

Unknown

rail maximized where possible. So if it were possible to devise some sort of requirement to ensure that then and that is something that we would be happy to see the authority were happy to see in the latest iteration of the draft DCO that there is a commitment now to.

00:02:58:44 - 00:03:16:05

Unknown

And provide the reinstatement of the rail prior to commissioning of the facility which was was previously missing. So we are happy to see there is a commitment to actually having the and the railway reinstatement in place and have a set timeframe for that to be delivered.

00:03:17:24 - 00:03:40:04

Unknown

Thank you. Thank you. I'll just ask you a follow up on, which is. Would you actually like to see a limit on the number of HGV movements? Yeah. Under law for an orphan. Can she counsel? I'm. I'm not sure how feasible it would be for the applicants.

00:03:40:15 - 00:03:55:40

Unknown

Yeah. Give them a chance to respond to this. From our point of view, we would like to see the least amount of waste coming in via road as possible. Obviously, that may be determined by commercial considerations and other other matters.

00:03:56:16 - 00:04:08:45

Unknown

But yes, I think from our point of view, we would like to see that the use of river and rail maximized and the use of HGV is on the highway network minimized where possible. So as I as I suggested.

00:04:12:00 - 00:04:38:12

Unknown

Would the applicant like to to respond to that sort of general ask from the from North Lincolnshire. Sorry. Sorry, says Sarah Price on behalf of the applicant. Before my colleague Ms.. Brooke come comes back on some of those points.

00:04:38:22 - 00:04:59:44

Unknown

And so you referred to some policy. And I think it's also just worth referring everyone to paragraph five point 13.10 and MP and one as well, which also makes the points that you did on waterborne and rail transport being preferred over road transport at all stages of the project where cost effective.

00:04:59:46 - 00:05:25:48

Unknown

So I think that that's helpful to refer to as well. And in relation to HGV limits, I'm sure others will will come to that from our team and where where DCMS have done that before. So typically the very large nuclear power station projects, for instance have tended to include those sorts of limits.

00:05:25:48 - 00:05:49:46

Unknown

That's usually led by the capacity of the road network. So clearly those projects have been accompanied often by seaborne transport, for instance, where that is again preferred and there's been plans to maximize that where possible. But the HGV capacity has tended to be limited by the ability of the roads to actually take that material.

00:05:49:46 - 00:06:11:05

Unknown

So I'm sure well, we'll come on to what the network is capable of here. And I'm also just making the point which again, my colleagues will come to. But in selecting this site, the the attractiveness of having both the river and rail links was absolutely key to the applicant.

00:06:11:08 - 00:06:31:12

Unknown

It's as I'm sure people are aware, those fairly unusual to have sites that are so well-served by most multi-modal transport links. In this case, there's a port that can be used immediately and the applicant is now committing to deliver the rail works at considerable expense to them.

00:06:31:26 - 00:06:49:12

Unknown

And so it's, you know, there's there's every. Position in place for the applicant to make the most of those those things that are available to them. And again, I'm sure that others will come to the detail, but I just wanted to start with those points as well.

00:06:50:35 - 00:07:11:29

Unknown

Thank you. I thank you. Yes. If you like to carry on and explain the position in as much detail as you as you wish to do so might be fine. Claybrook on behalf of the applicants, what we are proposing to do is we have Mr. Gallup here today to talk to Rail and then Jonathan Ogilvy to talk

00:07:11:29 - 00:07:33:15

Unknown

to and matters related to vessel movements in the wharf. So if we start with Mr. Gallup and hopefully that will answer some of your points. Afternoon, sir. Nick Gallup speaking for the applicant. I think what I'll start with is the sort of chicken and egg about how you provide services in advance of the material that's necessary to

00:07:33:15 - 00:07:57:03

Unknown

make those services operational and the need for flexibility around that, which is a principle that's been discussed and elaborated and acknowledged by the Secretary of State on previous actually significant infrastructure projects, particularly in the context of strategic rail freight interchanges, where, depending on the nature of the project, some applicants have chosen to try and hardwire the delivery

00:07:57:03 - 00:08:11:14

Unknown

of rail services and rail infrastructure. And one of those, I think, has recently come unstuck and others have decided to sort of phase in the provision of that rail infrastructure because of all the external dependencies that sit there in.

00:08:13:22 - 00:08:28:30

Unknown

In terms of the nature of the the round works and the works number three, which is the reinstatement of the branch line from Flex Borough back to the mainline. That track can be sidings and works. Number four, putting in the the road the specific rail terminal.

00:08:29:29 - 00:08:41:35

Unknown

The railway line is already there. It's been retained because at some point there was a feeling that, you know, rail services would come back again. It's not using it because there's no critical mass of traffic for the operator that's currently using it.

00:08:42:24 - 00:09:07:44

Unknown

So the proposed the proposed development creates that opportunity for critical mass. And we see that critical mass in the operations that currently run out of Manchester, Merseyside and West London, where they are doing one or two trains a day of compacted refuse to right field RDF sealed in steel containers to move from material recovery facilities in the

00:09:07:45 - 00:09:29:46

Unknown

urban areas out to energy recovery facilities outside of those urban areas. Now, it's it's no coincidence that the reason those services are running is because not only is there a scale of material anywhere between 400,001.1 million tons per annum, it's moved by rail that way.

00:09:30:42 - 00:09:47:44

Unknown

But the contracts with the waste authorities go on for a long period. We're talking 25 years plus. In some cases, that creates a very good, stable, predictable environment within which rail services can be delivered at scale, commercially viable, operationally viable.

00:09:49:03 - 00:10:09:18

Unknown

And I think what's the issue here is and it's the same issue that other similar facilities have faced in their in their development, is that until the facility is consented, it's very difficult for a party to go out to the market to say we now want to draw a line around this critical mass of waste and bring

00:10:09:18 - 00:10:26:25

Unknown

it to this site, because the providers of that waste, be they local authorities, be they commercial and industrial and commercial industrial is far more fragmented. They will say, well, where's your facility? If we're going to commit to moving this stuff by rail and if we're collectively going to bring train operators in, they're going to need to provide

00:10:26:25 - 00:10:39:27

Unknown

containers and railway wagons. They'll will need to engage with Network Rail and the Office of Rail and Road to get agreements in place, get timetables sorted out. Where's the facility? Well, we haven't got it yet. Well, thanks very much.

