

AUDIO_LUTON_ISH8_SESSION3_29112023

00:07

Good afternoon everyone and welcome back. Time is one o'clock not Pfeiffer two o'clock not bypass tea as it says about o'clock over there. I'm going to start off with quality. I'm going to pass over to Dr. Hunt, to ask questions on this matter.

00:29

And before we start just for the recording, to the outcome, want to introduce the new individuals who will be representing

00:39

Yes, good afternoon. Rebecca Clanton for the applicant for the air quality session. To my left. I've got Mr. James Behringer, who's our air quality lead. You'll recall him from previous issues specific hearings. And online we've also got to the extent that is necessary to call on him. We've got Mr. Matthew Rhodes, who you dealt with yesterday for transport, just in case he's needed on the freight item queue.

01:06

At Isa h5, we discussed whether significant air quality effects were likely due to use of static conveyors during 24 hour working and the Applicants response the action point ruled out significant effects from contaminated material, but allowed the possibility that conveyors could be used for non contaminated material under permit. Can the Applicant confirm whether an assessment of likely significant air quality effects from 24 hour use of static conveyors has been included in the ES and whether there's the potential for any unassessed likely significant effects to arise.

01:40

Good afternoon, James Bollinger on behalf of the applicants very much similar responses, we gave it issue specific hearing five in terms of

01:49

the assessment was carried out based on an eight hour working day but with all equipment operating at the same time over a wide spatial area and again, assuming that all aspects of work are taking place concurrently, therefore representing a reasonable worst case assumption.

02:06

In terms of the conveyor belts, the

02:11

equipment would be electric if it were to be used, and therefore the dumpers, the dump truck movements that we have assessed, again presents a higher case in terms of total emissions that could be occurring on site.

02:25

Thank you.

02:27

Do the local authorities have any comments on the use of static conveyors or from an equity perspective?

02:37

Andrew Linsley for Lindbergh Council, I think generally, we would agree with the comments made by the applicant. There is guidance on this from the issues where quality management, so in guidance on the assessment of mineral dust impacts for planning, there is some discussion there about the use of conveyors. There's also

03:00

a figure there that compares different techniques for material handling, and looks at the potential for dust generation. And it suggests that if properly managed conveyors actually have a lower dust potential than using

03:17

whole roads. So I think the the view the environmental protection would take would be that if, regardless of the technique that's used, if it's managed properly, we wouldn't expect to see fugitive dust visible fugitive dust beyond the the boundaries. So

03:34

almost regardless of what's used, we would expect to see it managed properly, and we will expect monitoring in accordance with issue to air quality management guidance.

03:47

Thank you. Join us authorities, at funerals, funerals for the heartbeat, your host authorities and no further comments on this point. And just in case it's helpful. We're likely to only speak to the last item on the agenda for air quality unless Roger or myself put our hands up. Thank you. And central beds. Thank you Caroline microteaching central Bedfordshire Council, no we don't have anything to add on this and I don't think we will have much to say on the other Air Quality Matters. Thank you. I can

04:18

see not a lot of questions with a Buckinghamshire Council. No, we don't have anything on air quality and the only other matter we might comments on today's climate change for you.

04:30

And

04:32

if we can move on then the next item I had was just around freight consolidation. The airport's National Policy Statement suggests that freight consolidation could be used to reduce construction traffic and traffic related admissions. Can the applicant confirm whether any consideration has been given to the use of freight consolidation centres to reduce air quality impact?

04:54

James manager on behalf of the applicants, the air quality assessment has assumed that there is no freight consolidation

05:00

As part of the assessment therefore it's representing a reasonable worst case approach, which obviously is you know, concluded no significant effects

05:15

Thank you.

05:18

And the joint host authorities post hearing submissions on is h five referenced a request by North Hartford cheer to provide details and modelled impacts around hitch and Air Quality Management Area.

05:29

Can North Hartford cheer provide any updates on the outcome of this work or signpost to where it's been submitted to the examination?

05:37

If you are asked for with the Hartfordshire hostilities, and I wanted to take that one away?

