



## Hearing Transcript

<b>Project:</b>	<a href="#">Cory Decarbonisation Project</a>
<b>Hearing:</b>	Issue Specific Hearing 1 – Part 2
<b>Date:</b>	6 November 2024

**Please note:** This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

## **Cory\_ISH1\_6 NOV\_PT2**

Created on: 2024-11-06 13:16:34

Project Length: 01:13:05

File Name: Cory\_ISH1\_6 NOV\_PT2

File Length: 01:13:05

### FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:04:26 - 00:00:40:20

Okay, I make it, uh uh, 1150. So it's time for me to, uh, resume this, uh, this hearing. Um, and, uh, just before I ask, uh, if anybody's got any points they want to make in light of the, uh, the first session we've got, um, uh, Mr.. Uh, I'm just conscious that took quite, quite a long, long time. Now, I know, um, I completely understand just on the basis of a of a brief note, it's very difficult for the, the applicant to, to judge, uh, how much information to do. And of course, you want to make sure that your, your clients have the best possible opportunity for, uh, giving me the information that I need.

00:00:40:22 - 00:01:15:03

But but I think what I would request is any further presentations if we can just make sure that, um, they are, uh, sort of as punchy as possible to give the information I need and perhaps, uh, you know, could be used to illustrate, uh, uh, illustrate points. Uh, I say that I don't want to, uh, limit anybody's opportunity to contribute today. But I'm conscious that we've got quite a lot to go through, and I just want to make sure, um, that we limit the number of things that perhaps we do have to delegate to, to, to, to written responses. Um, you may you may actually say, well, that's it or I don't know.

00:01:15:05 - 00:01:34:16

So that's Andrew for the applicant. So we take that on board. Um, I think that will be the largest chunk of our presentation, as it were, because it was dealing with first principles, whereas the remainder of the agenda is, is perhaps doing that less. So it's it's more more focused to understand.

00:01:35:13 - 00:01:57:16

Thank you very much, Mr. Tate. Um, so now can I ask if there's any points that people want to, uh, to make on that unconscious? I asked a lot of, uh, discussions and, uh, uh, thank you for the, uh, for the applicant to bear with me jumping around different, different issues. Um, but it was helpful for me to, to ask those, uh, those points. Uh, Mr.. Mr. Turney.

00:01:59:11 - 00:02:19:28

Richard Tanney on behalf of landfill and Munster. Mhm. Um, can I just start, please, by, uh, seeking some clarification, which is in respect of the figure 3.3 that was put on the screen, uh, with the three different layouts. Um.

00:02:20:07 - 00:02:22:22

It was, was this the three colors, the.

00:02:22:24 - 00:02:24:18

Option yellow to option three.

00:02:25:01 - 00:02:35:15

I think Mr. Carrot, you you were talking through. Thank you. Um, I just don't know how agile the applicants can be in getting that up on the screen, if possible. That'd be good.

00:02:35:17 - 00:02:52:08

It's really just to understand the reason for the change from the previous figure 3.3, or whether there is a change from the previous figure 3.3, which was in app 072. Yeah, that's the new one, which I think it's been extracted from.

00:02:52:15 - 00:02:57:17

So so can you just clarify when you're talking about the old one and the new one. Can you just explain.

00:02:57:19 - 00:03:09:09

So this is a. This is called figure 3.3. It was figure 3.3 to the is. And you would have found that. And you still do found find that at app 072.

00:03:11:22 - 00:03:37:04

But this is the first time I've seen this. Although I can see it is on the website. There's a change made, but I haven't found any commentary to explain it. Um, in the as reference, you see, this is an ISO two one. So this is one of the things that was submitted in September by the applicant, but it shows a change at least to the area of land included in option two.

00:03:39:03 - 00:03:43:01

So yeah, perhaps if the applicant could just clarify that. So

00:03:44:29 - 00:03:52:12

is this from the response. This is from the response to relevant representations. Is it. Uh, yes. I mean, so just just to help us attorneys question. Yeah.

00:03:52:28 - 00:04:02:29

Uh, advocate for the applicant. Uh, no, sir. There was a there was an omission of coloring in figure three three. So it's explained in the errata document.

00:04:03:01 - 00:04:05:12

So it's an errata. Yes.

00:04:05:14 - 00:04:11:16

It's an eruption. It's not a change. It's just that some of the yellow wasn't shown up in figure three three. Right.

00:04:11:18 - 00:04:16:26

Original and Mr. Tony. So what what were you just clarifying the change.

00:04:16:28 - 00:04:33:11

It was clarifying it because one of the points I wanted to make was about option two, the compressed layout, which in, uh, the original figure 3.3 did not include any land to the south of the Munster Joinery site. So I wanted to explore that.

00:04:33:13 - 00:04:34:21

I can understand from.

00:04:35:28 - 00:04:56:08

What the applicants now saying is. That option to compress layout is shown as this site, which is a larger site than what was shown in the. Yes, that's clarification, but it's helpful because if I can just understand then, um, and this is just so I know that we're on the right lines.

00:04:58:01 - 00:05:22:09

The subsequent point is whether the indicative equipment layout, which is app 011, and the figure 4.2 master plan, which is app 045, whether they are all intended to show the same area of land as is shown in option two compress layout.

00:05:24:20 - 00:05:29:17

Can the applicants, if they can address that, that query that um directly please?

00:05:29:24 - 00:05:34:09

Sir Andrew I think so, yes. Um, and we will confirm that in writing.

00:05:34:13 - 00:05:37:26

Oh thank you sir. I was going to ask you, is that something you're going to have to.

00:05:38:01 - 00:05:41:29

That's what that's what I understand is the position. Thank you.

00:05:42:25 - 00:05:45:05

So so, so sorry. I know you want to.

00:05:45:07 - 00:05:47:09

Just a coloring. Yeah.

00:05:48:01 - 00:06:13:19

Yeah, but just so unclear that I understand Mr. Tierney's points. So as I understand you and we'll get clarification on, uh, on this, um, was that you your understanding was there was, uh, an option showing where the the CSS, sorry, the carbon, the carbon capture, uh, development site, uh, sort of stopped further north than is shown on these drawings. I mean, in my.

00:06:13:26 - 00:06:34:18

Because it's it's potentially quite an important point for you. So it might be helpful. I did ask if we could have app. Uh uh oh. Uh seven two ready. If you could go to the original figure 3.3 app 072. Figure 3.3. You'll see. You'll see it's quite a noticeable difference.

00:06:59:16 - 00:07:11:15

That's it. Yeah. You see the the the option two stops and the monster joinery site. So it excludes the land to the south. There's quite a significant difference in area.

00:07:11:19 - 00:07:13:03

I can see the difference. Yeah.

00:07:13:15 - 00:07:20:19

So but as I understand it the applicant is now going to confirm that option to compress layout is

00:07:22:05 - 00:07:41:26

as shown on as 021. And that it's the same site area which is then comes through into app 011, the indicative equipment layout and figure 4.2 and app 045, which is the master plan.

00:07:44:18 - 00:08:13:25

That's very helpful. And um, that's that saves some time. I think the other points are that will help. I hope will help you is if perhaps the applicant could provide, I suspect on as um 021 the corrected version. The actual land area is shown because we measure those included in in the expanded option. You know what said about option two? We measure those as being materially less than eight hectares.

00:08:15:10 - 00:08:28:21

So perhaps rather than me giving figures because at least my option two figure will be wrong. It would be helpful if the applicant perhaps could provide the figure to the examination for the shaded areas, unless it's already in the document somewhere. I've missed it.