00:10:39:27 - 00:10:56:03

Unknown

Will people move on? So I think there is the risk that chicken and egg that you've got to get the facility at least through determination for the markets then to go, okay, this is real. We can start to see this as a real timeline, a point at which we could start transporting that material.

00:10:57:37 - 00:11:15:35

Unknown

So it served. And that is a point I think that's recognized in part partly in the way other air facilities have been developed out. So Infinium a ferry bridge, they've built the rail terminal because they want to have that provision for rail as soon as they're ready to use it rather than not build it at all at

00:11:15:35 - 00:11:29:17

Unknown

other facilities. I think Rookery South has a requirement through its planning consent to report to the local authority every couple of years to say, well, we've had another look at rail. We're not sure we're ready yet, we're not sure the market's ready, etc..

00:11:29:18 - 00:11:53:20

Unknown

So you've got different approaches. And in the context of discos and nationally significant infrastructure projects, those that have a big rail component to them, not least strategic rail freight changes in the case of West Midlands Interchange as RFI and East Midlands Gateway, they deliberately phased when the rail was going to come in.

00:11:54:14 - 00:12:11:02

Unknown

Partly to allow the occupiers and the activities to build on site physically to create critical mass. The then train services can work commercially, operationally from the get go, but also recognizing that there are these external actors that they have to engage with.

00:12:11:24 - 00:12:28:37

Unknown

If you're going to run a train on a network, you need to have a train operator licenses, access agreements, etc. and they take time to get in place. And the separatists acknowledge that in the decision letters on both of those projects, because the the concerns were raised that, well, they're not putting the rail infrastructure in from day

00:12:28:37 - 00:12:41:36

Unknown

one, so how can we be satisfied they're ever going to use rail? Secretary of State responded, quoting the national policy statement on national network, saying, Priority point for five. I think it is that there is a need for flexibility.

00:12:41:36 - 00:13:03:17

Unknown

There is a need to flexibility to allow the the operator of the site to respond to commercial conditions as they arise. Northampton Gateway strategic Ralph range change by contrast went straight for the we will put the rail services in from day one and they've come unstuck because between them and an external party network rail, they are unable

00:13:03:17 - 00:13:19:25

Unknown

to deliver that real connection. Hence the DCO is currently the subject of an application for revision. To try and break that connection. Coming on to the point about HGV, again, just sticking with, say, other other end ships for the time being.

00:13:20:00 - 00:13:33:25

Unknown

The Birch Coppice Strategic Rail for interchange, one of the buildings on there, one of the industrial units on there, did have, at the request of the local authority, a condition on there that required the 50% of the traffic through that building had to come by rail.

00:13:34:48 - 00:13:56:17

Unknown

The operator found that because at the time their business was about importing components from mainland Europe and because of problems with the rail services to and from mainland Europe at the time they occupied that building said this is commercially flattering our ability to do what we need to do here because we can't honor the commitment again because

00:13:56:17 - 00:14:07:11

Unknown

it's outside of our control. If we ran the trains and it was our railway line right the way through to Germany in this case. You know, we have more control over our destiny, but we don't. Therefore, this is pressuring us.

00:14:07:33 - 00:14:26:17

Unknown

And the inspector the inquiry that was held to review that agreed and put it down to more of a best endeavors rather than a you must absolutely put X percent of your traffic through the building site. So I think it is it's trying to pick up that spirit of flexibility, because where that flexibility has been granted, the

00:14:26:18 - 00:14:43:35

Unknown

traffic does flow, you know, where developers of industrial products have been allowed to get the facilities in, get the activities going, create the critical mass, because trains need rather large volumes of traffic. And if it's 20 tonnes of material, a single HGV can turn up quite happily and move that.

00:14:44:32 - 00:15:05:22

Unknown

You'll need a 900 to 1000 tons of material based on what the existing rail services are carrying to make it operationally and commercially viable. So it's making sure that you've got enough time to get that buildup at the point at which the rail becomes not only operationally viable, but commercially attractive and compelling, which is why West London

00:15:05:23 - 00:15:27:09

Unknown

, Greater Manchester and Merseyside have all chosen to go down the rail route rather than use road haulage to move that around. You've made reference to a number of DCO decisions and Secretary of State's decisions. Can, when you do your written summary, provide us with the paragraph numbers and the clear references for that, please.

00:15:27:11 - 00:15:57:04

Unknown

Thank you. Thank you for that. I think I misspoke. You said there was we've been hearing about the opportunity for forever transport before we respond. Yes. Have a chance, medically speaking, on behalf of the applicant with regards to the preliminary risk assessment application document number zero 73, which is annexed to the Chapter 13 Traffic and Transport Document

00:15:57:04 - 00:16:14:19

Unknown

zero 61 of the Environmental Statement and the Marine Navigation Risk Assessment has been undertaken to support this application by assessing these additional vessel movements that could take place in the route within the river trend associated with the delivery of export of goods to and from flexible wharf.

00:16:14:20 - 00:16:39:21

Unknown

As a result of this project, I'm just jumping at the numbers. The number of vessel movements in the Humber Estuary, looking at the baseline and the River Trent has significantly decreased in the last 20 years. Investments in the River Trent dropped from approximately 2500 to 1000 between 1999 and 2019, where vessel movements at Flexible Wharf dropped from

00:16:39:46 - 00:17:01:21

Unknown

450 to 300. Noting the access to the river, Trent is limited by the high tides, resulting in only a limited number of vessels being able to access and depart during this window. With departures from the wharf being able to occur approximately 2 hours before the high tide and arrival is approximately one hour before the high water outlook

00:17:02:45 - 00:17:19:36

Unknown

. There is an increase in vessel movements associated with the import of fill material during the construction phase. This has been estimated to represent between four and 16 additional vessel movements at the wharf per month and a maximum total of 80 vessel movements per year.