05:42

Is the applicant able to provide any form of update?

05:48

The hitch in summary notes sorry, James manage on behalf of the applicant. The hitch in summary notes has actually been provided to the host authorities. But it was only offered today. So it's fair that they haven't had a chance to go into it in much detail yet. Could you briefly summarise the outcomes of the note and any particular effects on the Air Quality Management Area?

06:10

Yes, up to the

06:13

note just sets out in a bit more detail the exact receptors that were modelled in the hitch in AQa

06:22

there were no significant effects, predicted as a result of the scheme and on discussion with the host authorities. The sorry, the Hartfordshire host authorities recently, they did indicate that the Air Quality Management Area has been below their ethical standards for a number of years now. And they are considering

06:42

possibly revoking that AQ ma through the different process.

06:50

Yeah, would it be impossible to provide a copy of that note to the examination? Yes, we will. Thank you.

06:59

And sorry, just one last question on that point. Whilst it doesn't identify any likely significant effects, can I just confirmed that it doesn't identify any exceedances of the air quality objectives or potential for air quality to worsen within the Air Quality Management area due to the airport traffic

07:20

jams manager on behalf of the applicants.

07:23

There are no exceedances of the air quality objectives predicted in the hcna q&a or in that area.

07:33

There are some increases as a result of airport related traffic to the scheme. But those do not result in significant air quality impacts.

07:52

Okay, thank you.

07:55

And final question, does the assessment tree the need for any further mitigation and I'm assuming if you are not having highly significant effects, you're not identifying a particular mitigation. James Ballenger on behalf of the applicant? That's correct. There's no requirements for mitigation.

08:16

Thank you.

08:18

And since if next time it was around odour and flies as well. Rebecca done for the advocate. I'm sorry, sir. I'm just gonna say I'm just trying to get Mr. Fairburn in who's who's dealing with this agenda item we've we've whipped through things slightly more quickly than we were anticipating. So I've just sent out a message to speed him into the room. Right. So if I can just hold off on that one for a second?

08:57

Yes, actually, I'll make that point. Sorry, just in terms of the action points. Given that we've now got an action for the applicant to provide the notes. Would the joint authorities be able to provide their response to the notes to the examination

09:12

at funerals for the heartbreaker hosted Darcy's? Yes, that shouldn't be a problem. I'll just need to confirm which deadline we're able to do that for you.

09:27

I'm reassured that he's winging its way to us now.

10:00

So I should just say I don't think the rest of this section will take too long. So you may also want to line up your biodiversity team as well. Thank you, sir.

10:09

Rebecca time for the applicant. I'm just wondering if we move on to kerosene odour whilst he's coming in.

10:15

It's been Mr. Ballenger.

10:20

So a lot of cans comments on the applicants rep three dash 060 submission.

10:28

Highlight reports of strong odours of kerosene, and suggest that proper measures to investigate reports of kerosene odours should be implemented. Similarly, concerns about fuel odour were raised at the open floor hearing on Monday.

10:40

Can the Applicant confirm whether the airport currently has any specific measures in place to investigate, report and mitigate for kerosene odour

10:50

James Behringer on behalf of the applicants, there is a process currently in place managed by lol in terms of being able to report odour, it's related to the noise complaint procedure system that they have in place as part of the outline,

11:06

air quality plan, section 2.7. That's a PP o six, five. There is also the commitment to draft up a proposed outline plan for monitoring and assessment of odour complaints in

11:22

in the future. And that notes will be shared with Luton Borough Council this week.

11:37

And similar to the last point, would you be able to provide a copy of that no to the examination and with the local authorities be able to provide

11:47

a response? Yes, yeah.

11:51

Thank you. And in terms of deadlines, do you have a feel for which deadline MIP

11:58

there'll be deadlines 676. Thank you.

12:08

And in terms of mitigation for kerosene odour, I mean, is there anything that particularly can be done to mitigate the odour, particularly if it's safe from exhaust emissions from planes?

12:22

Trucks Ballenger on behalf of the applicants.

