



Hearing Transcript

Project:	EN070009 - H2Teesside
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing
Date:	28 August 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.

H2TEESSIDE_ISH1_SESSION1_280824

Wed, Aug 28, 2024 5:49PM • 1:28:37

00:05

Good afternoon. The time is now 2pm and I would like to welcome everybody to this issue specific hearing in relation to the application made by h 2t side limited for the proposed h 2t side project.

00:17

At today's issue specific hearing, the examining authority will be considering the scope of the development, including its relationship to the extent of the order limits and the progress of development design, before we formally open this issue, specific hearing the examining authority and the examining authority introduced itself, I'd like to ask a couple of sorry I would, I would ask the planning spectrums case team for this project to confirm that you can hear me and the meeting, recording and live streaming has started. Yep, can hear you clearly, and recording and the live stream has quenched. Thank you very much. Could I also ask that all audible notifications for electronic devices, including mobile phones, be switched off or at least turned to silent? Please. You I

01:05

additionally, I would ask, I would advise that no requests have been made for special measures or arrangements to enable participation in this hearing. But I would just like to turn that that is correct, please.

01:18

I'm getting no indication, so I will move on. Thank you. As you can hear me and the live streaming and digital recording has commenced, I would advise that this issue, specific hearing into the scope of the development, including its relationship to the extent of the order limits and the progress of Durham design for the HT side project is now open. Moving on to introductions. My name is Christopher Butler, and I was appointed on the 22nd of May under Section 65 of the Planning Act, 2008 under delegation from the Secretary of State as lead panel member to examine this application. I am a chartered member of the royal Town Planning Institute, Institute, and have academic qualifications in Town and Country Planning. I have made a declaration of interest responding to the planning inspectorates conflict of interest policy, and can confirm I have no declarable interest in relation to this appointment. I'm now going to ask my fellow panel members to introduce themselves, starting with Mr. Simms, please

02:11

Good afternoon. My name is Matthew Sims and I was also appointed on the 22nd of May 2024, as a panel member to examine this application under Section 65 of the planning at 2008 as amended under delegation from the Secretary of State. I'm a chartered civil engineer and a member of the Institution of Civil Engineers, and I have also made a declaration of interest responding to the planning inspectors in

conflict of interest policy, and can confirm that I have no declarable interest in relation to this appointment,

02:43

good afternoon. My name is Sharon Bennett, Matthews, and I was also appointed on the 22nd of May 2024,

02:49

as a panel member to examine this application on the section 65 with the Planning Act of 2008

02:55

as amended on the delegation from the Secretary of State. I have a solicitor and my legal specialist in this town and country planning, I have made a declaration of interest responding to the planning specter of conflict of interest policy, and I can confirm that I have no declarable interest in relation to this appointment.

03:14

Thank you. Together, we constitute the examining authority for this application. We were reporting to the sector of state for energy, energy security and net zero with a recommendation as to whether the development consent order should be made. Also present today are members of the planning inspectorates case team working with Mr. Simmons, Miss Bennett and I on this national infrastructure project,

03:35

in addition to the planning in addition to Lily Robbins, the case manager who you would have already read, met on the introductions to this this proposal,

03:47

we have Mabon Evans, who's one of our case officers, and providing support for this virtual event. Technicians from production 78 are also in attendance, virtually solely for the purpose of managing audio and visual services, including recordings and live streamings of this meeting. I would also add that other colleagues from the planning Inspectorate may join this issue specific hearing virtually as observers, as part of the planning inspectorates commitment to continuing progress professional development. However, I would stress that they are only observers.

04:18

If you have any questions regarding the application process generally. Could I ask that you please email the case team who'd be happy to help you? So moving on to introductions from attendees today. Firstly, we would like to acknowledge and welcome all those who are attending this virtual event, including those watching the live streaming. We'd also we would like to start with instructions from attendees, when I read out the name of the team, please, could all members of that team present virtually introduce themselves? I'll do the running order first. So running order will be the applicant, then Anglo American, then Barker rose consulting on behalf of BOC limited and Natura global limited air this year.

05:00

Sutherland. LLP on behalf of navigator terminals, limited. PD, tees, port, limited, Sep, Corp utilities, limited, INEOS, night trails, UK, limited and CF fertilizers, limited and shepherd and weder. Wedderburn, LLP on behalf of North Sea, Midstream Partners, North Street, northern gas processing limited, teas, Teesside and liquid processing limited, and Teesside gas processing plant limited. And finally, BD Pittman's LLP, on behalf of the South tees group, in terms of other interested parties, we will then invite other persons present virtually who have registered to speak but are not on the list above, to identify themselves to and to indicate on which agenda item they may wish to speak on. If you're a representative, please state who you represent. Just a little bit in terms of virtual event management before I ask you to introduce yourselves. However, there are a few housekeeping matters specifically to virtual events, and we need to deal that we need to deal with, especially if some of you today haven't attended a virtual hearing before. Firstly, I would ask you to note that the chat function in teams is not being used today, so please do not send any messages via chat, as it's not being monitored. If at any point in the meeting you can't hear us or you wish to speak. Can we ask that you turn your camera on, if it's turned off and or use the raised hand function in teams. There may also, there may some there may sometimes be a delay before we can acknowledge your your request to speak.

06:33

But if you do raise your hand function, then we will come to you once we have an opportunity to do so.

06:39

Miss Robbins will have explained to you what to do if you lose your connection. And we're able to adjourn for short periods if there's a more significant connections problem,

06:48

we will adjourn for a short break of convenient points, usually no more than every hour and a half or so. In terms of the digital recording of this hearing, a digital recording is being made and will be available on the project page, on the national infrastructure website, as soon as practical after the close of this hearing. If you take part in the hearing, it's important that you understand that your comments will be recorded and that your digital recording and that the digital recording will be published and retained, usually for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision.

07:17

As such, the planning spectra is subject to the general data particular protection regulations. In the unlikely event that the exi It is unlike it's very unlikely the examining authority will ask you to put sensitive personal information, such as email addresses, economic, financial, cultural or heritage related matters into the public domain. Indeed, we'd actively encourage you not to do that. However, if for some reason, you feel it's necessary

07:40

for you to refer to such sensitive personal information, we would encourage you to speak to the case team. In the first instance, the case team will then explore with you whether the information can be provided in written format, which would be then appropriately redacted before being published. Please

bear in mind that the only official record of the proceedings is the digital recording that will be placed on the project page of the national infrastructure, website, tweets, blogs and similar communications arising out of this meeting will not be accepted as evidence into the examination of this application. So moving on to introductions,

08:13

I'd like to get the names of those wishing to speak at this hearing. If you're a representative, please. Can you state who you represent? And can we start with the applicant. Please

08:23

Good afternoon, sir. I appear on behalf of the applicant. My name is Harry wood, Philpott King's Council, and I appear together with Miss Isabella tafur on behalf of the applicant, h 2t side Ltd, and we are both instructed by Prince masons, sir. So far as the speakers for today's hearing are concerned, I'm anticipating that the answers to most of the examining authority's agenda items will be provided by Mr. Elna ibrahimzadi, who's a senior project engineer at BP. Where that's not the case, I anticipate that I will be responding if it becomes necessary to call on other members of the applicants team to speak, I propose to introduce them at that point.

09:11

Okay, that's that's fine. I'm quite happy with that. So in that case, I'm going to move on to interested parties. Then please, can I ask Anglo American to introduce themselves, please.