00:17:20:24 - 00:17:41:36

Unknown

This is assumed that a cargo vessel would carry an average 2500 tonnes of fill material. This total amount of fill material required per year is approximately 100,000 tonnes over a full over a four year period. This equates to 40 vessels, the same as, say, 40 vessel movements per year at the wharf.

00:17:42:04 - 00:18:03:32

Unknown

Assuming all material would arrive by the river, the number of vessel movements during the operational phase considered the following assumptions. The maximum number of vessel movements during high tide is two vessels arriving at the wharf and two vessels departing during departing and sailing downstream to the Humber and each spring tide cycle.

00:18:04:11 - 00:18:22:21

Unknown

It is noted that there may be operational constraints that limit vessels, e.g. pilotage and downtime. However, for the purpose of the estimate, a worst case number of vessels to feed into the environment for environmental studies. It is assumed that the this is does not limit the movements has been taken out of the consideration.

00:18:23:22 - 00:18:42:22

Unknown

The number of additional vessels arriving during Neap period is calculated based on the ratio of vessels arriving in the spring and Neap tide period, which was as a result of an assessment.

Due to figures provided by the associated British ports with British ports ADP as a statutory authority.

00:18:42:47 - 00:19:05:07

Unknown

The number of vessels arriving and departing per year were calculated for both spring and neap tides, assuming 26 spring tides and 26 neap tides per year. The total number of vessel movements per year at Flex Borough with and compared to the information on vessel movements that currently occur, which was provided by the Associated Press reports ABP

00:19:05:27 - 00:19:27:43

Unknown

to allow for a percentage increase of vessels operating to be calculated. An assumption on the density of RDF was considered and the same for the liquid carbon dioxide. It was also assumed that 2820 foot equivalent units to EU per vessels in on average has been would be the capacity of the future container vessels.

00:19:28:12 - 00:19:48:39

Unknown

This is assuming that each container has a volume of 33 cubic meters. A total number of vessels of movements was assessed both 24 hour and 12 hours operation of the Wednesday. However, due to the potential of unlikely operational constraints that could restrict the number of appointments, the 24 hour operations was felt to be unrealistic.

00:19:48:40 - 00:20:14:06

Unknown

And so the estimated vessel movements. So to calculate the estimated vessel movements, the 12 hour operations were considered to be determined for the for the future of the assessment. As such, the vessel movements expected during the operational phase, in addition to the baseline traffic that already occurs is the offloading of containerized waste adds approximately 350 vessel movements

00:20:14:06 - 00:20:37:38

Unknown

per year. This equates to about 24% of the overall RDF supplied to the site. Offloading of bulk materials approximately 180 vessel movements per year, and loading of carbon dioxide approximately 50 vessel minutes per year. The combination of the new activities which result in a 580 additional vessel movements at the wharf per year, nearly 50 additional vessel movements

00:20:37:38 - 00:21:00:07

Unknown

per month. The number of women which relate to the data relates to the offshore offloading of RDF was determined by calculating the number of vessels required for the carbon dioxide loading and offloading of bulk materials and subtracting those from the total number of vessel movements resulting in the remaining 350 vessel movements, which allows for approximately 100000 to

00:21:00:08 - 00:21:19:05

Unknown



2000 tonnes per year, which equates to that approximate 24 percentage of total tonnage that I mentioned earlier based on the capacity of the assessment presented in the preliminary navigation risk assessment. The increased vessel movements during the operational phase can be accommodated at flexible wharf within the existing two berths available.

00:21:19:43 - 00:21:39:41

Unknown

It is considered that the vessel movements can be accommodated within the current, permitted and consented working hours at the wharf and considering the traffic baseline and the historic traffic of the Humber Street River Trent, it is considered that the navigation impact of the freight associated with the project will be limited and total vessel movements will remain within

00:21:39:41 - 00:21:58:24

Unknown

the level of site which has already been experienced in the 1990s, and is also worth noting as a final point that access by the river is restricted. And we should make note of this as the tides would only allow a maximum of four additional vessel movements per high tide to be accommodated, i.e. two vessels arriving in sea

00:21:58:24 - 00:22:20:19

Unknown

vessel the passing of the wharf. It is also an agreement with the Associated Press reports that the vessels entering and exiting the river, Trent, will be piloted by. By the statutory authority. Thank you. Can I just follow up with a question, Mr. Ogilvy?

00:22:22:10 - 00:22:45:34

Unknown

What do you consider the consented hours of the wolf to be? John Ogilvy speaking on behalf of the applicants. At the moment, we believe that to be no constraint to the operational hours. And if others from the applicant's team would like to correct me, then please do.

00:22:46:04 - 00:23:05:24

Unknown

But there's no restriction on those hours at the moment. I mean, I don't know whether you were party to one of our earlier hearings, but. We were asking for evidence of the original permission, and I don't think one has been able to be found.

00:23:05:24 - 00:23:27:49

Unknown

So I'm just revisiting that just for the clarity from my own perspective to see if there's any further update. I know we have written responses to questions on that basis, so. I vote for the applicant. Just to confirm, we haven't been able to uncover a specific planning permission.

00:23:28:00 - 00:23:50:02

Unknown

And I don't want speak to speak for, I'll say. But I believe they've also looked at it. It's, I suspect, the age of the consent. But in terms of the 24 hour operations, my understanding is that they have been ongoing for a fairly considerable period of time, but we have sought to get that information from BP.

00:23:54:09 - 00:24:06:12

Unknown

Andrew Love an orphanage council. Yeah, just. Just to confirm. So we have carried out a search of our archives and not been able to track down the. The consent for the war, I assume, due to the age of the consent.

00:24:06:46 - 00:24:29:04

Unknown

And it's been a historic war. So not able to confirm any operational restrictions, hours restrictions apply to the wolf. Thank you. So is the council's position in alignment with the applicants that they can operate on a 24 hour basis should they wish to?

00:24:30:49 - 00:24:46:41

Unknown

We have no evidence of restrictions that we will be able to enforce. So I think we would agree with that position. Okay. Thank you. Mr. Nicholson, I see you have your hand raised. Yes. Simon Nicholson on behalf of Rain.