12:26

We note in our air quality assessment that there's no significant effects likely to occur related to odour as a result of the application. And in terms of

12:37

what we're looking at, particularly for the future complaints procedure, that would be around identifying any abnormal effects spills or potential

12:49

issues of not following best practice in terms of fuel handling or other methodologies which may result in increased odour emissions from aircraft or other on airport activities.

13:03

Okay.

13:06

And

13:07

just understand how does that How would this link into any environmental management system at the airport?

13:30

James Bennett drum half of the applicants will have to come back to you to just write that out for you. Thank you.

13:37

Sorry, Mr. Pittman, you had a hand up. Yes, thank you Chair, just to say that there is a potential issue here in terms of local odour impacts close to the airport, in related to certain weather conditions, days like today when it's very cold. And there's a potential

13:56

temperature inversion, which can happen in winter or summer time is a particular weather condition that can give rise to pollution being trapped close to ground. And I think that needs to be borne in mind when we're considering this issue. Starting in terms of the odour, there's two aspects to it. One is close to the airport from on the ground emissions. And also, there is the opposite of the ongoing issue on fuel dumping, which we previously discussed.

14:27

Thank you. And just to reiterate my question around mitigation. Is there any form of mitigation that you're aware of that can be put in place to manage that issue? Particularly the temperature inversion?

14:47

Mr. Pittman? Sorry, I Sorry, I wasn't sure who you were addressing the question to parents. I beg pardon.

14:54

Not in my knowledge. Now. I would ask that of the applicant.

15:03

This fellowship. James Bollinger on behalf of the applicants, I think as I've outlined, it'd be very much focused on determining the cause of the odour, and then mitigating any potential adverse effects.

15:28

Okay, at the last session, we obviously discussed the fuel dumping issue and the response being provided by the local authorities on that matter. Is there any update from the, from any policies about the cause of that issue? And the floor with the Civil Aviation Authority?

15:51

James belladrum path, because at this point, though, we don't have any updates. And we're still following up with the CIA on that question. Okay. Thank you.

16:11

Okay, if we can return to the coder issue. Yes. Thank you Rebecca clutton for the applicant. I do now have Mr. Fairburn, Mr. Jason Fairburn, who is our water and hydrogeology lead who's able to assist

with the odour and flies question. Thank you. So since our discussion about the effects of the proposed water treatment plant at ISA five, the applicant submitted a change request examination respect to the water treatment plant. And could the applicant provide a brief update on the implications of the change request for odour and flies from the facility?

16:46

But thank you, Jason verbund for the applicant. So yeah, with the change notification request, we've got two solutions in the drainage proposals, the preferred drainage proposal would require the foul to go to Thames Water, which would then negate the requirement for the treatment facility, particularly the organics and Moroder, creating

17:07

components the second reserve option with the surface water contamination to ground or to treatment, again, that sort of treatment process would be less odour concern than the Val process.

17:32

And so can you just expand a bit on the process where there would be some odour? What exactly what what is the change in the treatment process? And how does that reduce the odour risk and the fly risk as well?

17:46

Yeah, Jason bourbon, the applicant? I think we probably need to get back to some action through with the treatment process engineers to give that detail. Okay, if you would be able to do that. Could you confirm which deadline you'd be able to do them? I? Yeah, I think next week is the deadline.

18:04

Thank you.

18:07

I just wanted to turn to the local authorities briefly. To the half shared postal authorities have any particular comments or Luton regarding the odour issue now.

18:19

The NRS for the Hartfordshire house authorities, I would defer to Roger Pittman. If he has any question, any comments on this point?

18:27

Thanks. Sure. Just a quick point, really, just to say that we are still waiting the response from the applicants representatives in relation to the reported fuel dumping. I've spoken to

18:43

other local authorities, in the meantime to ask how many of their evidences that they have of any fuel dumping. And there has been no responses apart from a couple of possible issues from that have been

recorded by Luton within the last five years. So at the moment, the numbers of incidents seem to be very few.

19:06

That's very helpful. Mr. Pittman. Thank you. Could you also just pick up the point about the odour from the treatment works the wash treatment plant?