00:08:29:21 - 00:08:42:26

Are we sorry, Andrew, for the applicant, I'm sure we can liaise so that we have your figure and then we will respond, um, in parallel, and I hope we reach agreement.

00:08:42:28 - 00:09:02:24

Well, but if if you've got to say that way. Um, option one, figure figures 74,000m<sup>2</sup>, so 7.4 hectares. Option two as originally drawn 55,000m<sup>2</sup>, so 5.5 hectares and option three 66,000m<sup>2</sup>, so 6.6 hectares.

00:09:04:14 - 00:09:19:06

But just unclear. The the applicant will confirm those. And what was. I got no objection to liaising directly. It'd be helpful if uh, in, in sort of responses to issues that we pick up from this meeting if you could just confirm those as well. Yeah.

00:09:19:08 - 00:09:20:28

So certainly we'll do that. So yes.

00:09:21:00 - 00:09:54:26

Thank you. So the, the reason I um, I start with, with that is to understand, um, a couple of points, um, and, and to draw them to your attention, um, in terms of the alternatives assessment you would have seen in the TCR app, one, two, five, the terrestrial site alternatives report that The applicant starts off with a four hectare area of search and then move to a seven hectare area of search, and then finish with an eight hectare area of search.

00:09:55:03 - 00:10:05:19

And for your note, the references in the teaser are 2.4.1, 2.6.2 and 2.6.5.

00:10:07:27 - 00:10:40:24

Now, the issue that is not clear from the application documents is whether or or chronologically. When did the applicant decide to look for the largest site area? And specifically, was it before it made the choices about compressed layout and about other process matters which are set out in chapter three of the Is

00:10:42:10 - 00:10:57:01

so the alternatives process is described as getting at some point to an eight hectare site requirement, and it's whether that was set before the consideration of the process alternatives which are described in chapter three.

00:10:57:25 - 00:11:02:16

And what if you just say what are the implications of that for your for your clients?

00:11:02:29 - 00:11:42:10

The implications are that the compressed layout is less than eight hectares. We know that. And it's somewhere between the figure that we originally calculated 55.5 hectares and the expanded layout 7.4 hectares. So where it lies, whether it's six hectares or seven hectares, I don't know, but it's less than eight hectares. And that matters for two reasons. One of them is that it goes to whether or not you can avoid the Munster Joinery site, but it also goes to the validity of the conclusion on the alternative sites because, as you know, the final alternatives analysis is based on an eight hectare land That requirement.

00:11:42:27 - 00:11:58:10

So if the applicant is now at less than eight hectares for their land requirement, then their alternatives process might need to be revisited. So that's the specific point in terms of the relationship to I was.

00:11:58:12 - 00:12:05:04

Just I just wondering whether do the applicants want to respond to that particular point just before Mr. Tierney moves on?

00:12:08:04 - 00:12:21:00

I've got I haven't got a particular sorry, Andrew, date for the applicant. I haven't got a particular date, but that was the four hectares was at an earlier stage. But we will supply that rather than me coming up with a particular date. Um.

00:12:21:15 - 00:12:24:05

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Richards.

00:12:24:07 - 00:12:49:09

Any for the applicant? Just to be note for the applicant for landfill and normally on their side of the table. Um, just to be absolutely clear, it's not the four hectare that I'm interested in. It's. Why did at what point did the applicant decide it got to the eight hectare requirement? And was it before it made those specific preferences, which I'll set out in, um, chapter three of the iOS and.

00:12:50:08 - 00:12:58:25

Android, that if I can give you a foretaste of The Arcanum, the answer is yes, but I can't pinpoint the exact location. So I'll come back to you in writing and thank you.

00:12:59:00 - 00:13:38:11

So it follows that, as I've said, that if we get to a position where because of later design choices, in fact the land requirement has gone back down, then it does suggest that the sort of final site selection report in the TSR at eight hectares is not quite right, because it should have been revisited at the new site level. So I just made that point a flag. That point obviously can be examined later. Can I then just pick up on a couple of specific points that were made, um, where in some cases made, uh, and in some cases not made by Mr.

00:13:38:13 - 00:14:13:29

Alderson? certain. Um, the first one is just to understand, um, uh, my understanding, my client's understanding is that the power requirements, as Mr. Alderson suggested, the power requirements are met through the turbine, which, uh, lowers the pressure of the flue gas and generates power at the same time. So that's part an integral part of this project. And additionally, through a power feed from the existing quarry, uh, sites.

00:14:14:01 - 00:14:44:18

And the reference for that, sir, is app 051 is chapter two, paragraphs 2.2 26 and 2.2 27. And I think it would be helpful to understand that that is the case, number one. And number two, to understand that if that assuming it is assuming that yes is right, why is there a substation and a transformer yard in the operational layout?

00:14:47:26 - 00:14:58:05

I mean, I think it would be helpful if, uh. Can can the applicants ask answer? Because I think particularly on the why why is there a, uh, a need for the substation in the, in the CSS layout?

00:14:59:23 - 00:15:25:01

Tony Alderson, on behalf of the applicant. Um, yes. The supposition is correct that power is primarily supplied from the back pressure turbines and from the existing power output from Riverside one. Riverside two. The requirement for the electrical infrastructure substations transformers is to supply power to the range of voltages required by the equipment on site, so it's supplied at one voltage and step down accordingly. Um, using that equipment.

00:15:28:29 - 00:16:05:12

That's that's helpful. Thank you. I mean, we can obviously explore in evidence, um, at, um, deadline one. um, the size of that. And so, um, but that's helpful to understand. The second point of clarification was that Mr. Alderson referred to a control room, I think, just at a high level. Um, we were keen to understand, first of all, how many staff would be required to operate the carbon capture and storage facility, and secondly, why control over that facility couldn't be provided within the control rooms at Riverside one and Riverside two?

00:16:07:06 - 00:16:11:18

Again, if the applicant can, uh, are able to address those questions, that'd be helpful.

00:16:12:06 - 00:16:49:28

To Alison on behalf of the applicant. In terms of the numbers, I think we have to sort of refer back in written response on that, on that level, in terms of why can't we use the existing control room? It's full. The existing control on site one will also have control of a site two, you know, there's no space for additional control panels or operator stations there. Um, the intention is to have the carbon capture plant, operating as a as a standalone facility with its own control room on site, which as we need a new control room having an integral with with the plant is is the the preferred solution there, that there would be no new space to accommodate that within Riverside and Riverside to.

00:16:50:10 - 00:17:02:03

And so so the control rooms being located here within the then the carbon capture facility towards the southern end, as we discussed earlier, they're segregating people from from process plants to the greatest extent possible.

00:17:02:18 - 00:17:16:26

So if I can just add to that, Mr. Fox, on behalf of the applicant. So, uh, if reference 2.6.6 confirms that we consider that we'd like to be approximately 27 full time equivalent staff expected to be required for operation activities.

00:17:16:28 - 00:17:19:03

Sorry, I didn't hear that at 27.

00:17:19:21 - 00:17:22:13

That's paragraph 2.66 of the. Yes.

00:17:22:25 - 00:17:27:25

So just as I understand that that's not the figure of people in the control room.

00:17:29:26 - 00:17:32:06

No, no, that's just the general. Yeah. The number. Yeah.

00:17:32:08 - 00:17:38:28

Because I didn't. I mean, Richard, Jennifer, Lantern and monster. There won't be 27 people in the control room, presumably.

00:17:40:20 - 00:17:42:19



I think we'll have to come back in writing to confirm that. Yeah.