00:24:48:33 - 00:25:08:39

Unknown

I have a number of points on the last one. I believe that in 1996, when the local authority changed over to the NLC from Glenwood. The archive was all moved to Lincoln. So there may be something in there that's just a suggestion.

00:25:12:16 - 00:25:35:07

Unknown

Right. Let's see where to start. The river. Very interesting points. Um. The only thing that hasn't been taken into consideration in any way is the the current workings of the port and their movements are not being taken into consideration.

00:25:37:03 - 00:26:02:22

Unknown

Which I think is a huge thing. Um. Also. The time to empty your ship has not been stated. And going back to my comments yesterday. The unloading time for a vertical lift, which is what you need for a container as it does swing around all over the place.

00:26:03:35 - 00:26:27:10

Unknown

Um. To unload a boat at flex per wolf for the time or the allowance of time to unload it. Uh. Is very small. The window is very small because the ships sit on the on the. Silt in the bottom of the river as the tide goes out and leans away from the from the key.

00:26:27:10 - 00:26:50:46

Unknown

So it's not possible to do a vertical lift. The volume of vehicles, the volume of ships that they can turn around. Yes, I don't I don't dispute that at all. But the majority of of goods that are brought into or out of flexible wolf, minerals and steel, mainly.

00:26:53:06 - 00:27:18:21

Unknown

They don't require any restriction because of vertical lift. Because the. They're not something that's stacked. It's you know, it's a lot less limiting. So this is. You're comparing apples to pears. I'm. The volume in the containers 33 cubic meters.

00:27:19:12 - 00:27:37:27

Unknown

That makes it very light. According to the original figures I was given in 2021, which was I believe I've got my notes in front of me now, was 3.75 tons per. Container that makes it very light and fluffy.

00:27:39:17 - 00:28:00:03

Unknown

Um. There was no discussion or no comment about the density of the waste in these containers. In other words, what the net weight would be per container. Which is quite crucial because then you'll need to know how many containers are on a ship.

00:28:00:36 - 00:28:25:17

Unknown

Because a. We've got a quantity of ships per annum and you can break down to find out what what the weight capacity is per container or actually how many containers per boat. That gives you a bit of an outline then of whether the vertical lift on loading and loading can be carried out in the window.

00:28:25:49 - 00:28:52:48

Unknown

That is possible. Um. The other thing is we're going back to the 24 hour working. There is a noise restriction at night with a lower baseline. So now that may affect any work done on the. On the, uh, the key.

00:28:55:23 - 00:29:28:47

Unknown

And that I believe Mr. Oliver mentioned that. The law or planning condition came in in 1996. Um. Let's go to road transport. Road transport. No. Sorry. We haven't done the real. Right. The rail transport. Yeah. It's all it's all very vague.

00:29:30:16 - 00:29:51:43

Unknown

But there's no. There's nothing confirmed. Going back to a comment Claire Claybrook said yesterday for the applicant. Uh, I think it's. No, it was yesterday about when I said that wasn't real. Hadn't been consulted about planning. It was waved away.

00:29:51:43 - 00:30:08:16

Unknown

But does she have any evidence that planning has been. Been actually discussed with the applicant with the with Oslo Rail because they say they know nothing about it. Well, that was answered yesterday, Mr. Stewart. Mr. Nicholson. I don't want to revisit that.

00:30:08:39 - 00:30:30:10

Unknown

I look forward to seeing your written submissions to what you said, and the applicant will equally have their opportunity to explain what they've done. I don't want to go over that. So I'm. Are

there any other points on today's agenda that you would wish to add in terms of the rail or river movements?

00:30:30:33 - 00:30:46:02

Unknown

Because that's obviously the topic that we're covering at the moment. Not at this time, but I will definitely have a comment about the road transport link. Okay. We'll come to that. You made reference to in 1996 planning permission, which Mr. Oliver mentioned.

00:30:46:02 - 00:31:02:09

Unknown

Can you liaise with the council to make sure that we get a copy of that? And can the Council let us know what their position is in respect of that permission and any conditions that may or may not apply?

00:31:02:09 - 00:31:29:09

Unknown

Please. Thank you. Come on then, Mr. and UK when you have your hand up. Thank you very much, sir. Yep. Do you want to take a picture? Right. Okay. Thank you very much, sir. Slowly going for UK win in the impression we get listening to the applicant is that neither rail nor water transport can be described as

00:31:29:09 - 00:31:58:38

Unknown

certain or straightforward. So in light of this, UK win suggests that assessments of traffic impacts and other environmental impacts should be made on the basis that any requirement may later be altered or lifted. I mean, this is just what happened at the Runcorn incinerator, which is a 1.1 million tonne incinerator, where local residents were reassured that the

00:31:59:02 - 00:32:32:34

Unknown

feedstock would only ever be RDF and would only be primarily delivered by rail. The feedstock changed from RDF to include quite a bit of raw waste that was delivered by road. So in line with the experience of Runcorn, in line with the flexibility referred to by the applicant and indeed the cost effectiveness proviso within government guidance, it

00:32:32:35 - 00:32:55:08

Unknown

makes sense for the assessments to be made based on the maximum that could be expected for each of the three methods. In other words, an assessment with a maximum of what I understand to be about 25% delivered by water for the water impact, but also a maximum of 100% delivered by road, which I think has already been

00:32:55:08 - 00:33:07:03

Unknown

raised. So we'll leave it at that for now. But thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you for that. Now, can you briefly respond to that? But I think I know what they're going to say. But but please do say.

00:33:08:48 - 00:33:25:07

Unknown

Claire Brook on behalf of the applicant. So in terms of the the last point made by UK when we can confirm that the EIA assessments were carried out on the worst case scenarios which did assume 100% by road for the purposes of the transport assessment.

00:33:25:33 - 00:33:40:28

Unknown

And then in terms of air quality, as we heard yesterday, it's an even more worst case assumption in that we've assumed 100% by each mode in order to ensure that we have assessed the maximum potential effects in those situations.