09:26

Thank you. Hello. Tabitha Knowles from litchfields planning consultancy, acting on behalf of Anglo American woodsmith Teesside limited. Anglo American woodsmith limited, and Anglo American crop nutrients limited, which collectively and here on will be referred to as Anglo American. Thank you,

09:47

Miss Knowles. Before you go, switch your camera off, just to double check I've got you down as items. Agenda Item three, scope of the development and the relationship to the order limits, and specifically with relation to the interface of design with i.

10:00

And other order limits, including the York posh ash project that's located in the area, and Item four, which is the progress of development and design. And then I possibly Item five, any change requests, but, but that that item was possibly going to fall away anyway. But is that correct? Yes, that's correct. Thank you. All right. Thank you very much. I'm going to move on to Barker rose consulting, please. Could you introduce yourself please?

10:28

Hi, yes. I'm Mrs. Sarah Gilly. I'm a partner at Baker rose Baker rose consulting. LLP, and I'd be speaking today on behalf of Bac limited and natara global limited. On behalf of natara global, I also have Nick Pannell here, who is a representative of the company itself. Okay, thank you very much. Does Mr. Parnell wish to introduce himself?

10:58

Good afternoon. Nick Pannell, VP of transformation and interim VP of Operations at natara Global. Look forward to supporting Sarah. Okay, thank you very much for introducing yourself. Ms Gilly, is it? Is it miss Gilly, or Mrs. Gilly? It's Mrs. Mrs. Gilly. I'm just double checking. I've got you down to speak for both of your clients on agenda items three, which is the scope of the scope of the development and the relationship to the order limit and Agenda Item four, which is the progress of design, development and design. Is that correct? Yes, that's correct. Okay. Thank you very much. I'd like to then move on to evershed Sutherland's please.

11:37

Thank you. Good afternoon. Zara darripa, ever sheds, we're acting for some cork utilities, INEOS, night trials, PDT support, navigator terminals and CF fertilizers. With your permission to avoid listing the parties at each time I speak, I'll refer to them as our clients, unless we're specifically talking about one of the parties. We are just for a watching groove today, unless there are specific questions, we will happily take those away and respond later in writing. Okay, that's that's understood, and again, just referring to you. It's Miss, is it? Yes? Please. Thank you. Okay. Thank you very much. In that case, I'd like to move on to Shepard and Wedderburn, please,

12:24

yes, good afternoon, sir. My name is Colin Ennis, and I'm a partner in the law firm of Sheppard and Wedderburn. I appear here this afternoon on behalf of Northern gas processing limited, Teesside gas and liquids processing, Teesside gas processing plant, limited and North Sea Midstream Partners. And hereafter, I'll call on the nsmp entities

12:47

and the collectively the entities own and operate the Teesside gas processing plant located at seal science.

12:56

And in terms of matters we wish to speak on, it's three, two, and I

13:01

suppose we're perhaps stretching the agenda item in the sense of where coordination with existing operational

13:09

natural development, which I know it's put down as other ncips that are at the future development, but it's that relationship that we wish to flag and be involved with, if we may. So

13:21

that makes perfect sense, and we fully understand that. Thank you very much for your introductions and confirmation of which agenda item you wanted to speak on, Mr. Innis, can I move on to BDP, Pittman's? LLP, please.

13:40

Good afternoon, sir, and good afternoon everybody. My name is Tom Henderson. I'm a planning lawyer and a partner at the law firm, BDB Pittman.

13:50

We are representing three bodies, the South tees Development Corporation. South tees development is limited, and tees works limited, which together we've referred to under the umbrella term the south tees group. And we'll, we'll do that unless the context requires otherwise.

14:09

Thank you. Okay, Mr. Henderson, just to double check, I've got quite a full list of agenda items that you wanted to speak on. We've got agenda items three, one and four, two, agenda items three, two and three, three and Agenda Item four, one and four, three. Is that correct? That's correct, sir. I mean, in essence, our submissions cut across

14:36

a number of the agenda items, and if it's convenient, at the appropriate time, we could just deliver them in one go. There's I'd anticipate I've got about three or four minutes worth of things to say. Okay, I'll take your lead on that. Happy to Okay, well, Mr. Sims is going to take us forward on the question, so I'm sure he'll bring you in at an appropriate point in time. If that's okay. Yeah, it's fine. Thank you very much. Okay, thank you.

14:59

I.

15:00

We've got quite a lot of parties that didn't respond to a register to speak, but only one that said they definitely weren't coming, which was the marine management organization, to just confirm that they they wrote, confirm that they had no comments to make in regard to issue, specific one over and above that which they'd already made in their relevant representation.

15:19

So are there any other parties joining us virtually, who have registered, who wish to speak during this hearing? If so, could you switch your camera and microphone on or use the raise hand function in teams to indicate your wish to speak? Please.

15:35

Again, no response. So I think we've covered everybody that wishes to introduce themselves today. I just need to talk briefly about the purpose of this issue, specific hearing today. So

15:49

the purpose of today's issue specific hearing is so that the examining authority can explore a number of matters orally in respect to the scope of the development, including its relationship to the extent of the

order limits and the progress of design. We'd also like to remind you the examining authority is predominant. The examination is predominantly a written process. So the examining authority will be issuing a number of written questions in our first written questions, which are due to be issued shortly. Furthermore, as you would have seen from the examination timetable, further rounds of written questions are proposed as well. The purpose of the examination is for the examining authority to examine the information submitted, both by the applicants and also by interested parties, other persons and relevant affected persons. As a result, we would assure you that we are familiar with the documentations that you've sent in. So when answering a question, you do not need to repeat at length something that has already been submitted. If you want to refer to the information already submitted, we would be very grateful if you could use the appropriate planning inspectorates, examination, reference library, reference number. Furthermore, could you please, could we please ask the first time use an abbreviation or an acronym that you give the full title? As there may be people listening today or present today,

17:05

or people watching the Digital recording that may not be familiar with the application documentation or the expressions that you use as you are yourself, whilst we accept that the majority of the discussion will be undertaken by those parties who have requested to speak. This is a public exam.

17:24

Wish to speak, this is a public examination. And therefore,

17:29

if at any point you wish to make a comment, please feel free to use the raised hand function in teams and switch on your camera

17:38

at the relevant time, if you wish to contribute. At the hearing today, we will have a structured discussion, which will be led by the examining authority based on the agenda that was already published. The purpose of this is to discuss. This discussion is for the examining authority to ask questions and to seek clarification on matters related to the scope of the development, including its relationship to the and to the extent of the order limits and the progress of development design with a review with a view to ensuring that we have all the information that we need to make our report to the sector of state. The questions will be the questions that we will be asking today will be focused on those areas where we consider further information is required, or where we think the issues would benefit from examination orally. We would therefore like to take this opportunity to reassure you that whilst we may not be asking specific questions or covering a specific topic that you were expecting, it's not necessarily that we view this matter as satisfactory. It merely indicates that we consider we have all the information that we need on this topic at this point in time, we

18:40

would like to remind everyone that this is not an inquiry, and therefore, unless the examining authority has specifically requested or agreed to it, there will be no formal presentation of case and no cross examination as such. Any question that you may have for other parties would need to be asked through

the examining authority. In addition to the above, I would remind all interested parties present that it is not the purpose of this issue specific hearing to discuss the compulsory acquisition or temporary possession matters at this hearing today, at separate hearings specifically dedicated to compulsory acquisition and temporary possession are currently programmed in the draft timetable for November of this Year and January 2025

19:21

the draft timetable will be confirmed in a rule eight letter, and the compulsory acquisition and temporary possession hearings will be confirmed closer to those the dates of those hearings, should they be required? I'm relatively certain that they will. So I'd expect to be issuing a notification of those hearings prior to them taking place with three or four weeks notice.