19:17

Yes, yeah, that's something that we haven't been directly involved with. So I would wish to look at that in

19:24

in retrospect, if you don't mind and come back.

19:29

Okay, thank you, and loosen

19:33

Andrew loosely for Luton Borough Council. If I can just pick up on the odour complaints that were referred to in the previous response. There were four complaints

19:44

in some way linked with the airport when I say complaints. More service requests are one of them was actually from Mr. Pittman himself requesting information and assistance regarding the incident that he's investigating.

19:57

None of Well, only one of them.

20:00

specifically referred to fuel odour. That was from sort of our patridge wave. If memory serves me correctly, and wasn't about a specific issue, it was more an observation that the complainant had observed an odour they said every morning, but it wasn't about a specific event.

20:24

Another one was just a general comment about air quality and odour. And then the final to make up the fourth appear to be unrelated. It was about a burning odour coming from a commercial unit potentially near to the airport. So I'd agree with Mr. Pitt with that. We don't get many

20:41

complaints regarding odour related to the airport. And it's something that I've discussed with the applicant and potentially with the new procedure that's coming forward, we can maybe

20:55

have a slightly more unified approach to investigation because I just have a concern that complaints may well fall in the gap between the operator and ourselves. And obviously, we have a statutory duty to investigate nuisance. So in the first instance, I think it's quite right that the operator looks into things because they have much more ready access to what's going on on site. But there always has to be recourse for complainants to raise their concerns with the council, if they're not satisfied with that initial investigation. But I'm sure that will all come out in the the proposal from the applicant and you'll receive a written response.

21:37

Can I just ask the applicant? Is there a mechanism to engage the local authority in your process?

21:48

James maling, on behalf of the applicants, the process set out that will send through this week

21:55

doesn't actually include that final step at the moment. But I'm sure that's something that we can discuss further through the socg process.

22:04

Ken, thank you if you could give an update. And there'll be helpful

22:10

in terms of the timing of that, would that be with the next submission the socg? Or could you give an update in advance of that time?

22:20

Can give an update to deadlines? Six. Thank you.

22:26

And then just in relation to the treatment plant. But yeah, Sandra, nice thing for Luton Borough Council. It was just to maybe make the point that, at least as far as I understand it from the original submission, the water treatment plant was going to be permitted under the environmental permitting regime. Obviously, there's some changes but assume it's still needing to be permitted.

22:51

chastened event for the applicant, yes, subject for the foul discharge or discharged around that would require the environmental permitting regs to define that.

23:01

And the reason I mentioned this is that we will actually need as an enforcing authority, consent from the Secretary of State to prosecute for potential

23:15

nuisance. So in the first instance, it would be likely that Lincoln Borough Council if we experienced an issue with odour would actually look to the environmental agency to take action under the permit. Normally, there is a permit condition. But on to most permits that requires no foul odour over I think it's normally the boundary of the facility, as judged by

23:43

an Environment Agency officer. The reason for this procedure is basically just to stop a sort of a double jeopardy situation occurring where a counsellor might say to take action under statutory nuisance for the same offence that the EA might take action over for a breach of permit. So it's probably worth noting that the EA is probably as relevant as any other enforcing authority with regard to what they were deemed to be acceptable.

24:12

Can the Applicant confirm whether

24:15

the discussions have commenced with the Environment Agency and whether who controls would be a requirement of the permit?

24:23

Jason Fairburn for the applicant? They've not been discussed in the discussions we've been having regards the water wastewater treatment process. We are meeting regularly with the enrollment agency at the moment. So we could bring that up in our next engagement with them an update of follow on meeting. I think that'd be helpful. My My concern is that given the location the facility which is somewhat away from residential receptors,

24:50

it's just worth understanding whether or no to control would be imposed.

24:55

If it's not, obviously there's potential fraud or impact on users of the

25:00

Park is a facility. And at the moment the ES considers there's there's no impact on Wigmore Valley Park because there are no in combination effects on the park there are only single effects. So we Fodor, it also occurs to us as the park, as well as noise, that would be an in in combination effects potentially. So I'm just trying to understand whether that is a potential issue.