00:33:41:21 - 00:34:00:27

Unknown

Thank you. Can I can I just go back to the beginning of this section briefly on your on your response to the to the assaults about a limit on HGV. And I think he said so this question is going to the applicant basically that where there was a an HGV limit, it was because of the capacity of

00:34:00:27 - 00:34:15:33

Unknown

the road network. Is that did I hear that correctly? I'm Sarah Price on behalf of the applicant. And so that is what I said and in some instances there as well. And depending on the case, there are other environmental reasons.

00:34:15:33 - 00:34:31:44

Unknown

Say, for instance, air quality and an emissions is is limiting as a planner. And I don't think any of those apply here. We do have someone on the team who can talk about the road transport side of it, if that would be, that would be helpful.

00:34:32:43 - 00:34:45:17

Unknown

I suppose. My question then is if we do as we do sometimes compare with other projects, I think that I think there is a vote in HGV on the code of oversight. Why isn't there? Is that correct? I'm not sure.

00:34:45:34 - 00:35:07:23

Unknown

But we can go away and and look at that point and others and perhaps and in our responses, provide a summary as to the circumstances that applied in those cases. I think that that would be helpful. Yeah. Is anybody, any other interested parties want to make any further responses on this topic?

00:35:13:38 - 00:35:52:20

Unknown

Have you already done by Mr. Nicholson? Well, okay. Well, no. Yes. Well, briefly. Very briefly. We'll cover it until the next item. If it's local. Yeah, yeah. Yeah. So I suggest we move on to local waste related concerns and at this point.

00:35:54:16 - 00:36:12:22

Unknown

I would just sort of introduce it by saying the API people who are I think on the on the on the line have raised concerns about potential harm for animal feed contamination, which is in up to 81 caused by the operation of the proposed development.

00:36:13:12 - 00:36:34:41

Unknown

And they provide several controls and an associate of common ground sorry is being drafted between the applicants. They agree. My question to initially the applicant. Can you confirm those areas where agreement has yet to be reached with a agree and the reasons why that's the case?

00:36:44:30 - 00:37:10:19

Unknown

Claybrook on behalf of the applicant. Sorry for the slight hesitation there. We weren't quite sure what would be covered off in this particular agenda item. I can confirm that there is ongoing engagement as between the applicant and Abbey Agri in particular, in terms of the written representation that has been made by Abbey Agri and the concerns that

00:37:10:20 - 00:37:33:38

Unknown

they have raised. We have a deadline to put in a full response to that written representation, which hopefully to some extent addresses those concerns, noting that Abbey Acharya obviously present in this hearing and I know at least one of the items raised in their written representation related to flood risk, which we will be dealing with, I think

00:37:33:44 - 00:37:57:03

Unknown

, in the next agenda item. In terms of the contamination risk that that aspect was responded to on our behalf as part of our written response to the written representation. I don't know if we've got anyone specific here today from erm Mr. Murphy to my left was in part involved in that response.

00:37:57:26 - 00:38:15:48

Unknown

So if there are specific questions, but in particular we've put forward evidence to demonstrate how the RDF will be transported to site in terms of confirmations around the sale containers with respect to TV's rail freight and the wall.

00:38:16:45 - 00:38:35:18

Unknown

So I think that was the sort of principal information that we've put forward as part of our written representation response so far. Thank you. I think it's by all means if you want to add further detail, but I really want to focus on those things that you obviously there's lots of things you said you will do and

00:38:35:19 - 00:38:47:22

Unknown

no doubt, at least I assume that. And that covers a number of Jacqui's concerns. I just want to narrow down the discussion to any areas that you've not and in respect of waste, to come back to other topics as hasn't when.

00:38:47:22 - 00:39:07:28

Unknown

But but is there anything specifically further you want to add to that or I'll invite Ibekwe to give to present their perspective on this. Claybrook On behalf of the applicant, I don't think so at this stage. I'm looking to Mr. Murphy to my left, but it may be helpful to hear from APRA.

00:39:07:45 - 00:39:22:46

Unknown

They've obviously only relatively recently received our deadline three response and noting that they also made a response deadline three in terms of ongoing concerns and discussions that still need to be had. So can I invite API agree to.

00:39:25:01 - 00:39:50:35

Unknown

Contribute. Respond to that position as stated by the applicant. I am. My name is Takagi Wisdom from that place representing AP Agri. We have reviewed the applicant's response and given the significant risk to the biosecurity of the plant, which affects the plant, but not just that.

00:39:50:35 - 00:40:09:16

Unknown

It affects the supply chain and food UK's food security, and therefore that risk cannot be underestimated. And therefore I'll now pass on to my clients, Abbey Agri, who can explain about the concerns that they still have on hand regarding the proposal.

00:40:20:12 - 00:40:41:49

Unknown

So William Glass from Abbey at Great. The point, I think that we must stress is we have read the applicant's responses as received recently and we understand the points made about controls of around orders. And we also understand what they're saying about pest control.

00:40:42:18 - 00:41:20:12

Unknown

But our concern remains that despite that, what the applicant is not able to control any more than the agri can is the space between the two plants and the risk, therefore, of transmission of principally salmonella, which is a constant ongoing issue for animal feed production by birds and also rats and mice, to be specific, and particularly on

00:41:20:12 - 00:41:48:10

Unknown

the Riverside site. Seagulls and other birds are always part of the problem we face. Salmonella control in UK Feed is a story which goes back over more than 30 years to the original raising of awareness of salmonella. First of all, in eggs, which was in the public domain all that time again.

00:41:49:04 - 00:42:10:44

Unknown

And the principles of risk assessment are always based on all the controls arising from risk assessment, so are based on pest control, which is talked about here and all, but also environmental proximity and doing as much as you possibly can to limit the risk risk of ingress.

00:42:11:45 - 00:42:36:32

Unknown

And it's that that is our real point. By building this site next to KBR agrees we will increase that risk and therefore we believe that further steps will need to be taken to protect both the IP agri facility and also, as is already outlined, to protect the.

00:42:38:19 - 00:42:58:00

Unknown

Threat that's posed to us by the news site. So it's focusing on our own. That is the part that is yet to be discussed and which we believe must be discussed shortly. I hope that's clear. And. Another of my colleagues who is also on will explain to you now the.

