

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [DraxBECCS](#)  
**Subject:** Mr Tranter: representation regarding the planning: Drax Bioenergy with Carbon Capture and Storage Project  
**Date:** 05 September 2022 22:31:03

---

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

I wish to make representation regarding the planning: Drax Bioenergy with Carbon Capture and Storage Project.

I tried to register online, you might be able to see this, but the system (that states it is in BETA) would not fully complete my registration process.

I am hereby emailing you my 2 concerns regarding the project, they are serious and in my opinion are a threat to life and I hope I can have an answer to these through your processes:

Complaint one:

Drax Power are using BECCS to justify that it's okay to cut down vast amounts of woodland, transport the wood across the world and burn it for energy. While calling it renewable energy. Approving this carbon capture project makes us look like fools that won't shout out the obvious; nothing Drax does is green, renewable or good for us or this planet.

Complaint two:

The lack of knowledge in the documents provided is frightening. They've even avoided telling the public in any detail how they intend to put the CO2 under the sea, they've created a memorandum of understanding with a sub ltd company to do the transportation of the Co2 to the ocean. This avoids them having to describe in detail how they intend to transport the CO2 in these documents. Surely a large power station producing 9.6 million tons of co2 should at least say how they intend to store that CO2. They show us in these documents how they will use even more energy to capture the gas and then what? Nothing is said about permanent capture. It's all pie in the sky thinking.

Here is a list of simple questions that I don't think they will answer, as it will clarify how incompetent the project is:

1. Please tell us, in detail, how building 16 works?
2. How much CO2 can be stored on site at Drax? (per day and maximum)
- 2.b where will it be stored (building 16)?
3. What happens if the other subsidiary ltd company isn't available that day (i.e. maintenance or staff on strike), again you'd need storage?

I calculate around 22,000 tons of co2 would need to be pumped under the ocean per day?

4. So what would happen if they can't use the pipe to the ocean, would they switch off the carbon capture?

5. Is this why they use the words 'up to 9.6 million tons'?

This maximum on site storage amount is essential in knowing at what point they would hit a maximum level and at what point the carbon capture would have to be switched off (i.e. full capacity)?

I honestly, don't believe they've given us the information they should to make the decision. The pipeline and infrastructure under the ocean is essential to the working methods and environmental controls surrounding this project. Without the two companies putting in the planning application together you can't see the full picture, without the full picture we are unable to understand how the project fits together.

The planning application should be rejected based on lack of information covering the final stages of how the carbon will be 'captured and stored'. Which in a carbon capture system is pretty much essential to the workings of the project.

Best regards,  
Michael Tranter

p.s. any response can be published in further documents but please email if they do respond to my questions (so I can see them) and I hope I can then follow up on their response if it's not good enough. Thanks.