25:24

Jason forbid, on behalf of the applicant, yes, we can get back to you on that. I think the understanding at the moment is that the odour from the proposed original Wastewater Treatment Plant wouldn't be a significant effect. There are mitigations that can be incorporated to manage odour through scrubbing system control. So we can cover those in our response to the previous section. Thank you.

25:51

Were there any other comments on the odour point?

25:55

Right. In that case, that was all the mess. So I wanted to say sorry, Thurlbeck a classical applicant. So yes, we did just want to identify as well the fact that the obviously the detailed design of the wastewater treatment plant is a matter that is subject to approval and control therefore, by the local planning authority, subjects and requirement five, so they themselves do also have the opportunity to ensure that the design is such that only two controls are in place. Thank you

26:30

I can hand over now to miss Davies.

26:35

Now, moving on to biodiversity, I want to turn to the potential impacts on wind chill word. So while everyone's rearranging themselves, if we could get as 015 put up on the screen behind me, that'd be very useful Thank you

27:25

Do you want to introduce your colleagues, please? Yes, Rebecca cluttering for the applicant. So I'm on biodiversity today supported by Dr. Paul clack, who again, you'll recall from previous issues Pacific hearing, he's our biodiversity lead. And to Dr. clacks. left is Dr. James Riley, who's dealing with the air quality aspect of this. Thank you.

27:49

So in the applicants D five response, which is rep 5046. The applicant appears to be saying that there'll be no notable moving traffic or emissions from the adjacent carpark and that it's 64 metres away from winch Hillwood.

28:08

So the question for the applicant,

28:12

on if you can can you confirm that you're saying that there'd be no notable emissions from the adjacent car park?

28:21

Dr. James Riley on behalf of the applicant. If we're going to go into the detail of permissions I may need to

28:27

invite Mr. Behringer back who is obviously the one responsible for modelling.

28:31

So but basically, as I'm sure he will amplify

28:37

the emissions from a car park are much less much significant than emissions from a road because obviously, at a given point in time, most of the traffic in that car park is stationary and not emitting. And I don't if you want to pick up anything further on that.

28:50

James Behringer, on behalf of the applicants car parks were included in the air quality modelling and all emissions from those were calculated following the best practice guidance set up by cert because detailed in the air quality chapter 7.1 is 76. And that included start stop emissions. We carried out a conservative approach for that, particularly for the long term car parks, which is what the carpark closest to, which would be in future whereby we assumed a turnover rate of 1.15

29:24

spaces per day, which for a long term I suspect would be a conservative estimate.

29:31

Thank you. That's very helpful. So I can find that in the air quality chapter Then can I

29:37

James bellinger on behalf of the applicant? Yes, that's correct. We'll be able to find that in chapter 7.1.

29:47

Appendix 7.1

29:54

And then the distance

29:56

that's been put to us in rep 5046 was

30:00

To 64 metres.

30:02

Putting aside the unlikely precision of that number,

30:08

looking at the plan that we've got

30:13

I don't know

30:16

which page you need now, it was four of six, if that helps at all, and it was to show which Hillwood adjacent to carpark 10.

30:33

While that's being put up, the point that I was looking to make was it does appear that the car park is almost immediately adjacent to the word and that doesn't therefore appear to reflect this measurement of over 60 metres and I just wanted to check if I've understood that correctly.

31:03

And this is not really a question for me because I wasn't involved the modelling but it's certainly looking at the modelling that was done in the carpark and location was modelled. It doesn't appear to be modelled adjacent to which award so I don't think we'd have to check 64 metres. I'm not sure who invest to check that figure.

31:21

But I believe that that is accurate rather than being adjacent to.

31:29

Yeah, we'll take that away and check and get back to you for headline six. I think that's probably the best thing to do rather than rummaging through these plans. Apologies I thought I'd send through the picture that we wanted. Yes, Rebecca up the applicant, I just wanted to check what was the correct plan because I think the as 015 It's, it's book four of six for the works plan. But I think we were told that maybe it was page 10 of 17, there were 17 pages, I just want to check that we're actually all looking at the same.