00:17:43:29 - 00:18:05:00

Tony Abbott's behalf. Yeah. So the the you'll have shift teams because the plant operates continuously. So typically you would have five five shift teams to provide, you know, 24 seven coverage. Um, and then some of the staff working on it on a, on a day basis and maintenance personnel, etc.. So, so yes, you wouldn't have 27 people on site at all times. That's the total headcount for the carbon capture facility.

00:18:06:13 - 00:18:56:00

Thank you sir. That's very helpful. Um, can I just, um, then, um, the next point that Mr. Alderson made was about, um, and it was touched on as well by Mr. Crafter's about the segregation, which is, um, I think perhaps most easily described in option three. And that figure 3.3, where, um, the site would be built around the retention of Lancelot Munster Joinery. Um, and it is just to understand whether the applicant's position is that that is not technically feasible or whether it is undesirable, because obviously we need to you need to understand for the purpose of compulsory acquisition, whether they are saying it is not technically possible to achieve that build around.

00:18:57:22 - 00:19:00:17

And again, if the applicant is able to respond to that, please.

00:19:01:11 - 00:19:45:29

Tony Alderson, on behalf of the applicant, uh, yes. We consider it, um, not technically feasible to have the site split by Munster Joinery with some of the facilities to the north, and as to the south, because there would be requirement for interface between those two elements of the site with sort of pipework, cabling etc. personnel requiring access between the two, you would require your means of access separate to the two sites north, north and south um, to to provide a means of interconnection out with the most ordinary site would require further, you know, land to the to the west, within within the um within the land to the west, which we're currently not looking to undertake.

00:19:46:01 - 00:20:17:00

And also we would require an equivalent area of land if we if we didn't take up the Muslim boundary site, um, which if you refer to so the so the blue, sorry, the pink option, you know, which shows you no further land take to the north. You know, if we, if we didn't have the site. So so technically I don't consider it to be to be a viable option for a practical and operational perspective. It would be, you know, to challenging to to achieve that as well. And the land would be required elsewhere.

00:20:17:02 - 00:20:23:23

And a more sensitive location of land to the north would be taken as illustrated in the the the pink option there.

00:20:24:17 - 00:21:03:20

I'm sorry to jump across. Can I just clarify something, Mr. Alderson? On on that. I think the issue is about sort of technical, uh, sort of feasibility. You explained that there's obviously implications for additional land take, uh, access between the two, but is it actually technically not feasible or. I think it's helpful just to unpick what why that's not considered a an option, but particularly just going back

to Mr. Mr. Kratz explanation of how things at the south end of the site, uh, are more associated with, uh, sort of staff, uh, arrangements and things like that.

00:21:03:29 - 00:21:24:19

And there's less in terms of the carbon capture technology happening at that end. So is it a case of a technical in feasibility or, uh, is it more to do with, um, you know, other factors such as taking up different parts of land that may or may not be, uh, more or less desirable.

00:21:26:10 - 00:22:00:02

On behalf of the applicant. But all of those things apply that from a technical basis, you do need to have interconnection for for power, instrument cabling, etc. if even where there are not sort of process pipework connections in between between the two areas. And also, you know, there are the practical aspects of, well, if you move the gatehouse to the south, how do people come in through the gatehouse and access the main part of the site, which is to the north? If you don't have interconnection between the two so that you then incur some additional access requirements and additional gatehouse, additional security, etc.

00:22:00:11 - 00:22:31:05

um, to provide interconnection between the two. You would would need a, you know, a strip of land, you know, to connect the two. And if that's not within the muster journey site, then it would have to be, you know, to, to the west with within the um, within the land there, which is, you know, we're currently not proposing to utilise so that there are so technical, practical aspects that that would make it not not a viable solution to have to have a split site.

00:22:31:21 - 00:22:44:07

Um, the other element as well is to have a third party sort of located, sort of embedded within, within the process plant. And the implications of that for a third party occupied site, you know, within, within the midst of the facility.

00:22:46:10 - 00:22:52:03

Thank you. And sorry, Mr. Fox. I talked across you. You're about to say something, and I, uh, rudely interrupted you.

00:22:52:05 - 00:23:22:05

Sorry about that. Sorry, sir. Um, this talks about the applicant, and Mr. Walters has actually covered most points. I just wanted to emphasize that those access, um, arrangements and security arrangements that Mr. Wilson was talking about, the. That's land to the west. So that is more and more more accessible, open land. Um, and, you know, the alternative would be go to the east where you'd be talking about doing ductwork on pipework over on top of Norman Road, which would have highway safety issues, um, in their, in their own right.

00:23:22:07 - 00:23:29:27

So I think it's just adding a bit of context in the things that you could do, but they would in themselves have have impacts.

00:23:31:03 - 00:23:31:26

Thank you, Mr. Fox.

00:23:32:03 - 00:24:13:27

So Rich, attorney for Lansing and Munster, say the the position that that you've seen set out in evidence in due course is that there is within the the land sell side, there's space for a cable and pipe duct behind the warehouse. And our view is that that could also be used as a pedestrian access for people visiting the staff passing to the southern side. And I think it's from what you've heard, sir, I think the position is that if those things could be done, then it would be less attractive, but technically feasible.

00:24:13:29 - 00:24:19:07

I think perhaps if we could just have that confirmation, if we could have a

00:24:20:23 - 00:24:32:21

cable and pipe duct, plus a pedestrian link so that someone could walk between the two. That it would be technically feasible, but less attractive.

00:24:34:24 - 00:24:49:23

And protect the applicant. So I think we would wish to wait to see what is actually proposed before we comment on, um, the operational and practical aspects of it. I think that when we when we receive that, it's just.

00:24:49:25 - 00:25:21:04

Like Mr. Alderson just addressed you on what he said were the technical impediments to the delivery of of an option that has been considered. This isn't this isn't our option. This is their option. Three. And so I just wanted to understand that if the position is that there is a, that there is space to provide that, that continuity for ducting and for pedestrians to move between the two, that option three would then be technically viable, but still less attractive.

00:25:21:25 - 00:25:51:06

Well, I think that there is a there's a choice. I mean, if the applicant is able to to respond to that today, that would be helpful. But I also understand that you've you've already indicated I think you'll be submitting some evidence at that that deadline, one which the applicant could also, uh, respond to. Um, so this is an A you've already said you'd, you'd rather you'd rather wait to see that. But um, is there any information you can give on the feasibility of having that?

00:25:51:18 - 00:26:05:23

We don't know what the space. We haven't seen the report obviously. So we don't in this space being referred to is, um, but subject to. And that's why I've sought to reserve our position on that. Yeah. Sure way. So I'll just see if I think.

00:26:06:07 - 00:26:08:27

Well, let's let Mr. take finish. Oh, sorry. Sorry.

00:26:09:17 - 00:26:12:28

I just see if Mr. Alderson does have anything to say at this stage or would.

00:26:14:19 - 00:26:18:01

But just just just so I understand the point. Um.

00:26:19:18 - 00:26:27:23

Uh, you're talking about, uh, a piece of land that's to the rear of the building. That's on the on your on your client site. Is that is that correct? Just.

00:26:27:25 - 00:26:59:11

Sir. Uh, Richard. Attorney for Chancellor Munster. Yes. In a in a sense, what we're I mean, what we're going to show is, is that we don't you don't need the land to the south. Um, but, um, the question really is option three, what are the true technical impediments, not desirability. This is the applicant. Option three, this is not our option three. We don't think you need option three.

00:26:59:18 - 00:27:30:18

So I'm just trying to understand how the applicant has got to the position of excluding option three. Now from Mr. Olson's first answers before Mr. Tate joined in his position, as I understood it, was that it would be less desirable for a range of reasons, but also it would be technically not feasible because of the absence of any space for a duct, for cables and pipes and a link.