00:42:59:14 - 00:43:23:09

Unknown

Very significant place that flicks. Our factory has in the supply chain. Thank you very much. I'm just a little bit of context to our site at Flickr. Sarah. The. Sorry sorry to interrupt you. Can you just introduce yourself, please?

00:43:23:22 - 00:43:45:07

Unknown

My apologies. My apologies. I had the microphone on mute when I was talking. I'm Jeff Marsden from ABC. I'm Global Safety and environment manager for IBRD. And just to put a little bit of context to our site at Flickr, Sarah, the site was originally built in the mid 1980s by Unit Guy Poultry, who constructed a large number

00:43:45:07 - 00:44:09:04

Unknown

of poultry farms along the M18 along the one in 180 that were fed from the feed mill feed then went through a series of changes in ownership and we acquired the site in 2010 and had been rebuilt in 2004 from the ground up, which the site is originally was part of the night pro chemical site.

00:44:09:04 - 00:44:33:04

Unknown

So it's been built on top of the chemical site that was destroyed in the explosion in 1974. And they just to build on what my colleague has said the UK market for broiler chickens that's chickens that you eat somebody's dinner chickens to Lightman who I wasn't involved in agriculture is 1.1 billion birds a year.

00:44:33:07 - 00:44:52:08

Unknown

That's an awful lot of chickens. The sites at flicks on its own feed 10% of those. So we at the factory at Fleet Street FT Feed just round about 110 million chickens a year. 10% of the poultry on that.

00:44:52:32 - 00:45:14:27

Unknown

So if we end up with a problem with salmonella as a result of the development or anything else, that will have a very, very significant effect on the poultry supply chain in the UK. That, quite frankly, means no chickens on the supermarket shelves, to be absolutely honest, because the birds that we supply from there go to all

00:45:14:27 - 00:45:34:09



Unknown

the feed that we supply goes to feed birds that end up in Sainsbury's, Marks and Spencers, Tesco's, Kentucky Fried Chicken to name but a few. So it is a very, very significant strategic sight in the terms of the UK food chain.

00:45:34:10 - 00:45:58:36

Unknown

Food supply chain, the. Proposals by the applicant do start to address that, but they don't reduce the risk, in our opinion, to a reasonable level. That will still be a very, very real chance. As my colleague has said, of salmonella migrating from rats and birds into the fate, Mel, as a result of the adjacent development, which isn't

00:45:58:36 - 00:46:19:16

Unknown

currently there, because if you look at the sites who have an opportunity to tomorrow, the raw material intake faces the river and open countryside that will then be running alongside that map. We said development goes ahead will be the waste facility in the intake facility, which will dramatically increase the risk to our production from that site.

00:46:23:17 - 00:46:47:29

Unknown

Okay. Thank you. Can I can I just ask you a fairly direct question is what is it you? What is it you're seeking that would satisfy you that the applicant is not offering? We believe that in order to reduce the risk to an acceptable level, to use health and safety analogy as low as is reasonably practicable, there

00:46:47:30 - 00:47:13:20

Unknown

will need to be significant further changes to our plan to ensure that we can operate within the parameters to supply safe feed into the supply and poultry supply chain in the UK. In terms of segregation within our own within our facilities and and improving to improving our manufacturing techniques.

00:47:14:18 - 00:47:31:39

Unknown

And that one involves a very, very significant investment to ourselves. So so just to be clear, I think I've understood that. So it would be it would be measures I'll call them protective measures taken on your facility that would improve level of protection from the proposed facility.

00:47:33:01 - 00:47:47:18

Unknown

I think that's probably where we'll end up if the facility goes ahead, because it's unrealistic. As one of my colleagues said a few days ago, rats and rats and seagulls tend not to be house trained, and you can't write a procedure that stops that movement between the two plants.

00:47:50:08 - 00:48:10:42

Unknown

Can I just obviously I thank you, but can the applicant respond now or do you want to take some of this wine and continue your discussions with AP Agri Claybrook on behalf of the applicant? I suspect the latter is going to be the more productive route, recognizing that discussions are ongoing.

00:48:10:42 - 00:48:28:33

Unknown

So it's helpful to get the update today from maybe agri in terms of where they're at, at least to hear that in part, some of the points that we've put forward in our response do go some way to addressing their concerns in terms of works to their own facilities.

00:48:29:26 - 00:48:52:28

Unknown

I think that's the first time that that that has been raised directly with us. So I would like the opportunity to speak to the experts and take some further instructions. I mean, in terms of pest control that was referenced there, we have specifically referred to the approaches for dealing with pest management, in particular via the permit itself

00:48:53:27 - 00:49:13:21

Unknown

, but also in our response. We have made it clear that so far as our risk assessments of works are concerned and the way in which the plant operates and the negative pressure, that there isn't a risk of odor, there isn't the way in which the waste is received in terms of the RDF have been bailed and sealed

00:49:13:36 - 00:49:34:17

Unknown

such that we consider that the low level risk or there is no such thing as zero risk but a very low level risk in terms of pest management that may be required for a facility of this type. But I don't want to stretch beyond into the realms of expert evidence and would like to pick that up separately

00:49:34:17 - 00:49:55:09

Unknown

. And we will continue to discuss that with APRA. Thank you and thank you. I agree. I will, I think, move on, obviously. Or you're in discussion and you're and you are progressing that you mentioned odor. So I think that moves me nicely onto ODA assessment and.

00:49:57:45 - 00:50:16:05

Unknown

If I point to if I just ask again North Lincolnshire probably quite directly this is appears to be an area of some disagreement with the applicant. Again, I'm going to perhaps try and move to solution made a little bit, which is do you wish in terms of odor, do you wish to see this addressed to an additional

00:50:16:06 - 00:50:43:32

Unknown

requirement? And if so, what form? Should it take? Annie Ward, North Lincs Council. I think what we're looking for in terms of ODA at this stage would be at the very least a qualitative risk based approach, which would be in line with the Institute of Quality Management Guidance Document, and that would be used at this stage for

00:50:43:32 - 00:51:09:39

Unknown

screening of potential odor impacts in terms of a requirement. Again, there's some overlap potentially with the environmental permit, whether the applicant would consider an odor management plan as part of a requirement. Well, we can thank the applicant, can you?