31:58

Pretty I can't see that screen very well. But it's not coming out very clearly. But I just I don't want us to give a response to you on the basis of the wrong plan. So don't worry, I didn't give a page I just said that it was on that title. And I wanted it to be zoomed into that corner. So I think it sounds as though you'll need to go away and have a look at that for me anyway, because certainly on the plan when you find it, this is the right documents, you'll just have to keep rummaging through until you find it unless you've got a plan that shows something else that's more definitive, it does appear that they're right next to each other. And that's not reflecting what's being said at deadline five, which suggests that the modelling has been done on an offset of over 60 metres. So I'll need to understand if that makes a difference to the potential effects on the woodland from an air quality point of view. But it's not just about emissions. It's also about dust light, including the adjacent solar panels and noise the cumulative effects of all those which my colleague has just said, there might be some significant effects looked at individually, but the overall effects on that woodland. If it's not been done, I would be interested to see that

33:06

because I realised that its mitigation measures and best practice in the code of construction

33:12

plan and the outline landscape and Biodiversity Management Plan. But I can't see that the residual effects of those from a permanent car park have been calculated anywhere.

33:24

There my next question also has a bearing on the hydrology around that woodland.

33:34

The best drawings I've seen in terms of illustrating the land levels, or figures 4.5 to 4.7 in as 042.

33:44

And then as the Indicative landform drawings on page 79 of the general arrangement drawings part one of three, which is as 018.

33:53

And looking at those drawings, it looks as though there could be quite a severe drop around two sides of the woodland close up.

34:05

And it's hard to tell from the diagrams I've got but it looks as though the drop could be of the order of 10 metres.

34:12

So we touched on the potential changes to hydrology in the last year ring. But this issue still isn't addressed in rep 4070. And it was something I was looking for was the effects of significant changes in topography on the hydrology, because those sorts of drops, we could be having an effect on the hydrology beneath that woodland.

34:35

So the response that you gave me to this at rep 070 focused on the construction, and then the potential effects of the formal drainage system and I can't see that the effects of introducing a cliff around two sides of that will lead to being looked at.

34:52

So, if there's not a reason not to do that assessment, then that's something I'd be very grateful if you could provide for me, Rebecca Clark

35:00

For the applicant yet, we'll certainly take that away. So the question that we're looking at is the effect of the changes in level on on whichever word in terms of hydrology we've got that will will will come back to you for the six ds. And to be fair, you have already provided me with the beginning of that, but it didn't take into account these topographical changes. So if that could be added on, I'd be very grateful, of course. Thank you.

35:24
ologies.

35:27

And while we're on it, I probably asked a similar question for all the sensitive habitats and sites that could be similarly affected. I'm not clear that there are any, but it is quite hard to follow through what all those topographical changes are and some of them are significant. There's going to be some quite large cliffs built around the site. So if somebody you could have a search through and see if we should be considering any other sites in that context as well, I'd be very grateful

35:57

did anyone have any other questions on the matter of winch Hill worked and the assessment of that?

36:13

Apology apologies, I've just managed to switch off my screen I'm going to put it back on again.

37:01

Byte

37:04

turning to the buffer zones around the woodlands.

37:08

The Forestry Commission referred to updates to the guidance on buffer zones for woodlands in their rep. 4169. And the applicant responded to say that they won't comment on speculative changes, will obviously be asking the authorities about the progress on this guidance and the likely timescale for delivery. But in the meantime, has the applicant found out any more about it?

37:31

Good afternoon, Dr. Paul black on behalf of the applicant. We've tried, we've had a good look, we can't find anything. And we do note the wording in rep, or 169. That suggests there's some uncertainty over the timing and whether it'll actually happen or not. We haven't found anything that's in the public domain that gives us any indication as to when or the extent of any increase in the buffer zone. If that helps.

37:55

Not much, but thank you for trying. I'll um I'll be asking them a question about it, then the written questions and then depending on their answer, we might need you to act on that.