19:46

Our certainty in this regard is partly down to the applicant's notification of the potential changes to the proposed development known as change requests, which have indicated they're likely to be submitting change requests in October 2024

20:00

All, however, as no formal change requests have yet been submitted, and in the light and in the light of this, we do not intend to pursue agenda items five, one or five two, that's the agenda items on impact of change requests accepted into the examination prior to the start of the examination, if any, and the details thereof. And agenda item two was the impact of potential change requests and the details thereof. This is because, as I said, no formal change request has been accepted to the into the examination at this time. Should church change requests be submitted, they will potentially be included in discussions of subsequent hearings, and mostly likely those in January 2025 in terms of conduct and management of this hearing, we're conducting this meeting in accordance with section 91 and 94 of the Planning Act, 2008 and the infrastructure examination procedure rules 2010 specifically rules for rule 14, related to the procedure at hearings, we'd remind you all that section 94 eight of the Planning Act, 2008 allows the examining authority to refuse to allow representations to be made at a hearing, including representation is made in excise of an entitlement under Section 91 three, if the examining authority considers that those representations are irrelevant, fixatious, frivolous relate to merits of policy set out in a national policy statement, repeat other representations already made in any form and by Any person, or they relate to compensation related compulsory acquisition land or an interest in or rights over land,

21:29

turning to agenda, turning to the agenda. Rule 14, two of the examination procedure rules, requires that the start of the hearing, examination authority shall identify matters to be considered at the hearing. The draft agenda for these hearings were set out in Annex E of our rule six, letter dated 31st of July, 2024 and in a more detailed agenda was published on the project page hour website on the 21st of August, 2024

21:53

both draft and more detailed agendas are available via the project page of the national infrastructure's website. We consider. The main items for discussion are the scope of the development in relation to the extent of the order limits. This includes how the order limits have been assessed in relation to the current level of design development coordination with other consents and proposal, proposed national nationally significant infrastructure projects in the vicinity, and coordination with other developments proposed in the vicinity. We'll also consider we need to look at progress of design which is specifically related to the level of design detail in the application documents, location of preferred routes, of pipelines, cable, cable routes, etc, and the timeline for define design refinement and how this can be secured in the development consent order and the impact of any additional submissions accepted into the examination prior to the preliminary meeting hearing.

22:53

As I've said, we've already indicated that any change request or potential impact of change requests aren't going to be pursued as a result of none being received formally prior to the start of this examination,

23:08

we would ask you to note that we are aware that many of the matters relevant to this development, consent order application often need to be considered in multiple different ways, and that there are cross cutting issues. Please note that today's agenda is for guidance only, and we may add other issues for consideration. As we progress, we will seek to allocate sufficient time to each issue to allow proper consideration of them. Should the consideration of the issues take longer than anticipated, it may be necessary to prioritize matters or defer other matters to written questions, as we have already mentioned, because this is a virtual event, we will adjourn for short breaks at convenient points in time. You can stay logged into teams throughout that break, but please ensure you switch your camera off on and mute your microphones. If you're watching the live stream, you will need to refresh your live stream web live streaming web page to continue watching the live stream after any break. If you do lose connection, use the same link that you were you that you used to log on to this afternoon, and the case, team will endeavor to reconnect you as soon as possible. Should you experience any problems with the live streaming, any digital recording of the event will be published on the national infrastructure web page as soon as practically possible, after the event has ended, if for any medical or other reason, anyone requires a break at a specific time, could you please let the case team know, and we hopefully be able to adjust the program to meet your needs. And finally, it's important that we get the right answers to the questions that we are going to ask. We reshape that this is predominantly a written process, and therefore, if you cannot answer the question that is being asked or require time to get the information requested, then, rather than giving a restricted or potentially incorrect answer, can you please indicate that you need to respond in writing? We can then defer the response either to an action point to be submitted at the next appropriate deadline, or the next round of written questions or at a later point.

25:00

In time. So before we move on to deal with the items detailing detailed in the agenda, are there any questions at this stage about the procedural side of today's hearings or the agenda generally?

25:13

Getting no indication. So I'm going to ask Mr. Simms to take Agenda Item three forward, please. Thank you, Mr. Butler. So Agenda Item three is the scope of the development and its relation to the extent of the order limits. We, as Mr. Butler, has been through with a number of IPS who have asked to speak in items at three and four. I'm proposing to bring you in at each relevant question, rather than asking you to speak now at the beginning of the item, because I believe this will allow for a bit more of a focused approach to the questions.

25:44

But I am really conscious that some of the questions we cover may appear to overlap, and if they do, and and we've covered the point suitably, we will, we will potentially take that point, and if items are covered that we want to cover in a later question, and we've already covered them, we'll try not to do that again. So as I said, we'll endeavor to cover the topics by five o'clock, as we've said in the agenda. However, we do have the ability to continue rather than adjourn, if we feel that it will be best served in that way,

26:18

we anticipate items three and four, covering the substantial part of the remaining part of the agenda, and with the final elements taking 20 to 30 minutes at the end of the most,

26:30

I'm not going to intending to repeat the statement or question that's shown in the detailed agenda, so hopefully you've got that to hand. But rather, I will refer to the bullet point numbers, and we will, I know, be asking the questions directly. Most of my questions initially will be to the applicant, but then I will ask any of the other interested parties that have registered, if they wish to to comment on that. So we'll find our way through the agenda quite, quite easily. I hope

26:58

if I don't call you in, please don't be shy or embarrassed to raise your hand, as Mr. Butler has suggested, put your video camera on. Raise your hand. There may be a slight delay, where, as you will see as well, we're covering two pages of of our faces on the teams panel. So hopefully one of us will pick up a hand that goes up. So please make sure you do ask those questions, and get your hands up if you want to, and I haven't come to you.

27:24

So without further ado, I'm going to ask the applicant a very simple, straightforward question to start us off,

27:34

as per the agenda item, can I ask you to provide us with a brief overview, taking into account that we will cover detail further on of how the order limits have been assessed and set in relation to the current level of design development. Please.

27:54

Thank you, sir. Harry wood, Phil Bott, on behalf of the applicant, I'm going to ask Mr. Ibrahimzadi to respond to that question, sir. And I should say that generally, unless I interject to suggest that I'm going to speak to something you'll be hearing from Mr. Ibrahimzadi, and it's to him that most of your questions, I think should be directed. So I'll pass over to him now. Absolutely fine. Thank you.

28:19

So

28:21

Mr. From BP, speaking on behalf of the applicant. So if I just cover your question in two parts, I'll cover the main site plant, first the hydrogen production plant, and then the pipeline and utilities network later. So with regards to the main plant, the hydrogen production plant and also the associated infrastructure. On the main side, we have been through a

28:47

concept design as well as pre feed

28:50

level of design process, which stands for pre prompt and engineering design process.

28:57

And during the course of the pre feed design, we've also

29:01

performed a number of surveys

29:04

into the main site area to understand the

29:09

nature of the main site

29:12

in relation to the proposed development. We have been working with our previous contractors with regards to the sizing of the equipment the two phases of the project and all of the associated infrastructure, with regards to understanding the sizing and also the

29:29

vertical sizing, as well as the the horizontal footprint of the infrastructure we're looking to build as part of
The

29:39

the infrastructure that set out in work number one in the application, examination library document, a PP, 010,

29:49

the

29:51

extent of the production plant and also footprint associated with it as formed as the soft form, the extent of the work number.

30:00

Bond package with regards to the pipeline's infrastructure, primarily consisting of the hydrogen distribution network, but also other utilities, import utilities, including oxygen and nitrogen water as well as power, among other utilities.