00:27:30:29 - 00:27:32:24

Yes, I understand.

00:27:32:26 - 00:27:48:02

So the question is that it is that it is that the technical impediment? In other words, if those points were overcome, would it be technically feasible but still less attractive? Or is there a technical reason why option three can't be delivered beyond the lack of a link?

00:27:49:29 - 00:27:56:05

Again, I think the applicant has probably already indicated they'll come to this later, but I'll give them the opportunity to respond to to that.

00:27:56:29 - 00:28:33:08

So there are no I'm sorry, Andre, for the applicant. No, there are a number of permutations which we would want to be clear as to what is being put, and we'd much prefer to respond when we are sighted on that. Um, from the, um, from Mr. Tony, so I don't think I have anything to add at this stage, but we will see what we can do in the context of responding at deadline. One, if there's any generalised information that may be helpful, but anything specific would need to depend on what is specifically being put forward.

00:28:33:21 - 00:28:34:20

I hope that's helpful, sir.

00:28:34:23 - 00:28:35:21

Okay. Thank you.

00:28:35:27 - 00:29:05:21

Is it Richard? Anything until a Munster? Um, I understand they don't want to say anything more, I think it could I just confirm then that the point that's put in the, um, is chapter three, which is line of sight from control room, but that's not relied on as a technical impediment to using option three, because that was the other point that hasn't been mentioned so far. But it's in the. Yes. Is that said to be a technical impediment to option three or just not not desirable?

00:29:07:06 - 00:29:07:23

Again, I'll.

00:29:07:25 - 00:29:09:21

Ask the applicant if they're able to respond to that.

00:29:18:12 - 00:29:30:28

Second. I think we will we will give you a full a full response at deadline one on the generalized point. And that will include line of sight, um, as one of the factors that is that is mentioned and.

00:29:33:08 - 00:30:00:00

Said it, I'm afraid that given it's in the is is the reason for the reason for rejecting the option. I think it would be helpful, sir, for you to know and for us to know for the purposes of making our submission, because we're entitled to know what the environmental information is, whether the line of sight argument, which is the one which is pulled out in the environmental statement, is one that is relied on or whether it's not relied on.

00:30:03:22 - 00:30:08:02

Sorry for the ping pong Andrews applicant. Sorry, sir. Patrick Ross, you.

00:30:08:22 - 00:30:09:29

Know, please carry on with state.

00:30:10:08 - 00:30:24:28

Yes. It is one of the factors in the environmental statement, and we will incorporate that in our response at deadline. One on this particular matter, albeit not specifically to what Mr. Turner is suggesting, until we see what he is suggesting.

00:30:25:18 - 00:31:05:18

Is that I think then the the next point which can return for us to the next point, which I think is probably finishes off that issue about the option three, is just to understand if the applicant is going to rely on line of sight, whether they will be able to confirm that the proposed control room would have sight of the infrastructure, which is proposed to be to the south of the Munster Joinery site, if that's going to be relied on as factor, because our view is that it would be very difficult to see over a distance of about 300m across other infrastructure.

00:31:05:23 - 00:31:14:23

But, um, perhaps that's something the applicant can develop in their response, assuming that Mr. Alderson is not going to be guided.

00:31:14:29 - 00:31:18:00

I think you probably anticipated the applicant's response.

00:31:18:11 - 00:31:21:21

And I can see I see the barricade going up, nodding.

00:31:21:23 - 00:31:23:07

So I went, uh, I can see the.

00:31:23:09 - 00:31:32:23

Barricades going up. Um, and, uh, that's, uh, noted. Can I then just, um, raise, I think, um.

00:31:35:07 - 00:32:07:12

Uh, just just confirmation then on some of the options discussion in, um, chapter three of the is, uh, which is um, app 052. So, um, one of the points that, uh, you see referred to at 3.4. ten of chapter three of the is, is about the choice being made to have a, have a dual line in the design.

00:32:07:14 - 00:32:41:06

So in other words, there's two process lines. And I think as I, as I read that chapter, that the applicant's position is that a, um, a single line would be technically feasible. And the consequence there is that there have been material reduction in the land take if it was a single process line rather than a dual process line. So it would be helpful to understand the applicant's position as to whether they accept that a single process line would be technically feasible to meet the project's objectives.

00:32:42:03 - 00:33:13:02

And rather than coming back on another point, um, from the same section, there's also, um, a choice made to prefer hybrid cooling and um, again, and that's 3.5. 21. And again, just confirmation from the applicant that their position is that wet cooling is technically feasible, albeit not preferred because, again, that would materially reduce the land take. So it's those two points.

00:33:13:05 - 00:33:18:00

Um, single process line versus dual process line or hybrid cooling versus wet cooling.

00:33:20:15 - 00:33:23:25

I'll ask the, uh, the applicant to if they want to respond to that.

00:33:24:06 - 00:33:27:04

Yes, sir. I'll see if Mr. Alderson can respond to that now.

00:33:27:16 - 00:33:28:01

Thank you.

00:33:28:12 - 00:34:04:00

So, Nelson, on behalf of the applicant. So regarding the the twin trend versus single train configuration, then those two options are currently under evaluation by the engineering design team to consider the relative merits of the two. Um, you know, while a single train could be built of the capacity we're looking at here, and indeed a single train plant of that capacity exists elsewhere in the world at present. Um, other considerations include the the relative availability on a, on an annual basis of a single train versus two train, because you have to look at when when are maintenance outages scheduled.

00:34:04:02 - 00:34:34:00

How do they compare with the outages of Riverside one. Riverside side two, the single train, whatever, that's offline. Then you're capturing no CO2 at all for that period. And whereas with two trains, one online, one offline, you can, you can, you know, try and match outages with your reduced throughput from Riverside one or Riverside two and potentially have higher capture over an annualized basis, which is a you're clearly a positive objective for the project in terms of footprint. Then, yes, a single train would have a reduced footprint over the two trains.

00:34:34:02 - 00:35:27:28

Obviously, it's not halved because the equipment is, you know, of twice the capacity. If there's a single train configuration, the the elements that would be reduced in footprint are only those elements at the on the north end of the site. The the main sort of processor areas we have referred to is inside battery limits. So that so the technology area you're provided by, by the technology provider. Um, and so overall the reduction in sort of process footprint would be, would be quite modest of just a few percentage points of the overall, um, footprint of the plants and, and that would allow a more relaxed configuration, you know, to ease maintenance access, uh, for example, because, you know, with the the layout that we propose at the moment, we, we, we look to minimize, you know, the plot area, um, and by going to a single train, there would be some reduction, not to the point that would allow additional facilities to be moved further north.

00:35:28:00 - 00:35:47:22

I think that's the main point to make there is that going from two train to one train, it's not a case that you would be able to move one of the other building blocks from further south into the north, and free up space further south. It would just be a very, very slight reduction in area which could be utilized in a, in a in a more relaxed fashion for laying out that that larger single train to facilitate operation and maintenance of that.

00:35:49:21 - 00:35:50:07

Thank you.

00:35:50:25 - 00:35:55:19

That was the calling point as well, that wet cooling being technically viable.

00:35:56:24 - 00:36:15:27

Sorry. Tony Olsen on on behalf of the applicant. Um, so we're calling, you know, if you went for, for purely wet cooling, then the makeup water requirement would be significantly higher than for hybrid cooling, and we don't have access to a water supply to it to enable that. The options currently being considered are hybrid cooling and dry cooling.