38:06

At the moment, I've got the Forestry Commission Natural England and the Woodland Trust all saying that the buffer zone should be larger than 50 metres.

38:15

And the applicant is saying that the buffer zones are larger than 50 metres and are therefore sufficient. However, I haven't been given any basis for the distances that are incorporated in the plans. And I'm going to need to come to a decision about whether the buffer zones are adequate in the context of what needs protecting on what's been done around them. So I don't really feel like I've got enough information to conclude on that at the moment. Obviously, I'll be asking the interested parties for further detail on their concerns, because I think that's probably lacking a bit. But in the meantime, do you want to take the opportunity to expand on why you think the current buffer zones are sufficient? Thank you. Yes, Dr. Paul Clark on behalf of the applicant, mindful of the point that we're going to clarify that you raised us around the figure that we provided and the distances to the car park and reading the forestry Commission's response. Our interpretation is that this might be down to an air quality effect and particularly on operational phase or air quality. And if he wants you to consider when, assuming that the development is built according to the plans, there is there's at least what was withdrawn here and if it's 5060 metre distance to the carpark and operation and we're not predicting any significant effects from an air quality point of view. We just got to make the point then at that point, you've got both the buffer zone hedgerow and then immunity grassland until you get to end to the carpark which is my colleagues have explained isn't quite like a road in terms of emissions and the road to the south of the woodland remains as a an airport service road that's gated and you can actually see the guy on the drawing the drawing so there is a bigger buffer zone in operation than the just the 15 metres which is what we're focused on as a construction phase buffer primarily for route down

40:00

image. So there is a semi natural, natural kind of buffer of 5060 metres in most places. So I think it depends on the questions raised as to how we answer it. But I think we'd like to like to point that out. Thank you. Yeah, that's how well it's not just winch Hillwood. It's all of the woodlands and the trees that need protecting.

40:21

That is helpful. And at the moment, I don't have that set out in writing in terms of the logic behind the buffer zones that you have got and why they are sufficient. Although I accept that with the air quality assessment, it is covered as part of that, but there will be other factors. And if you could get that in writing to me, that would be very helpful. And then I can put that to those IPs that have got questions about the adequacy of the of the buffer zones.

40:52

Rebecca clutton for the applicant? Yes, madam, we're happy to provide that which is talking about timeframes, I think we might need to do D seven for that one. Hopefully, we'll have had the benefit, then also have some of the output of the responses from the local forest and the Forestry Commission as well.

41:13

We obviously need to go through and check all the buffer zones and make sure we've got responses for you in relation to all of those in relation to all the relevant factors that might impact upon the adequacy or otherwise of those. And that's just going to take a little bit of time. I think in an ideal world, we'd have a D sets, because then I can incorporate it in the questions that we put to the Forestry

Commission, and the others. But I appreciate if it's quite a lot of work, and you can't get it done by D seven, then. So be it. And we'll rearrange our questions accordingly. But if it can't be done by T six, I think there probably wouldn't be more efficient. Rebecca klanten for the applicant, well, we'll do best efforts to do if that will that will give you an update if it hasn't been possible. That's great. Thank you.

41:54

Moving on to three t 343. I realise this isn't on the agenda, but it's related. So hopefully,

42:00

we'll be able to have a short discussion about it. So a question for the applicant. In your response to issue specific hearing six rep 4070. You suggest that this tree would ideally be translocated to the adjacent winch Hill ancient woodland, but this would be dependent on operational challenges. It could also be moved to Woodland habitat creation areas, keeping it as close as possible would be preferable for moving the root ball and would also reflect the best practice guidance. And given the significant concerns raised by the IPS around this tree, I did wonder if it might be possible for you to reassure them. If the destination of the tree was confirmed at this stage? Is that something that might be possible? Rebecca, and for the applicant? This is a matter that Mr. wooley will deal would be able to deal with so I wonder if we might roll it back to the landscape and visual session on hopefully he'll be able to give you a firm answer on that. I'm sure it'd be possible, but I just I don't have the right man in the room. That's fine. I'm happy for that to go down as an action point.