30:18

Similarly, the working

30:21

we have completed previous level of design, again, front end engineering level of design, and we've also, as part of that, or during the course of that, performed a number of surveys to the area to understand the existing infrastructure in the area, the extent of the space available in the existing corridors, and stepping outside of the existing pipeline corridors,

30:42

the nature of any developments available there, and also space any technical and environmental restrictions. By taking that, all of that into account, we've been able to

30:53

reduce order limits to what was submitted as part of the application

30:58

in March of this year. So

31:03

thank you very questions.

31:09

Thank you very much. It was just from for us, just a real initial overview, so I've got no potential no follow up questions that I want to ask you immediately, because most of our detailed questions will be covered very shortly.

31:25

Is there any any IP interested party that would just like to ask any general questions? Sorry, would I make any general observations from that initial statement? If not, I will go forward into the detailed questions.

31:46

Okay, thank you. Mr. Ibrahim zardi, so

31:51

I'm going to go to point 3.1,

31:57

in paragraph 5.2, of the design and access statement, the applicant discusses flexibility

32:05

and states that, due to this being a first of its kind plant in terms of size, there's a need for flexibility.

32:15

Mr. Ibrahim zali, can you explain how this has influenced the design limits in reality and how the ex a can understand how this has influenced the order limits. Please.

32:31

Thanks. On behalf of the applicant. So with regards to the I'd like to start with with first Notting that the there is no

32:42

standard layout for a hydrogen production plant. So as such, we will be developing this to the final layout for the hydrogen production plant. In proposed development will be developed as part of the detailed design phase of the project by

33:01

an entity known as an EPCs, or engineering procurement construction contractor, which will be nominated at a future date following the completion of the front end engineering design. So with regards to the nature of the project, the

33:17

the carbon capture element

33:21

of the project, the hydrogen production plant is first of the kind, and we have been working with

33:29

license source, or the

33:32

for the hydrogen production plant itself, and also the associated co to capture equipment To understand the plant sizing and also the required

33:42

the footprint for those pieces of infrastructure. But as I was saying earlier, the this will be an ongoing process, and this will be finalized, the final

33:55

site and footprint, and also the sizing of this infrastructure will be finalized in the detailed design phase of the project. So as such, for

34:05

and I would also like to know that this is, this is typical for a project of this, of this nature

34:14

and size, and we'll be working with our license source and also the appointed fee as well as EPC contractors after leading

34:25

up to and also including the detailed design phase to finalize the

34:30

exact sighting sizing of the production plant. Until the detailed design phase is completed, we are using, and we will be using Rochester envelope

34:41

to take into account

34:44

the fact that, as I was saying earlier, they say there's no standard layout for the

34:49

project of this nature. Okay, so thank you for that. Can I just come back and just get some clarification in my mind? So what? What exactly?

35:00

Is the first of its kind for this particular site and and again, how has that influenced the the order limits?

35:12

I wasn't quite clear which bit you were referring to is, is the first of its kind for for the development and apologies, if that was me missing the point.

35:22

Apologies. Missing the point. Apologies on behalf of the applicant. So if I were to report the

35:29

work numbers, I said that in the examination library document a PP, 010,

35:35

it's primarily the work packages, one, a point one, which is the production plant, and also the associated capture plant of the Phase One of the main production plant, and also one 8.2 which is the phase two of the

35:52

the proposed hydrogen production plant.

35:55

So those are the elements that are primarily the the first of a kind

36:01

that's that's really helpful.

36:05

Thank you for for clarifying that. I think that would help us going forward.

36:11

I suppose one of the things that obviously we're, we're conscious of at the at this stage in the examination, specifically, is, is the Rochdale envelope and the limits of the order, which is what we're discussing today. How do you feel that? Or can you give us an indication of whether that first of a kind

36:33

project which leads to, obviously, a series of unknowns and question variables, as you've already stated, do you feel that? Do you know whether that's had a specific impact on the order limits, whether you're,

36:47

you know, potentially allowing the space that you need or more than the space that you need because of it being first, and I don't mean that in a

36:56

in any other way, than to understand what, what being a first of its kind actually means in terms of what we see in terms of the order

37:07

limits. So Mr. Ibram zada, on behalf of the applicant, we we have been working with the licensor of those packages to gain an additional understanding of the

37:19

size and also the footprint of those

37:23

piece of plant,

37:26

as far as reasonable, practical for nature, for project of this nature at this stage. So I feel like those so that understanding from the license source has helped us to inform a reasonable to account for a reasonable footprint in the birth packages that I was referring to earlier, and also in the the divider order limits

37:52

the I think, as I was saying earlier, the

37:57

as The design progresses towards the detailed design phase

38:02

there will be.

38:04

So we will be looking to finalize the final siting of those,

38:09

and also

38:11

to confirm the locations of that infrastructure as provided for indeed, wider Rochester envelope work plans.

38:20

Okay, that's finally, I think it's just, it's just worth noting that, you know, the Rochdale

38:25

decision, the original decision, talks about a cautious, worst case approach. And I'm just trying to make sure that that we're, you know, with the fact that this is a first of it kind we keep to understanding, as the examiner authority, that that's what we're expecting to see, is that cautious, worst case approach,

38:47

and any any other

38:50

commentary about this being a first of its kind, we may ask further questions on that going forward.

38:56

Mr. Philpott, I see you've you've turned your camera on.

39:01

Yes. So how would Philpott Casey on behalf of the applicant, simply to pick up the point about Rochdale envelope and the approach? Because, rather than that being an engineering matter for Mr. Ibrahim tsardi, it's that's really a legal point. And my understanding is that whilst the

39:19

the envelope that has been used to identify the

39:25

where exactly the works might go on the main site is relatively broad. In that sense, the environmental impact assessment has assessed the project with those parameters in mind. And so when it comes to any impact that might be different depending on where exactly within the main site, the various plant that will be authorized are located that has been reflected in the EIA and therefore in the ES and as you'll have seen in.

40:00

Level of flexibility. And therefore the extent of the Rochdale envelope decreases significantly when one moves beyond the main site. And so that, of course, is reflected in the assessment those elements as well. And so it is in terms of that first of a kind aspect which is confined, as I understand it, to the main site. So far as there is flexibility, my understanding is it has been properly assessed.

40:31

Thank you. Mr. Hayward, no inference that it wasn't being properly assessed in the overall environmental statement. But having come across the first of its kind statement, I think it was just worthy of understanding what that mean meant in actually being reflected in the the order limits. And I think that's been addressed by by both of you. Thank you very much. I think just to finalize that point about the first of its kind statements, and I think

41:00

you covered this, Mr. Ibrahim Zadi, by giving us the order numbers, which is really helpful.

41:09

We're assuming that the design of the pipelines out with works numbers one A, one and one A, two that you've mentioned aren't subject to the definition of your view that it's a first of a kind design. So we're really very much limiting it to those two works elements.

41:29

Thank you, sir, Mr. Ibrahimzada, on behalf of the applicant, that assumption is correct. Thank you. That's, that's, that's really helpful to have that clarified.

41:41

Do I have any any comments at this point from any interested parties? As I said, there's plenty of opportunity going through, but this one was very much about the first of its kind design.

41:56

Okay, yes, Mrs. Sarah Gilly Baker's consulting on behalf of BOC limited.

42:07

The comments we would like to make obviously relate to, to this point, about the first of its kind, and the level of design that the applicant has been able to achieve in this main, main site area for the for the hydrogen production facility and its associated connections. BAC has two pipelines in this area, an oxygen and a nitrogen pipeline, which have the potential to be impacted by multiple works listed by the applicant.

42:37

And so obviously, he's obviously explained that the detailed design of this main site

42:45

cannot be cannot be decided until further along, once a contractor has been appointed, and this will determine the footprint and actual size of the of of The plant in this area.