00:36:19:10 - 00:37:03:29

And so rich attorney for landfill and monster. So I think the the the points which this which is goes to is the extent to which when the the scheme uh design has been taken forward as opposed to sort of the eight hectare requirement. But when the scheme design has been taken forward, whether the impacts on landowners have been taken into account at that stage in terms of reducing the land area, and that's something you want to think about because, for example, if, if reduction um, in site area by switching to a single train rather than two could save, uh, the compulsory acquisition of landfill and monster land.

00:37:04:19 - 00:37:35:21

Then, whilst it might not be preferable. That's not the test for compulsory acquisition. So that's the point that I just want to emphasize at this stage. Um. Thank you. I think those are, um, I have some concerns about what was said about the economic costs, but I think, um, um, we can come back to that. I think, um, the the main further point I'd like to make, sir, is simply this, which is that Mr.

00:37:35:23 - 00:38:12:06

Alderson, in his presentation, said that the work that had been done was based on, um, I think he said information provided by the providers of the equipment, in-house design and certain engineering methodologies. Now, this is the information that, uh, Lancelot Munster Joinery requested from the applicant, and they were told that it would not be provided Through you. Can I repeat that request? So that we're provided with the information that has informed the pre feed design, which I think is now what they're working on.

00:38:12:26 - 00:38:14:24

Uh, for the purposes of our own design review.

00:38:16:15 - 00:38:35:12

Well, in terms of information provided, I think I'd first like to hear from the from the applicant about that. I don't think at this stage it's for me to necessarily insist on particular bits of information if there's a reason why they haven't been provided. But what does the applicant have a of a comment on that?

00:38:37:16 - 00:38:54:22

So only only an outline at this stage. Um, uh, some of the material is, is, um, confidential. But what we will do is at deadline one, um, provide as much information as we reasonably can bearing that in mind in relation to the to the source material.

00:38:55:27 - 00:39:28:28

Can I just just rich. Tony, I know I've have taken too much time, but just, um. Just on that. As you know from the discussion yesterday and I had a subsequent discussion with, uh, the applicant's legal advisers. Um, the timetable is going to be under pressure. Uh, if we cannot file a comprehensive report, that deadline one, uh, because there needs to be a comprehensive response to it. And if we're to receive further technical information at deadline one, obviously that will then require a further report to be submitted.

00:39:29:09 - 00:39:59:26



I've already discussed the applicants already raised the possibility that they might want to see our expert report sooner than deadline one, because of the time they think is needed to consider it. So can I ask respectfully, that instead of that information being withheld until deadline, one that it's provided now, um, so that it can inform our work? I know, sir, you're not going to direct that today, but I just want it on the record that we have been asking for this for many months. It is information which is obviously available because Mr.

00:39:59:28 - 00:40:14:12

Alderson has referred to it. It is information that will go to the design of the scheme, and therefore the necessity for my client's land to be compulsorily acquired. And in those circumstances, we should have it because we should know the case against us before we have to respond to it.

00:40:16:00 - 00:40:41:01

Well, I think one comment I just would make before the the applicant response to that is, you know, I'd encourage all parties to do what they can to to try and sort of see if there's areas of common ground. And obviously we have a we have a draft statement of common ground between, I think both of your clients and the and the and the applicant or people showing their head. There isn't a draft one. No, sir.

00:40:41:09 - 00:40:50:20

No. We are keen to have a statement of common ground. I don't think that was, um, favoured until recently, but I hope that is now common. Common position.

00:40:50:22 - 00:41:18:15

Well, Richard, we I mentioned this yesterday. It is favored, but it's on the basis that the experts sit down to agree. So far, we haven't been allowed to speak to the expert on behalf of the applicant. That was our request for an expert to expert meeting that was refused. We also asked for information that inform the design. Again, that was refused. So I think the applicant is the one that needs to come to the table on this and perhaps.

00:41:18:29 - 00:41:56:27

So to to ensure that. I think the point I'd like to make is that just to reiterate the point, I think it's, uh, it's in everyone's interest, and particularly mine is the the examining authority that, uh, parties can work together where they can, uh, to, uh, minimize those areas of any sort of misunderstanding to identify where there is, uh, common ground, if there is, but also, importantly, to point out where those areas of, uh, of disagreement are. Um, and I think that, you know, that is the purpose of the, the statement of common ground. So I don't really want to get into what's what, what the perceptions is of why things are haven't sort of receded enough.

00:41:56:29 - 00:42:12:06

But I would like if I can both ask both parties to do what they can to try and progress those those matters, so that from from my point of view, I can clearly understand where there's still areas in in dispute and where there are areas that are in agreement. Please.

00:42:15:00 - 00:42:15:15

Thank you.

00:42:20:21 - 00:42:31:06

Was there any other point, Mr. Turner, as that, uh. Thank you very much. Uh, Mr.. Mr. Wilson, I think, uh, you've you've had your hand up and yes.

00:42:31:17 - 00:43:25:15

Many thanks. David Wilson, on behalf of Thames Water. Um, I generally think there's a general lack of detail on the alternatives, uh, review and methodology and the criteria for the review of alternatives. And to follow up on your point, um, if there's a technical limit on the flue pipe length, I know it was mentioned it's difficult to bury the flue pipe, but it's also feasible to bury the flue pipe, which might enable options further afield to be reviewed. For example, in the addendum to the SAR report, they show some additional sites which have been reviewed, including an operational part of their sewage treatment works, which would not be feasible, but they've emitted sites further to the south, for example, the Viridian um Industrial Park, where there's allocated land for employment development, which hasn't even been developed yet and is not covered by nature conservation or Mol designations.

00:43:29:14 - 00:43:41:23

Thank you, Mr. Olsen. Does the applicant want to respond to that? I think, uh, there's a number of points about the feasibility and also why options further afield, such as the Viridian Industrial Estate, weren't when looked at.

00:43:42:17 - 00:44:15:17

Thank you sir. Mr. Perry, on behalf of the applicant, first of all, um, uh, the the Tsar has set out the method used for site assessment. It's it's there. There's specific questions we can address. Those um, technical feasibility about, uh, flue gas treatment has, has been covered by Mr. Alderson. I believe Meridian Park is is located to the south of, uh, the development site. It's also to the south of major public highway, the number of which has just fallen out of my head.

00:44:15:25 - 00:44:41:05

Um, but, uh, I would suggest there would be some, some fairly serious technical implications of laying an extensive ductwork underneath that. Um, and in any event, you would have the carbon capture plant very substantially separated from the Riverside campus, uh, and losing all the operational, um, requirements that that come through that.

00:44:43:19 - 00:44:49:02

Thank you. Before I go on to Mr., uh, Pennington, is there anything else you wanted to add, Miss Dawson?

00:44:53:15 - 00:45:14:05

Wilson, Thames Water. It was just. I don't think it's been confirmed whether the pipe could be buried or not. It was said it was difficult, but I mean, district heat network pipes are buried and they actually give more efficiency by burying them because there is a loss of heat. So I was wondering if it would be feasible. I know it may be more difficult, but is it feasible to bury the pipe? And I don't think that was answered by, um, his colleague.

00:45:16:03 - 00:45:18:05

So, yeah, if I could ask the applicant's.

00:45:18:27 - 00:45:56:20

Attorney, Allison, on behalf of the applicant. And I think, as I mentioned in the commentary, we're looking at the ductwork, which would be sort of three, maybe four meters diameter, carrying hot flue gas, which would require permission for, for cooling to prevent sort of heat leak into the surrounding ground. From a technical perspective, we don't consider it to be technically viable to bury such a, such a duct. Um, and it's as very as you're referred to for, for a site further south, that ductwork would also have to traverse a major highway, which again, would be technically not feasible to to to do that for such a large amount of work of this nature.