00:51:10:37 - 00:51:29:41

Unknown

Respond to those couple of points. Kevin Murphy on behalf of the applicants. And I think as far as the environmental permits are concerned, that would certainly cover things like odor management. And and if it was a necessary a management plan would be part of the environmental permit or part of the environmental management system requirements under the environmental

00:51:29:42 - 00:51:50:06

Unknown

permits. And of course, North Lincs would be a consultee to the Environment Agency in the course of applying for the environmental permit. So. Opportunity to comment. I'm sorry, Miss. I was going to come to you next, Mr. Nicholson, because I was aware that you had had your hand up on.

00:51:50:08 - 00:52:14:19

Unknown

On local issues. So I think I'll give you a chance to now to to to make your point. Okay. Regarding odor, the applicant states that it will be a negative pressure. A system which will not allow it to escape into the environment.

00:52:15:21 - 00:52:40:38

Unknown

The negative pressure of how described to me by the applicant or representatives of the cause will be caused by the updraft from the flu. While the incinerator is in operation. However, what happens when the incinerator is not in operation and how will negative pressure be maintained?

00:52:41:17 - 00:53:05:33

Unknown

And also, where will the odor go? If there is no burning to destroy the odor in effect? That's my first point. And my next point goes back to road transport. I had a very strange conversation with somebody with a London trust.

00:53:06:34 - 00:53:32:47

Unknown

Relating to the application. And he quoted me something that was stated by Mr. Bradley from the applicant, which quite shocked me. And he stated that. Mr. Bradley said that the rail and the river are just smokescreens and it'll all end up going by road.

00:53:32:49 - 00:53:51:17

Unknown

That is a huge concern for me. I just wondered what Mr. Bradley would like to say about it. Can I can I ask you to take those points? In turn, the first point seemed quite straightforward, and we were on the subject if we could possibly respond to that one about negative pressure.

00:53:51:32 - 00:54:19:04

Unknown

Yes. Claybrook, on behalf of the applicant, I've just recalled to the table Chris Hazel Marshall, who I think is happy to address any questions specifically around how the plant will operate in terms of addressing odor. Chris saw Marshall speaking on part of the applicant in terms of odor acknowledged the point that a formal qualitative and quantitative assessment

00:54:19:05 - 00:54:47:05

Unknown

has not been undertaken for the plant. We would typically refer to Environment Agency Guidance Note H four, which sets out methodology for undertaking odor impact assessment on a semi quantitative basis on a risk basis, using the final methodology, which is looking at the frequency, intensity, duration, offensiveness and receptor sensitivity to odor and odor emissions in order to

00:54:47:27 - 00:55:13:02

Unknown

quantify the risk of significant other issues arising at sensitive receptors. However, in order to do this, one has to have an odor source in the first place. So when looking at following the actual methodology, which would be part of the environmental permit, should the Environment Agency consider that odor is a potential issue for a plant?

00:55:13:28 - 00:55:37:05

Unknown

One has to come to the point of a frequency. The plant is inherently designed to manage and destroy odor. So the issue question that was raised around odor from the stack, the combustion temperature and combustion conditions are sufficient to destroy those compounds within the waste materials that may arise as odorous compounds.

00:55:37:20 - 00:55:55:41

Unknown

Therefore, there is no odor as such being emitted from the stack. As has been discussed by my colleagues. The reception hall is under negative pressure with fast acting doors to maintain a within that hall. That is the air that is used in the combustion process.

00:55:56:05 - 00:56:15:36

Unknown

Therefore, any materials that are rising within the typical when the waste is being unloaded and waste being unveiled is tightly contained within the fabric of the building and is taken into the combustion process and therefore destroyed. So in that sense, the.

00:56:17:17 - 00:56:39:16

Unknown

Facility itself is deemed to be odor free during normal operations. The question was again raised of what happens when the plant is offline. Clearly, the facility has downtime for routine maintenance activities. Typically around 10% of the year, one of the lines will be offline.

00:56:39:34 - 00:56:59:04

Unknown

The reason for having one reason for having multiple lines is so that the plant can be have one line shut down for these maintenance activities. The remaining two lines can operate. In that respect, any waste materials that are within the building when maintenance is being undertaken will still be being processed.

00:56:59:10 - 00:57:22:45

Unknown

Odorous compounds were still being processed. If for any reason there is a foreseen large scale maintenance activity required on the plant that can be scheduled in so that all the waste materials within the plant are used up. The waste bunker is empty and therefore the opportunity for waste to become odorous in that circumstance is not going to

00:57:22:45 - 00:57:47:17

Unknown

rise. In terms of odors arising from the transportation of wastes as it's been discussed, this is baled waste and containerized waste, forming a barrier between residual waste materials and. The environment into which odors can escape. And in that sense, we consider it to be of negligible risk of odors arising from the transportation of materials.

00:57:48:08 - 00:58:06:16

Unknown

To put this into context for some of the other waste and recovery facilities in most facilities operate, we're not having municipal waste trucks turn up at site. We're not having open trailer waste being delivered, black bag waste being delivered to the site.

00:58:06:16 - 00:58:22:19

Unknown

That is not purpose of this. This is refuge derived fuel. It is pretreated, it is wrapped and it is in containers. Therefore, some of the other issues and issues around things like fly nuisance can and have been observed.

00:58:22:20 - 00:58:39:06

Unknown

Some other sites are not anticipated to occur here because of the nature of the waste that's going to be. But to cite as the fuel. So hopefully that will address the issue around why we have not done a formal odor assessment.

00:58:39:06 - 00:58:58:03

Unknown

If such is required, it can be done. But I can already describe that the the outcome of that using something like the final methodology would be that negligible risk because of the measures that are inherently designed into both the process itself, the plant itself, and also the transportation.

00:58:59:14 - 00:59:16:29

Unknown

Okay. So I think what I understood from that was that to go back to Mr. Dickerson's point really was, was the. There won't be a complete shutdown to the extent that that there'll be waste sitting inside the the the the whole without a negative pressure.