42:59

So in this respect, our view is that the extent of the impact on on the pipelines here on bocs interests cannot be confirmed, and therefore at this point, it's difficult to understand what mitigation to avoid any impacts on on these pipelines can be delivered, and whether it can be delivered in the order limits when there is no detail designed to to understand what exactly the impact is.

43:30

Thank you, Mrs. Goodyear. I'm going to save that to Item four, because there's a very specific point about very specifically about that at item four. So, so thank you for your for your question. But in this case, I know I said we take them as they come, but there's a very specific point about that, the first question in item four, so I will bring you back back on that point, if that's okay. Okay, Mr. Henderson,

43:58

thank you, sir. Tom Henderson, for the South eastbury. So I was just to check I was proposing to hear the applicant's responses to your various sub bullets on Agenda Item three, I and then come in at the end of Agenda Item three, I, before you move on. So if that's acceptable, I'll wait till the end of the agenda that's absolutely fine. Yep. No, that's absolutely fine. Thank you.

44:21

Thank you very much. Okay, so I'm going to be I'm going to move on to bullet point two, regarding the the order limits and how they've been established in existing corridors.

44:35

Again, in the design and access statement, paragraph five, point 2.9,

44:41

explains that existing infrastructure corridors will be used where possible. So can I ask the applicant, Mr. Ibrahim, is that

44:51

if you can explain and detail where this is going to be the case, where existing pipeline structures will be used, and again, how the order limits have been assessed?

45:00

Established in these locations, please.

45:03

Thank you, sir, Mr. On behalf of the applicant,

45:08

our routing philosophy for the pipeline network for the proposed development has generally been to follow existing and established pipeline corridors where possible, namely the pipeline corridor, known as the link line corridor

45:23

in the T side area,

45:25

which is which dates back to the the ICI times in the T side area. But

45:34

a lot of the existing operators and developers in the T side area use this pipeline corridor through their pipelines and convey various fluids, including chemicals

45:47

and fossil fuels, among other mediums, to transport their

45:53

to transport their mediums. So we are also looking where we can, by going to industrial centers where we can we are also using look continues, the existing pipeline, Link, line, corridor. And the reasoning behind this is that by using the existing by following the existing convention, if you like, in the area, we are looking to minimize land take outside of the established industrial areas.

46:18

The nature of the works in that existing

46:23

I'll refer to it as the link line corridor, is going to involve where

46:29

pipeline supports exist. The nature of the works will include installation of annotation or hydrogen pipeline on those supports, where the where such supports do not exist. The nature of the works are going to include installation of additional

46:47

concrete supports at the current at the levels that are currently there, in terms of heights, which are referred to as total and on supports in the area

46:58

where these supports do not exist, to support the new pipeline built to look into extend this existing Toblerone supports and install a new pipeline adjacent to the

47:10

other infrastructure that stage. The nature of those works is going to involve.

47:16

It's usually the proposed hydrogen pipeline is usually going to either side of the existing corridor with the existing pipelines, depending on where this where there's space left, but it's on the left or the right of the existing corridors.

47:31

And again, so

47:33

as a function of where there is space, whether existing space or scope for this supposed to be extended the pipeline, the proposed hydration pipeline would have to perform what's known as jump overs, to jump over existing pipelines onto the other side of the corridor for them to follow along on space where there's space available to also enable The construction and ongoing maintenance and operation of these

48:01

the this proposed hiding pipeline, we have also included the access tracks to these to this nicline corridor, ignore the limits,

48:12

and also

48:15

so up to the existing fence lines of the established pipeline corridor. And that's to enable access for construction maintenance, as well as temporary lay down to enable the construction of the pipeline.

48:28

I would also like to point out that where the

48:33

where we can we've also made sure that we have kept the order limits very closely, not identically aligned with that of the nztc. Given the nature of the works,

48:47

the installation works are very close to each other in terms of installation of hydrogen pipeline versus installation of the CO two pipeline in the same corridors

48:56

where there is new infrastructures such as pipe bridges or culverts that are needed to enable the construction of a hydrogen pipeline. We've also included for an additional space around those areas as a temporary space for such infrastructure to be built, for a hydrogen pipeline to build and to be laid on this existing infrastructure. So maybe, yeah, that

49:21

means that's helpful to start with. I think the bit that I'm possibly missing from that explanation is how the order limits have been set when there's actually a reasonably well defined corridor and and existing infrastructure that you're going to be using in some locations, the order limits

49:45

change quite substantially. And although there's limited ability to scale on your drawing, some appear to be up to 100 meters wide, where some of the access statements make it suggest that it should be a lot less. And I'm.

50:00

Struggling to still understand why there's quite a variation in order limits

50:07

next to pipelines which are which have got a defined

50:14

existing line that you intend to use.

50:19

Thank you, sir Mr. Eleanor, on behalf of the applicant. So if I may continue with that, with that explanation, along the link line corridor, and I will then move out to further areas where additional infrastructure, including crossings, that are proposed to be built, which means that the order limits, we have to keep the order limits wider than than what it is in the link client corridor. So with regards to the link client corridor, the as I was explaining earlier, with regards the main site, we've also completed what we call early feed, early front end engineering design for the pipeline

51:00

hydrogen pipeline network. And during the course of that, we've performed a number of surveys along the link line corridor. So as part of these surveys, we found out that, as I was explaining earlier, there is,

51:13

as one continues along the link line corridor, at specific sections there is there's space on either the left or the right hand side of the

51:24

corridor, meaning that the pipeline would have to jump over so the existing pipelines. So we've made sure that the the order limits and also the land plans are set out in the the examination library document, ABP dash 008, account for those in terms of new rights and also the as part of the detailed design, the pipeline may also require what's known as expansion groups

51:54

to account for

51:56

either thermal driven or pressure driven or external factor driven stress cycles,

52:02

which will which will go out of the expansion groups would go out of the linear route of the pipeline. So the order limits are made wide enough to account for those which again widely aligned with that of the NZT DC line boundary, the order limits and also the land plans and undergo plants in the shared areas. We've also included, as you've seen, in the the land plans examination library document, ABP 008, temporary possession areas within that link line corridor to enable the build of the pipeline in this established corridors. So in specific parts of the

52:40

this or in specific sections of the client corridor. I will, for example, pick up the river crossing the area because we are proposing to build a new river crossing, either in the shape of a microborn tunnel or horizontal directional drill, which will have a larger footprint than what that's required for a and above ground pipeline, we have made a losses for a larger area and for that infrastructure to be built. That equally applies to

53:10

around the greats and Creek area, which again is an established industrial area because, but because of the nature of the works are significantly more complex than that of installing a pipeline on the ground, pipeline corridor. We have also a lot far wide area

53:27

in that section,

53:29

total horizontal, directional drill to the need in that section.

53:35

Okay. Thank you very much. I mean, I think, without,

53:39

without looking at every, every section, individually, and getting an indication from you, which we may ask for in our questions. I think you, you've answered broadly what I'm trying to find. And I see Mr. Mr. Philpott has put his camera on,

53:58

yes, so I was just going to volunteer. I hope it's helpful. As you've said, you've heard an indication of the overall principle with some examples, but I wonder whether anticipating what would otherwise be a written question if we volunteer to produce a note which explains the varying width along the existing corridor, so that you can see at what point we've had to do something different and why, and hopefully that will help in understanding why the order limits are set as they are in those locations. Yeah, Mr. Philbrook, is a great intervention, and we were going to ask a question about it, and a volunteer, a voluntary, uh, offer is always helpful as well. And I think we will probably be asking for some dimensions as well, because it's quite difficult to scale from from undimensioned plans to understand. And I think it goes back just for yourself and Mr. Ibrahim Zadi, I think it goes back to some of the kind of broad statements and the design and access. Uh.