00:45:57:27 - 00:46:08:08

So, so just to understand that using word feasible, I mean, are you saying it's it's not impossible, but the implications are things that you've factored out. Just so I understand that.

00:46:10:13 - 00:46:35:21

Alison, on behalf of the applicant. Uh, probably not impossible, but to make it technically viable would be such an engineering project in itself, and just wouldn't be an approach that anyone would, would wish to design in order to get your flue gas ductwork from one side to another that are at an elevation on a pipe bridge, is the design solution that that is is technically viable and operationally achievable.

00:46:38:01 - 00:46:39:14

Okay, thank you, Mr. Wilson.

00:46:42:18 - 00:46:44:13

No further questions at this stage. Thank you.

00:46:45:05 - 00:46:47:08

Thank you. Uh, Mr. Pennington.

00:46:49:16 - 00:46:50:03

Thank you. Sir.

00:46:51:26 - 00:47:24:10

Uh, Mr.. Sir. Um, so it was something that you touched upon, um, before the break in terms of the, I think the auctioneering principle three. Um, the East zone. Um, if I could refer to, um, examination library document reference as 043, which is the response to relevant reps. 9.2, document number four. Um, it seems to me a lot, a lot of emphasis is being placed on the, um,

00:47:26:06 - 00:48:14:20

the fact that South Zone one doesn't have any, any read score in the rag chart at table 2.1. And to read this summary there, um, at paragraph 2.2 26, uh, critically, what table 2.1 does show is that South zone one. The area proposed for the CCF has no read score. Whilst all of the zones do have at least one red and in brackets a fatal flaw. Um, I know you asked the applicant in terms of, um, what level of

level of investigation have been undertaken to, um, the Discount East Zone in terms of options in principle three? Um, but I don't think there was a very kind of thorough response.

00:48:14:27 - 00:48:56:13

Um, or it wasn't particularly clear to me how the conclusion in the table that it would be ruled out in Thailand, it would be a fatal flaw had been reached for, for East Zone. Um, in terms of options in principle three. Um, so I think I think my question really is, um, can a better explanation be provided by the applicant as to why option three has been scored red for each zone. And what difference would it have made? How would it have been assessed against South Zone one had option principle three been scored orange or amber.

00:48:56:15 - 00:48:58:09

So thank you sir.

00:48:58:24 - 00:49:18:01

So so just just so I'm just so unclear as to I mean, um, I would actually phrase that as a question, but is there a is there a particular you know, what is there a particular point you want to get to? I mean, it sounds like you're you're disagreeing with the, uh, the approach the applicant's taken. Um, can you just expand on that, please?

00:49:19:24 - 00:49:23:16

Yes. I think my point really is that East Zone seems to be

00:49:25:07 - 00:49:40:16

seems to have been prematurely ruled or or presumptuously ruled out on the basis that option in principle three is red. When the response to your questions earlier didn't really give a very thorough explanation as to how that conclusion had been reached.

00:49:43:02 - 00:49:47:13

I think you can ask the applicant if they if they could respond to that, please.

00:49:48:25 - 00:50:35:18

Yes, sir. Miss Berry, on behalf of the applicant, just to, um, clarify for Mr. Pennington, the the rector doesn't presumptuously rule out East zone three. The rector is simply a graphic presentation of all of the analysis that's presented in the Terrestrial Site Assessment report. I didn't just sort of randomly put the colored in and and go on that they, they, they, they emerge from the detail that is presented right in the terrestrial sites of the report. Um, I answered your questions about, uh, eastern three and in principle three, um, earlier, uh, we've said we'll come back with some further written information on that, but I need to check some details so we can well, we can address that further in, in written representations if that's okay, sir.

00:50:37:09 - 00:50:48:18

So I mean, Uh, I'm not sure that's probably addressed. Mr. Pennington's. Yeah. Quick question. Question on there. Um. Um, is there anything you want to add to that?

00:50:50:05 - 00:50:55:22

Uh, only that it would be, um, gratefully received if there is some further written representations on that. Thank you.

00:50:57:17 - 00:51:00:16

And I think that, uh, I mean.

00:51:01:04 - 00:51:16:15

I think it would be it would be useful to understand in terms of tenders written up in due course. Um, so similarly, as previously mentioned, um, if we get that information earlier, it will be useful for our submission at deadline one.

00:51:19:08 - 00:51:51:27

Um, so so you're actually asking for some further information that's been provided in the applicants, uh, documents that I'm not sure that the I mean, there's a number of clarification points that I'm making a list of for the, uh, uh, for the outcome of this, this meeting. Um, Uh. Uh, again, I'm a bit bit unsure exactly what you're. I understand what the point you're making is in terms of the level of information that you've, uh, that you consider has been provided within the, uh, in the document.

00:51:52:03 - 00:51:57:05

Um, I'm just trying to clarify what information it is that you're, uh, that you think is missing.

00:51:59:25 - 00:52:18:21

Well, for example, if you look at auctioneering. Sorry, Mr. Pennington, on behalf of the water, if you look at principle three, seeking to avoid or minimise the level of adverse impact on existing businesses and third party landowners, um, I suppose it it seems to me on my client that

00:52:20:15 - 00:52:41:03

option three, in terms of each zone has been ruled out purely on cost. And so I guess if there is any information as to how that cost has been calculated and what the level would be to kind of dismiss the the the zone in terms of being scored red would be useful.

00:52:42:24 - 00:53:03:16

And yeah, I think that's I think that's something uh, something similar, you know to to the applicants about where they're actually that was actually the, the main reason why the zone had been uh, uh, left out. And uh, I think I understood that there was going to be, uh, some, some further information on that. If I ask the applicants to.

00:53:04:07 - 00:53:35:17

Undertake for the applicant. Yes, sir. We will provide, um, further elaboration of that. But, um, if Mr. Pennington has as 44 and table five one, um, then some of the fact considerations that relate to the application of principle three are set out about disturbance and, uh, cost and, and leading to the most acute impact on employment in the desert development zones considered. So cost isn't the only factor, but cost was one of the factors we are But I could.

00:53:35:24 - 00:54:20:27

Just just supplement now. And I think it's been a bit clearer in his in the question. So if you if, if he turns to we can now uh, in the, in the TSA uh app 125 table three two within that document presents um, the, the the analysis for the Easton. And there's quite extensive analysis in terms of auctioneering. Principle three setting out, um, the information about the capacity of both, uh, the little uh, and Iron Mountain operations, um, that operates in, in East Town three.

00:54:21:25 - 00:54:54:14

Um, so I think detail is there. Uh, we discussed earlier about, uh, the level of analysis and the level of settlement undertaken there. And I, you know, we said we'd pull up some more information by explaining that a lot of that came from, um, to our land advisors to the project. You have been, you know, lots of you are familiar with the businesses in the area, having worked in IT and on projects in the area for some time. Um, but just to wrap up, I'd say the decision hasn't been made on cost alone consistently, as we said in the submitted application documents.

00:54:54:16 - 00:55:29:19

And I explained this morning. No rating was applied to the criteria to enable a neutral, balanced assessment to be made across all of the criteria. Um, it's, you know, you could you could pull on any one of these strings, you could pull on auctioneering principle five for two and say, well, that's a green. So that should win. But that's just one element, sir. My point is that we need to planning decisions are made on the balanced decisions, looking at policy across the whole and identifying overall what is the appropriate, uh, solution and development to be brought forward.