00:59:16:30 - 00:59:26:16

Unknown

So you're obviously in terms of your planned maintenance you will shut down a line on two lines will still be running or whatever and that will be the way that will be maintained. Is that correct understanding of that point?

00:59:26:37 - 00:59:45:40

Unknown

Chris Hayes of Marshall speaking. I'm part of the applicant. That is correct. As I stated, if there is a need during the life of the plant to have a complete shutdown, that is an anticipated known event. The waste tipping hole in the bunker will be empty, so there is no residual waste set in the facility for the

00:59:45:40 - 01:00:01:35

Unknown

duration of that maintenance. Otherwise, routine maintenance is taken by shutting down one line at a time. On the other point about transport and and the ceiling and the ceiling, the value of the other, basically maintaining the sealed waste in transportation mode.

01:00:03:00 - 01:00:20:13

Unknown

You have a number of things that you that you're not having what maybe open logs of untreated waste at this and this and this. So presumably then you would be happy to have a requirement impose that as a requirement in terms of the practical measures that you've you've described.

01:00:21:28 - 01:00:43:26

Unknown

Chris Hayes Marshall speaking in part to clarify, you mean a requirement specifically around not having waste trucks and open waste to site? Or, you know, all the wasted lives turns up in sealed containers or is baled and sealed and wrapped or something.

01:00:43:26 - 01:01:01:28

Unknown

I'm going to try and make up words with something that is astringent, as you described, to ensure that none of the things that people are concerned about actually are likely to happen or reasonably likely to happen. I would defer to my colleagues handling specifically the waste aspect of this, but the understanding from the perspective of having done

01:01:01:28 - 01:01:22:22

Unknown

the air quality impact assessment, including consideration of odor, that is going to be the case for the operation facility. And therefore it is entirely reasonable to conclude that there will be no odor emissions on stranded point. If you have all if you if you say, well, these things are in place, therefore that's the reason odor not being

01:01:22:22 - 01:01:48:48

Unknown

an issue. If I can just justify your wife explaining it. We want that mitigation. Yeah. And the way we secure that is through a requirement. Anybody want to dispute that or. CLAYBROOK On behalf of the applicant, I've just double checking the references in terms of the operational environmental management plan, which is obviously secured by virtue of an

01:01:48:49 - 01:02:05:38

Unknown

existing requirement. I believe we've made reference to the the baling and this and the storage of the materials, and I do believe it's covered off there. I'm looking to my left and Mr. Murphy has now been able to turn up the reference by with me a moment, sir, it said.

01:02:17:16 - 01:02:38:12

Unknown

Claybrook on behalf of the applicant, yes, I can confirm that is covered off as part of the open terms of the means for securing the way in which the RDF material is transported to site and what will be acceptable in terms of the transportation of that material from suppliers and its requirement for that deals with the OMB

01:02:38:14 - 01:03:01:31

Unknown

in particular. Mr. Moment. Mr. Cole, can you just. You don't have to do it now, but. Point out which paragraphs within their own are being so precise in saying that it's going to be either containerized or baled. And because when we've done the written questions.

01:03:02:37 - 01:03:23:12

Unknown

And. My initial assumption was that it wasn't quite as clear as that, so that they'll be helpful if it is as clear as that. So Kevin Murphy, on behalf of the applicants. The main references are on pages seven, eight, seven and eight.

01:03:23:15 - 01:03:44:18

Unknown

I think. So it's in the large table that repeats the mitigation measures from the yes and and then goes on to provides how those will be delivers an unsecured through the DCI. I think there was a second point raised by Mr. Nicholson about transport.

01:03:44:26 - 01:03:57:25

Unknown

I yet to give the applicants a chance to respond to. So would you like to respond to that? Work on behalf of the applicant. I'm not sure there's anything further we can add at this stage on that point.

01:03:58:11 - 01:04:31:24

Unknown

Okay. Okay. So it's a hand up still from UK Wind. So would you like to talk now? Great. Thank you, sir. Shlomo, go in for Ukraine. Let me just try and get in screen. In the interests of the examination and for the avoidance of doubt, perhaps the Environment Agency can confirm that in relation to odor management, the

01:04:31:24 - 01:05:01:39

Unknown

in particular the environmental permit relates only to the facility itself and not to odors of en route to and from the facility. A big from the environment agency. That's correct. It's within the curtilage of the facility. Obviously, there are permit conditions to control odors and that can include a requirement for a formal odor management plant.

01:05:05:01 - 01:05:26:08

Unknown

But yeah, we would cover the transport to and from the facility. Thank you. Thank you. I'm going to give the I'll give the. Mr. Nicholson, is is there anything new you wish to add or is it. Okay. Simon Nicholson from Raine.

01:05:27:10 - 01:05:53:18

Unknown

We've been focusing on RDF being taken to the site on Interrail containers. What about the other raw materials in inverted commas that will be taken to site, i.e. the plastics for recycling? Any other waste that is removed from the site as a byproduct from the incineration process.

01:05:54:47 - 01:06:23:14

Unknown

How is that going to be transported from site in original containers? Now I'll give the applicant one final chance to respond to that. And then we have a break as I make it to 1:00. Claybrook. On behalf of the applicant, we can respond to the first point made by Mr. Nicholson acknowledging what the Environment Agency have

01:06:23:14 - 01:06:43:47

Unknown

said, which we absolutely agree with. And the purpose of the end for the DCO acknowledges that there is a fair degree of overlap between the environmental management systems that will be in place pursuant to the permit and those that overlap or fall within the remit of the DCO.

01:06:44:12 - 01:07:06:14

Unknown

And acknowledging that that's particularly referenced in requirement for acknowledging that the OAM for the DCO. So it's its requirement for five if you want to. Do the cross reference. So it's only matters that won't be dealt with pursuant to the permit that will be covered within the OAM.

01:07:06:29 - 01:07:25:46

Unknown

And the transportation of material to the site is one such item and hence why it does form part of the one. In terms of the subsequent question, I suspect were many to come back on that specifically. Okay. Well, I make it 1307.

01:07:26:47 - 01:07:37:48

Unknown

I think we could all do with a break probably. And I'm proposing that we reconvene at 1345. Thank you.