55:00

Statement about, you know, 17 meters construction with either side of the pipeline. And then, you know, from best, you know, best tries, we're looking at sometimes up to 100 meters. And it's just trying to understand in what context there is a requirement for those order limits to be pushed beyond what you've said as a broad rule of thumb statement, in the design access statement, and I think that's where we were trying to understand from this question. But what you've offered is is going to be quite helpful. Thank you. I think there's just another one element to this question, which hopefully can be covered. And I think this was picked up by the South T's group in their relevant rep, that in some areas, it appears that for optionality reasons, a broad area of has been included within the order limits, rather than two or three defined areas individually. So again, I'm sure you'll cover that response in your written response to relevant reps. But again, it would be very helpful to understand where that that approach has been taken to cover a broader area for a number of optionalities, rather than an area for each individual optionality, if I've tried to make sense of that statement, so yes, I follow the point. If you're happy for us to incorporate that in the note, that might be the most efficient way to deal with I think, I think it will be so unless yourself, Mr. Herwood or Mr. Ibrahim Azadi have any other points on on that specific point about order limits in existing pipelines. Again, I will open this up and we just to remind other interested parties we do have the substantive discussion about design further on in item four. But if there's any points about the order limits being set in existing pipeline corridors, if you have any points to raise now,

56:54

okay, thank Oh, Mr. Henderson, is this your time?

57:01

Thank you, sir. I think it probably is

57:03

Tom Henderson for the South tees group,

57:07

sir. To underpin our comments on this agenda item, and indeed, some of the later agenda items, I wanted to make some brief general remarks by way of necessary context, and then I'll comment specifically on Agenda Item three, Roman one as our in our relevant representation, which is Library Reference RR, 003,

57:27

the South tees group is tasked with the regeneration of the tees works estate, which is the UK's largest Freeport and Europe's largest brownfield site. And it's apparent from the DCO plans that the South tees group owns and manages a significant proportion of the land in the order limits, including the main site and the connecting linear infrastructure. And whilst the south tees group is an in principle supporter of the proposed development, noting that extensive land take over the tees work estate, the South tees group is concerned to ensure that the development comes forward in a way which minimizes the impact on and is otherwise consistent with other development on the tees works estate, so the wider opportunities for job creation are not blighted, and those are the reasons why, in our relevant representations, we submitted our comments in the form of a holding objection.

58:18

Finally, by way of context, the South tees group was extensively involved as an interested party in the net zero T side DCO promotion. And as a result of that process, the South tees group secured reductions in the order limits for that project and bespoke protected provisions on the face of the DCO which I'll return to later. So having set out that context, turning specifically to this agenda item, as with the net zero T side projects, we're again concerned to ensure that the order limits are reasonably minimized and only include a level of flexibility that's reasonably required and justifiable against the outline design. And so when it came to reviewing the submitted DCO application to prepare our relevant representations. It was not apparent to us that that test had been met in all respects. We struggled to understand the rationale for the extent of some of the order limits as applied for when compared to the specific works within those areas.

59:16

And furthermore, it wasn't clear to us that existing or consented infrastructure corridors had indeed been taken advantage of with order limits for those areas no wider than necessary. And furthermore, some of the design elements appear directly incompatible with other development for instance, there's a proposed means of access which is in conflict with a park and ride site.

59:37

I think it's fair to say we're still trying to get to grips with this, and we've seen the applicant's proposed change requests, which, in respect of impacts on the tees works estate, seems very positive on the face of it, though, will reserve judgment until we've had an opportunity to analyze and comment on the

details through the proposed consultation. So those were the remarks we just wanted to make on this agenda item.

59:59

Thank you.

1:00:00

Very much, Mr. Henderson,

1:00:03

and I presume you'll be following them up in your written representations at the suitable deadlines.

1:00:10

We will, sir, thank you. Yes. And just for just for clarification, I you know you. I feel Eve, you mentioned that that you are in discussions with with the applicant. So I'm assuming those relevant representations will be helped by those discussions, and hopefully your questions might be answered with a with those conversations, rather than at this at this hearing,

1:00:35

Tom Anderson for the South East group, so we're happy not to go into a great level of detail at this stage. I mean, I was going to come back to this point. This point at the end, but what I would say is that we do need

1:00:47

to see the pace of engagement from the applicant increase.

1:00:53

We at this stage, haven't been provided with a draft statement of common ground. We don't have any bespoke, protected provisions at this stage, and some of the land agreements haven't progressed yet. And for that matter, we didn't get a direct notification about the proposed change request, so we only found out about that via website. So I make those points merely to say that we do need to see an acceleration in the pace of engagement, and we're very keen to engage with the applicant to try and resolve our concerns. Thank you. Thank you. Mr. Philpott, I wonder whether you might be more

1:01:28

you might be willing to respond,

1:01:32

yeah, so I'll respond briefly, if I may, at this stage. So as you your question to Mr. Henderson, may have anticipated, we are, of course, involved in direct engagement and discussion and negotiation with the South peace group over a land agreement so that with there is, as you might imagine, in that context, good and proper engagement taking place, and any questions that they have, we will seek to address outside the examination, if we can. We're grateful that the change request has been given a cautious welcome, as you'll have discerned from the extent of the reduction in the order limits that is

countenanced in that change request. It ought to be welcomed because it is going very directly to the points that have been raised. And so far as the nature and pace of engagement is concerned, we have the benefit here, as indeed we do have, with a number of other interested parties are following on the back of the net zero T side, DCO process, which established sets of protected provisions and other documents which give a significant head start in negotiating them here. So we're not starting from

1:02:56

a blank sheet. Far from it, we don't anticipate any reason why we shouldn't be able to reach, make rapid progress and hopefully reach agreement with Southeast group and others with the benefit of those advantages. So I don't propose to say more at this stage, we'll have a chance to respond to their relevant reps in defaults.

1:03:17

Thank you very much. Mr. Philpott, Mr. Henderson, did you want to come back on anything? Or are you content to take Mr. Philpott comments and move forward?

1:03:31

Thank you, sir, content to leave it there at this stage? Thank you very much.

1:03:36

Is there any other interested party who would just like to comment? Would like to comment on the odd limits of the pipeline corridors.

1:03:46

Okay, thank you. In which case we go on to bullet three

1:03:52

regarding phase one and phase two. This may be a very simple answer, but one that I I don't understand myself. Can the applicant, Mr. Ibrahimzadi, can you explain if all pipeline services and services are required for phase one, and if there are any that are only required for phase two, and is there a scenario where phase two doesn't proceed and some parts of the proposed development aren't required? Just an explanation on how you know the ancillary works for phase one and phase two. Interact please.

1:04:25

Thank you, sir, Mr. Elder Graham Zadeh, on behalf of the applicant, the entirety of the pipeline network is required for phase one the so if I'm explaining the phase two of the projects, the phase two of the project involves the second production train, which is going to bring additional volumes

1:04:46

to be delivered to customers across Teesside.

1:04:50

But the entire of the pipeline network is required as part of Phase One of the project on it, and it's sized in terms of diameter and flushing.

1:05:00

Such that it's also capable of taking the additional flow from the phase two of the main production plant.

1:05:08

So So out with the pipelines, all the other service connections would be in the same category as needed for phase one and anything that is needed for phase two, it would already be there and sized accordingly.

1:05:21

Definitely, accordingly. Thank you. It was, it was, as I suggested, it might be a simple answer.