00:55:30:28 - 00:56:00:28

Okay. Thank you. And I think I understand. I understand your point, Mr.. Is that your view is that the information provided doesn't provide enough information for yourself. The applicant of, uh, have explained their side. Um, I'm not sure we're going to get much further, uh, today, uh, sort of pursuing that. But I think, again, if there's if there's points you want to follow up in, uh, in written, written submissions and, uh, again, the applicant have been asked to provide anything that they can do on that.

00:56:01:00 - 00:56:03:10

I think that's the most appropriate way to to pursue that.

00:56:05:00 - 00:56:05:26

Okay. Thank you sir.

00:56:06:20 - 00:56:07:05

Thank you.

00:56:10:20 - 00:56:11:06

Yes.

00:56:14:02 - 00:56:48:11

Thank you, sir. Lawrence Pinturault for safe crossing this nature reserve. I have a comment to make, if I may, uh, about the estimated costs of alternative locations once the costs of acquiring and relocating a specific warehouse can be estimated, although it doesn't appear to have been fully considered on this

occasion. The cost of losing an ancient marshland, which, once destroyed can never be recreated, cannot be estimated.

00:56:48:14 - 00:56:55:22

This is one of the last remnant of grazing marsh in the whole of London. Thank you.

00:56:56:18 - 00:57:00:24

Thank you. Does the applicant got any comments on on that?

00:57:05:06 - 00:57:41:18

Uh thank you sir. Um, so that is purely looking at a bilateral cost implication. Clearly we have looked at the, uh, habitat condition within the the habitat that would be, uh, in the east paddock and stable paddock. Um, and we, we really recognise we've always been very transparent in the application documents that, that, that the East Paddock and Stable paddock formed part of that built Vernon area and have set out in our proposals the mitigation and enhancement proposals for that, for that loss.

00:57:41:28 - 00:57:56:18

Um, I think something you'll come on to further in items three and four. So I won't go into more detail on that now. But so I think that's, that's taking a the financial cost is this is one element overall we believe we can provide a better solution at the end.

00:57:57:28 - 00:57:58:17

Okay. Thank you.

00:58:00:16 - 00:58:07:09

Are there any other points that anybody wants to make on that. Yes. Uh if you just wait for for microphone please.

00:58:14:00 - 00:58:26:29

Thank you. Um. Um, without affiliation, I wonder whether the heat network that has been proposed repeatedly, but, um, not proceeded with, um, that is still part of the scheme.

00:58:28:27 - 00:58:32:14

I'm happy to ask the applicant if they can respond on that. Um.

00:58:34:11 - 00:59:14:05

Thank you sir. Miss Berry, on behalf of the applicant. So, uh, yes, the scheme, uh, includes, uh, the the plan. I'm going to get the technical information wrong, but the heat exchange sort of kit that would be required for, um, any heat from the carbon capture facility to be integrated into a heat network. Distribution. Quarry have employed, um, a managing director of heat to progress heat, uh, to progressing a heat distribution scheme. Um, but it's it would be, um, primarily reliant on the heat coming from Riverside one and two, which are the, um, uh, previously consented and currently operational facilities.

00:59:14:07 - 00:59:23:03

So it's a part of that heat distribution. It's work in progress, but it's something which would be benefited from using the heat from this scheme.

00:59:23:24 - 00:59:25:18

It's just that I.

00:59:25:20 - 00:59:31:29

Missed that it was it. The heat network would primarily be from Riverside one and two. Was that. What was that? I misheard

00:59:33:20 - 00:59:34:18

the sentence. That's what I think.

00:59:34:20 - 00:59:35:09

He said, wasn't it?

00:59:37:09 - 01:00:14:08

Yes, sir, I think so. I mean, I'm not the technical expert here and all of this, but Riverside one and two. Sorry, Miss Berry, on behalf of the applicant, Riverside 1 or 2 have both been built BCP enabled. But let me say it again. Riverside one has been built to be CHP enabled. Currently exports only electricity, but it could be readily, uh, upgraded to export heat. Riverside two is being built to be CHP enabled. Uh, they both have um they've both they've been there's been expectations for both those facilities to be able to export heat at some point.

01:00:14:10 - 01:00:35:06

And the applicant has employed a role to progress that. The carbon capture facility includes the project in front of you today, sir. includes the, uh, kit required to contribute to that heat distribution network should it be delivered, which we hope it will.

01:00:35:18 - 01:00:37:17

So could you just add that?

01:00:38:29 - 01:01:11:13

Yeah. So just just to be clear on, um, for the DTA, for Riverside two has a requirement relating to, um, heat networks. And you would have seen in the latest version of the DTA for this project, um, A0 14 that we have added a requirement to kind of essentially bring everything together on the, on the campus, um, to recognize that this is built in, being developed piecemeal over time to three different plants, and that they will need to be a kind of consolidated approach to it.

01:01:11:15 - 01:01:24:27

But the two just re-emphasize on this very sad, is that what we have within the scheme is related to the heat that the scheme produces, and it being able to be added to the overall network that would be built on the campus as a whole.

01:01:26:11 - 01:01:27:00

Okay. Thank you.



01:01:27:24 - 01:01:44:07

I'm James Stewart, without affiliation. I wonder if the route of the pipeline for the heat network should be considered. And also the heat loss from any other, um, facilities in the carbon capture scheme that will be affected by that heat loss.

01:01:45:14 - 01:01:48:06

Okay, again, I'll ask the applicant if they've got any comments on that.

01:01:48:23 - 01:02:07:06

And yeah, I can say the this submission, um, allows for um, the heat network to be built in what we call normal road corridor. So quote number three. So there's a number of different um, utilities that will go into Northern Road and one of which would be um, heat pipes.

01:02:09:01 - 01:02:09:16

Thank you.

01:02:10:27 - 01:02:25:13

The next part of the question along one, um, is the storage temporary storage of the Co captured CO<sub>2</sub>. Um, there seem to be six spheres or cylinders. I wonder what their capacity is.

01:02:27:06 - 01:02:51:15

And I arrange to that. Um, if the number of vessels going to be taking it away, um, is, um, reduced by having larger vessels, then you're going to need more. You may need more spheres. If it's less, then maybe you can build the spheres or storage, um, in the River Thames on piles.

01:02:53:09 - 01:03:06:00

Okay. Well, I think there's two parts to that to to that comment was the capacity and the implication for onward transport. Um, and Mr. Morris, we just talked about the storage being on piles in the river.

01:03:06:18 - 01:03:21:24

Yes. Um, the storage, um, is to be, um, the the CO<sub>2</sub> is to be taken away by river. Why not have the storage by the river around the other side of the site and said.

01:03:22:18 - 01:03:24:06

Is the applicant got some comments on that?

01:03:26:01 - 01:03:59:18

On behalf of the applicant. So in terms of the the storage capacity is currently proposed to have 24,000m<sup>3</sup> of storage capacity. This is based on the maximum ship size of 20,000m<sup>3</sup>, therefore giving some buffer margin above the cargo capacity of the ship to allow for some delay to to a ship arrival, etc.. Um, regarding the second point of having storage on the river, um, I think is maybe more sort of environmental considerations to that. So I'll defer to any colleagues who may wish to respond to that point.

01:04:05:15 - 01:04:10:03

And take the applicant, I think on that. If we may, we'll we'll come back and answer that in writing.

01:04:12:00 - 01:04:15:14

Okay. Just make a note of that.

01:04:19:09 - 01:04:32:06

Yeah. So I think the point was that, you know, the the current proposal has storage as part of the sort of continuous contiguous site with a pipeline leading to the jetty. And the question is, could could effectively that be the other way around?