1:05:29

Is there any other comments or follow ups from that point about the difference between phase one and phase

1:05:37

two? Okay. Thank you very much. So I'm just going to bullet point for now in terms of the size requirements. And we did touch on this briefly. Mr. Ibrahimzadi, so we may, we may have covered these points already. You have explained in your answer to the first question about the size requirements for the main sites. What I'm really keen on understanding a little bit more is how you have, and I know Mr. Philpott

1:06:07

intervened and as well, and helped on this matter, how you've managed to set the size of the limits of the order when there is so little clarity. And I mean that in, the context of where you are with the design, at the moment, reasonably little clarity on on the design and that need for flexibility. And in fact, I, I was going to mention what Mr. Henderson has mentioned about,

1:06:34

about the other development proposals potentially conflicting with that size requirement. So, so really it's just, if there's anything more you can tell me about

1:06:44

what unknowns are still being established in the design of the main site and how they they've been impacted, particularly in terms of the plan dimensions. A lot of the discussion in the design and access statement and in the DCO is about height parameters. And there's, there's, there's far less about maximum plan dimensions and distances between elements within the design and trying to work out in our in our own minds, how the the Design Pro process and those unknowns have are really working out in in design terms,

1:07:23

so Harry would fill pot on behalf of the app just before Mr. Abraham and Saadi comes in to respond to that. Just to introduce his comments by saying this, my understanding is that although there is, as you picked up uncertainty in relation to some elements on the main site,

1:07:44

my instructions are that the parameters that have been set and the order limits that have been set allow for that uncertainty, so that the uncertainty is not as to whether or not it will be possible to accommodate the infrastructure within the order limits that I'm told the applicant is confident about, and that's why the order limits have been set, so as to allow for that flexibility. The uncertainty is to more about precisely where within the order limits for the main site, certain things may be located in the spatial relationships between them. So that's just hopefully, by way of helpful introduction, where, where the the uncertainty lies, and what that reflects. And then I'll let Mr. Ibrahimzadi Expand on that. That's that's very helpful we feel about, and I don't think we were in doubt that the order limits were going to need to be increased because of the design. I think possibly a question about the opposite scenario is more more more pertinent, rather than a concern that you're going to suddenly need to put another change request in to increase the limits of the main site. I anticipate that might be the case of just the way the matter was introduced. I didn't want you or your colleagues to get any concerns that we might not be able to deliver, that the uncertainty might be such as to question whether we know enough to settle

1:09:14

Yes, and if my inference was that towards that way, then then, thank you for picking it up, but it genuinely probably wasn't so. But thank you for the clarification. So if you're happy for me to just just go back to Mr. Ibrahim zardi, so it's really again, just to reiterate, more of a and you might have covered this already, as I said, more about the, the how, how you can understand your design parameters, when, when you're on,

1:09:45

what assumptions have been made in the design to allow you to have set those kind of plan dimensions and set out of the site?

1:09:55

I'm certain?

1:10:00

With regards to the observed the the auto limits for the main side,

1:10:06

as we set out in the examination library document, a, PP, 012,

1:10:11

we there is a, we do have an

1:10:15

A preliminary support plan, or a layout plan for the hydrogen the main site, the production facility. This preliminary plot plan has been engineered on the basis of the work we've been doing with our previous contractor, and also the design information that's been made available by unwise and source with regards to their specific packages, and also applying the relevant industries and national and international industry

1:10:46

codes and standards in terms of setting up distances between the various parts of the domain sites, with regards to safety distances, and also outside of the

1:11:00

defense of the

1:11:03

domain site, so that has formed the basis of the preliminary report plan that's been set out in the examination by document ATP, dash, 012, which is then from the basis for the different work plans as part of work Number one, as set out in the application thing.

1:11:22

So ATP 010,

1:11:25

as Mr. Prupot was explaining earlier, we so based on the pre fit level of design work because of the nature and also the way the project is

1:11:37

as a result of the pre fit level of design work we've done to date with our pre bid contractors, as well as the license source. We think

1:11:46

it's, we think that that represents the

1:11:52

the divorce case,

1:11:55

brush Devon work for the plant. But as I was saying earlier, this will have to be because of the nature of the project, this will have to be subject to ongoing feed as well as PTF design process in the future to finalize the exact site of this point. Okay, that's really useful. I think, I think it probably leads me on to a question that might be, well, how long's a bit of string, if we were to look at the Indicative hydrogen production facility plan, which I think you were probably referencing when you were when you were talking about a design. Do you anticipate that that simple plan engineering drawing changing significantly from the detailed design or or is the detailed design more about the connections and the individual elements, rather than the basic layout of of how this plant will need to be set up.

1:12:52

Thanks, sir. On behalf of the applicant, so because of the nature of the project, as the project moves through the peak, as well as the detailed design phase, it is possible that relevant parts of the

1:13:07

domain, site infrastructure will move within the sub work numbers that are provided in the examination library document, a, PP, 010,

1:13:18

we expect those to be confined to those sub

1:13:21

work packages that includes the infrastructure themselves, as well as the connection pipe racks, as well as cable racks connecting that infrastructure. But we expect those changes. It's not fundamental changes to the design principle of the main site. It's changes within the relevant sub packages of work plans provided. Thank you. Yes, that's, again, that's, that's, that's really helpful to understand

1:13:48

where you are. And I think that just helps elaborate what's in the design and access statement about the difference between where you are now in terms of a design for the main site and and the detailed design developing further.

1:14:03

So I know we've covered this, as I said briefly in an earlier comment. Have I got any any other comments from any other interested parties about establishing the size requirements of the main site with unknown factors? I know

1:14:19

we've had comments from Mr. Henderson about about usage, but I think we've covered that suitably at the moment. So unless anybody's got any other particular points, I should move on to bullet point five.

1:14:36

Okay, I don't know

1:14:38

whether it would be useful to share the vision, the Indicative hydrogen production facility plan at this point,

1:14:51

if that's possible, I.

1:15:09

Yeah, we could just scroll down, probably just to the first the first page, and if we could just, potentially, just go across to the left and just zoom in on the top isometric drawing, please. I

1:15:23

Yes. So I introduced myself as an engineer. I like some plans.

1:15:27

This is really helpful. So

1:15:30

again, Mr. Ibrahimzadeh, could you just, could you just help us to explain what, what's happening in the the areas which are predominantly brown to the kind of the left hand side of of the the site as we're looking at it. Obviously, if we one was to look at this isometric view and the plan you could you could see, uh, lots of elements of the production plant on the right hand side of this isometric view as we're looking at it, but there's very little information about what is happening on the left hand side of this plan. Could you give us some indication of of why that is? And obviously I'm asking the question because it helps set the order limits. But at the moment, there's no discern on the face of it. Apologies, there's no discernible activity happening in those two large brown areas, one in the phase two area, one in the phase one area. If you could explain what's happening in there, that'd be helpful, please.

1:16:30

Thanks.

1:16:33

On behalf of the applicant. So

1:16:36

if I were to just very briefly explain to what we're looking at here, and then I'll move on to the dose brown, brown areas that you pointed to a second because so broadly the the bottom part of the the snapshot of the srina model we're looking here includes the Phase One of the production plant, as well as The associated infrastructure, and also the associated

1:17:02

asthma buildings, warehouses, office buildings and such. And equally, the top part of the

1:17:10

the screenshot of the asymmetric we're looking at here,

1:17:14

includes the the infrastructure relevant to the phase two of the main site.

1:17:20

So with that said, this,

1:17:23

by nature of it, this is an indicative

1:17:27

cost plan, if you like

1:17:29

that we've included in the application documentation the brown areas. So we, as we're moving through the design process, including feed, and actually, I'm including the detailed design phase

1:17:40

of the project

1:17:43

we we will be, we will be gaining an increase of more understanding of the the distances required between different parts of the equipment, with regards to safety distances as dictated by The national and international cops and standards,

1:18:01

and that will,

1:18:04

that will then, in turn, dictate the, if you like, the geographic, geographical spread of the plant, is the phase one of the production plant, as well as the phase two, with those being

1:18:20

set out in the relevant in terms of the geographical extent, set out in the relevant work plans, including work number

1:18:28

one, a point one and one 8.2

1:18:32

that will then that's total the final deciding of The equipment and the plant

1:18:41

to be performed and finalized as part of the detailed design phase, and to appropriate safety distances to be set up between the different parts of the infrastructure and the relevant extent of the resultant geographical extent of the area which that's one part of the

1:19:00

One aspect of it, the other aspect of it is that we will be looking to utilize some of those areas during the initial construction of the phase one, as well as the phase two of the main site, as well as during major

maintenance activities known as TARS, which stands for turnarounds to enable as material lay down areas, to enable the

1:19:26

to enable those major maintenance works to be performed, including

1:19:30

as necessary welfare facilities

1:19:35

for the personnel performing those major maintenance activities. In addition to that, we also, we also, as part of the design, we all, we're also having to include additional buff radius from the hazardous equipment. So the name the hydrogen, the main hydrogen production plant,

1:19:54

and the associated CO two capture and natural gas import infrastructure. We.

1:20:00

To again in line with the International and international design course, to ensure that outside of the main fence line of the main side, the risks in terms of processed risks to the public and neighboring facilities, is kept at as well as reasonable practical levels. So some of that area will also be utilized to do that.

1:20:22

In addition to that, some of the data, again,

1:20:26

depending on the final layout

1:20:31

and the

1:20:33

deciding of the infrastructure will be used for access roads, along with the

1:20:39

within the main site, as well as associated infrastructure like car parks, etc,

1:20:45

okay, sorry, sorry.

1:20:49

How do you finish there?

1:20:51

Yes, okay, okay, thank you again. Really pleased to ask that question, because that's been really helpful. It may be me, but I'm not sure whether that that explanation comes out in the documents as clearly as you've just explained in terms of what's happening in that site. So it may be that we ask some more questions about that, but I, I think that that's that that has been very helpful to understand a little bit more, but we may ask some more questions about that. So I've got a few pop ups of hands, which is interesting. We're sharing. I'm just going to Mr. Henson, I see you put your hand up, but I'm just going to ask Mr. Philpott if he's got any follow up before I come to you, if that's okay, and I think it's okay to stop sharing. Now, I think we've seen, seen that plan. Thank you, Mr. Philpott, so yes, just in light of the fact that you found that all explanation helpful to supplement what you've read or what already, I was going to volunteer that we include that explanation as part of the same note that I referred to earlier. So we'll have part of it dealing with the pipelines in the orderliness there, and then another part, picking up the explanation for the main site, so that you've got that in writing and we can put that in at deadline one. Yeah, I think that'd be very helpful, especially those areas the plan shows you know, you can clearly see where plant is going. But those very large areas where it appears that there's nothing happening, would would be really useful to understand in writing. So thank you for that offer. Mr. Philpott, Mr. Henderson,

1:22:31

thank you, sir. Tom Henderson, for the South tees group. I'll just be very quick on this point, and that was really useful to see that plan, because that really demonstrates the problem we had trying to understand why the order limits were drawn the way they have been in relation to the outline design, from a quick kind of look on the screen that looked to be almost 50% of the site without built development. So we do look forward to a more detailed explanation on that, and we will obviously digest on that and respond to it at the appropriate deadline. I just wanted to make one further point in regard to that and a conscious This is not a compulsory acquisition hearing. And that comes later. I think it was said by the applicant that some of that land was necessary for temporary construction reasons. I note from the land plans, as far as I understand it, that all of this land is allocated as pink land, ie permanent acquisition. So can I ask the applicant, that's part of of their explanation that they address that point as well, because we're just concerned to ensure that the land is is minimized to what is reasonably needed, so that we don't unnecessarily blight land which could be otherwise used for other development. Thank you, Ms Henson, and thank you for being conscious about the difference between this and a CA, hearing, we were very conscious that we didn't want to overlap the two, but we are obviously aware that there could be questions that come out of this that are really pertinent to the CA, so I think unless Mr. Philpott specifically wants to address that, I'm very happy to just say thank you very much. We accept that, and we'll

1:24:00

we'll move we'll move on. So if I may, Mr. Football, on behalf of the app, I simply wanted to make the point. The explanation being given is not that any parts of this brown area are only needed for temporary construction, and what we have, what we've been looking at, is an indicative layout. So the areas that are shown as brown on the left hand side of that isometric view may, in fact, be areas where plant is located, because the precise location of the plant within that plot is not fixed. That's simply an indicative location.

1:24:37

And so it's not it's not that the that these are particular areas which are anticipated to be used only for, say, temporary construction. They may be used for all manner of things. And there may be areas of the site that, even if they don't contain plant, may be needed permanently to be kept clear for various reasons of the sort that you've heard. It's not that one can point to any one part and say, Well, we definitely.

1:25:00

Are not going to put an implant there. Just taking it as a simple example, I was very keen that Mr. Henderson didn't misunderstand the position as it had been explained as he went away from this hearing. That's my only reason for interjecting. Yeah, no, that's absolutely fine, Mr. Football. And I think we we heard the comments about temporary and I think it was a worthwhile question for Mr. Henderson. Henson. And I think you've, you've helped clear that up, both with your explanation and your offer of including that in your your response. I'm going to move on to bullet point six, the last one. Again, I think it's a very short one, and then we'll take a five minute break

1:25:38

in the design and access Statement. This explains the phase. The two phases may not share infrastructure.

1:25:46

Is there any impact on this statement and this approach to the order limits, apart from what we've already discussed, please mr. Ibrahim's zardi,

1:26:00

thank you, sir, Mr. On behalf of the

1:26:04

the applicant. So with regards to the I would like to first point that there is some shared infrastructure between the two cases of the main site, so namely, in the shape of

1:26:18

a number of incoming utilities as well as main office buildings, warehouses, admin buildings and such as such, where there is infrastructure duplicated as part of the each phase. The reason for that is that which is typical for any project of this nature, that is to include that's to ensure

1:26:41

sufficient availability and reliability of supply

1:26:46

of hydrogen to our customers

1:26:50

again. So I would also like to point out that that's typical for projects of this nature to be built in trains or phases to make sure that one train is operational while the other one is visited in an unplanned shutdown

1:27:05

or has been taken down for political maintenance. So because of that, there is some infrastructure that's duplicated across the two phases. And I would also like to point out that with regards to availability and reliability, it's even more crucial for hydrogen market because, as you know, so, hydrogen is a maintenance market with with limited supply, so we are having to include measures in the design to make sure that there's sufficient redundancy to be able to guarantee a certain level of reliability and availability of The plant.

1:27:39

The because of this, this fundamental design principle,

1:27:44

some of the infrastructure is duplicated where there's common modes of failure, and because of that, there's minimal land impact in terms of the

1:27:54

out of the main site or the limits. Thank you. I have

1:28:01

no follow up question to that. And then, unless any interested parties do. I think it's just a matter of clarification for us. I'm conscious that it's half past three, and we've got through bullet point three italics, one, I'm going to propose a short break if we come back at 335 hopefully that'd be sufficient time, and then we'll hopefully pick up a little bit of speed as we go through the rest of the agenda. So yes, see you at 335 I'm just going to adjourn till then. Thank you. Applause.