01:04:34:12 - 01:04:35:07

Okay. Thank you.

01:04:36:02 - 01:05:07:29

Final thing. Um, sorry. James Hewitt, I'm without affiliation. Um, as was mentioned by Mr. Turney, there is either single line process line or dual. If, um, it, um, there's concern about the efficiency and feasibility of carbon capture, as they may well be from other schemes around the country, then maybe it would be expedient to have only one pipeline, um, process line at all.

01:05:08:01 - 01:05:25:14

And if if that is the case, then perhaps, um, I know it's been covered to some extent, then the amount of area needed would be reduced. It would be financially prudent, in my opinion, to only have one. And because of the risks of it not not succeeding. Thank you. Thank you.

01:05:25:19 - 01:05:29:00

Again, I'll give you the opportunity to the applicant if they want to respond to that.

01:05:30:24 - 01:06:03:16

Good afternoon. On behalf of the applicant. And yes, there would be a capital cost saving of a single line against two lines, the magnitude of which would have to be determined as work progresses. But as I mentioned earlier, there is an implication in terms of the the overall annual CO2 capture quantity because of maintenance outages of a single line versus two lines. So so the various factors have to be sort of balanced, you know, including performance, cost, um, efficiency, land take, etc..

01:06:03:25 - 01:06:09:09

Um, so that's that's work that's ongoing at the moment to determine which is going to be the preferred option going forward.

01:06:11:14 - 01:06:11:29

Thank you.

01:06:15:05 - 01:06:16:04

The city? Yeah.

01:06:16:06 - 01:06:17:24

Another question. Yeah.

01:06:18:07 - 01:06:43:03

Richard Denny for Lancelot Munster. I just wanted to clarify, on the basis of what was said in answer to the question about the heat transfer, is the heat transfer station that's shown in the indicative layout, sized for heat transfer from the CTS proposal. That's before you. Or is it designed for heat transfer from, uh, Riverside one and Riverside two?

01:06:44:22 - 01:07:03:02

So so as I understand, you're asking whether the what's shown on the, uh, the, the engineering drawings is that just to deal with, uh, surplus heat from the the the proposal, or would it be a combined one to deal with as, uh, I think Mr. Fox pointed out the the requirement for for all three facilities.

01:07:14:08 - 01:07:24:17

Uh, so, uh, Miss Barry, on behalf of the applicant. Uh, yes, I've just, uh, consulted and the heat transfer station within the within the development area is purely for the carbon capture facility.

01:07:25:17 - 01:07:26:02

Yes.

01:07:29:25 - 01:07:35:09

I think so. We'll need to come back to you on this. Um, because I misunderstood. So we've.

01:07:35:11 - 01:07:38:14

Just had. So it's not just for the. Oh, you need to.

01:07:38:16 - 01:07:47:07

I think I as I said earlier, sir, I'm a I'm a planner rather than a technical person, so I should, uh, confirm and we'll need to come back to you on that.

01:07:47:27 - 01:07:49:20

Commissioner, to answer that at all.

01:07:53:00 - 01:08:05:12

Tony Hanson, on behalf of the applicant, the the heat transfer station would be required whether or not there is heat recovery from the carbon capture plant that is integral to the to the base um district heating scheme, which recovers from Riverside one. Riverside two.

01:08:06:23 - 01:08:17:25

I think the point is, yes, but does it have to be on the CHS side? Because presumably if the CSS site wasn't happening, it would have to go somewhere else. If I've understood what the point was.

01:08:19:29 - 01:08:27:13

It would have to go somewhere. Where? Somewhere is that? Yeah. Thus, the site is currently. But.

01:08:28:00 - 01:08:43:14

Uh, I think Mr. Fox said that that was a requirement of, uh, of the DCO for Riverside two. So presumably, um, that to connect to the, uh, the heat network. So presumably that would have to have to happen, wouldn't it?

01:08:45:24 - 01:08:50:16

I'll let me just explain what the rep requirement did, because. Yeah.

01:08:52:16 - 01:09:36:01

Uh, yes, sir. So the the requirement for Riverside to my head is requirement 24, uh, is uh multi multi functional as many strands to it. We've just um worked through the first element of it, which is to set up, uh to agree terms of reference for a working group. Um, and our next step will be to convene that working group, uh, that will consider that we'll consider three consultants, I believe, or a range of consultants to be selected to undertake a review of CHP opportunities from Riverside to the, uh, and that will be progressing that along alongside this examination.

01:09:37:00 - 01:09:47:22

Uh, separately, Riverside two DCO requires the facility to have space on site to, uh, enable, uh, the heat

01:09:49:10 - 01:10:08:04

to be extracted. Our planner, um, and that is contained, uh, the error pointed to earlier to the east of the main energy recovery facility. So there is the ability to have the kit, but not to exceed the heat. This is why we need to come back to you, sir, because I.

01:10:08:06 - 01:10:27:28

Think be helpful just because I think the question was was a reasonable one. Is that, um. Yeah. Will, what's shown on the the engineering sort of illustrative engineering drawings for this scheme, would that effectively replace some things that would have happened elsewhere. Uh, uh, with within within the Riverside campus?

01:10:28:00 - 01:10:59:25

Yes. I missed bearing on behalf of that. Just just a final point on this. We will come back to you with full submissions, but just say the added complication or the added element to all of this is that a planning permission has been granted to, um, a district heat network provider, um, separately through the TPA process. And that includes the location of a heat exchange unit, um, on land to the west of Norman Road. So within this this little allocation area within the area that we are, um, proposing for the carbon capture facility.

01:10:59:27 - 01:11:08:07

So there's a number of previous consents and requirements and elements, um, which we will need to set out clearly for you, sir.

01:11:08:26 - 01:11:26:00

Okay, well, I think it would be helpful if that could just be explained just so I can unpick, um, what what's going to happen and particularly for particularly what, what the difference is with if if there

was a note, uh, you know, if the scheme didn't proceed, what the implications would be and what the implications would be if the scheme would, would proceed.

01:11:27:23 - 01:12:01:04

I'm conscious. We've, um, we we spent quite, quite a long time on just the first the first item on the agenda. I'll just see if there's any final comments that want to be made. But I'm going to propose that we have a, uh, have a have a break for lunch. I'm going to have another look at the agenda over lunch, because my concern is, uh, I want to make sure that we can consider the issues, but also to make sure that people have an opportunity to make any, uh, any contribution. So, uh, I may well, uh, decide there's some things that we need to pursue in, uh, uh, in writing, but, uh, I'll, I'll come back to everybody after that.

01:12:01:10 - 01:12:05:29

Can I just check to see if there's anybody else who wants to say anything on that? Uh, that first item.

01:12:08:13 - 01:12:38:27

Okay. Uh, well, I make it, uh, two minutes past, uh, two minutes past. Past one. Um, uh, I'm going to hope this isn't going to be too much of an imposition, but I'm going to propose that we take a break of 45 minutes for lunch. Uh, apologies if, uh, if that's a bit, uh, constrained, but, uh, I, I am conscious that we do need to complete the meeting, uh, by by 5:00 at the, at the latest. And hopefully having a slightly shorter lunch break will enable everybody to, uh, uh, get the refreshment they need, but also to come.

01:12:39:05 - 01:12:59:00

Uh, come back and focus on this afternoon. So, um, let's say let's come back at one. Um, I'll, I'll say I'll say 150. So it's a bit more than, uh, uh, a bit more than 45 minutes. Less than an hour. So, uh, I'll now, uh, adjourn the hearing or resume at, uh, one 150. Thank you very much.