43:12

Instead, what do you want me to remember today? Location of tree 343 T four, three. Okay, my neck, because I think you might be quite pushed for time towards the end of the day anyway. So if that's okay, this lesson? Yes, of course. I'm just trying to avoid another action ourselves. But if

43:34

we'll see where we get to.

43:37

I see. Okay, well, in that case, yes. If that was helpful for you, we'll we'll do it in writing.

43:46

Those were the questions that I had on biodiversity. Was there anything anybody else wanted to ask? on matters relating to biodiversity? Mr. Cut fourth, I can see you've got your hand up.

43:59

Can you can you hear me okay.

44:02

Yes, we can hear you. Thank you. I wanted to raise points, which I don't think he raised before about question bio 1.3 which asks for quantification of nitrogen deposition reduction by means of removal of agriculture.

44:20

Now, the nature of the question implies an assumption that removal of agriculture from a given area will necessarily cause some reduction. The applicant's response to this question is to suggest that it's too hard to quantify, but we'll inverted commas in inverted commas undoubtedly reduce, and quote, nitrogen that's deposition from this source and so should be taken into account. I wanted to raise the point that this response is misleading, because it ignores the fact that removal of any land from agriculture will inevitably cause an equivalent amount of non agriculture

45:00

for land or foreign land to be brought back into production somewhere else. This follows inevitably, because demand for agricultural products is not reduced simply by removal of land. Thus, the agriculture and its corresponding harmful nitrogen deposition effects are never removed, only translated to some other location assuming that the demand remains constant.

45:29

Now, even if that other location can never be traced, we can never find exactly where it is, this translation effect cannot be ignored or just treated as within a margin of error. Because it's so large, it's so large it will typically nullify the entire supposed reduction in harm.

45:53

So, the response I submit should have been there will be no reduction in nitrogen deposition to be taken into account.

46:03

This, this applies to not only to potentially applies not only to nitrogen deposition, the idea that

46:12

where the applicant claims some compensatory effect by creating new nature or new woodland

46:21

will often suffer from the same defect without a change in demand for agricultural products, there will always be a similar translation. So whenever

46:31

new woodland is created on old agricultural land, it will cause a corresponding removal of a similar amount of nature

46:43

or woodland as is created and must nullify any compensation or benefit.

46:49

Thank you, madam.

46:51

Thank you, Mr. carnivores.

46:54

applicant, did somebody want to respond to that? Dr. Jones right now behalf of the applicant with regard to the removal of land for agriculture, our our response was not intended to suggest that that it would nationally be removed from agriculture and therefore from the national footprint. But if you reduce a local source of nitrogen deposition, even if you move even if it is moved elsewhere, and of course, that is that is, you know, an assumption. But even if it is moved elsewhere, you're still removing that local source of nitrogen deposition on those specific particular sites. And that was the argument we were trying to make.

47:33

Thank you.

47:36

Were there any other comments on biodiversity?

47:41

Moving on to water is this involve another change personnel?

48:10

Better Cotton for the applicant just whilst I'm everybody's getting ready for the water session this afternoon. I have a Mr. Fairburn, who you've already heard from today. I have to be just a my third along Mr. Phaedo Choudry, who again, you'll recall from the previous issues, specific hearings. And then we have Mr. Marcus Grafton, who is the aviation he's the scheme lead

48:38

aviation director who is dealing with design matters if required, and also online. We have Miss Heather lap who ERTL in case we deal with landfill related matters in this item. Thank you.

48:50

I'd like to start with Thames Water. So Mr. Ashley, are you still online?

48:57

Robert Ashley for Thames Water. Yes, I am online.

49:01

Hello, please. Could we get an update on your discussions regarding the disposal of liquid discharges and the proposal? Okay, yes. So briefly, since the last issue specific hearing, we have continued to work with the applicant. There are more or less three key issues we are looking at. The first one would be what we would term domestic fall water flow as in Fall water from the airport itself and taking them into our network and to East heights the way treatment works, which is the receiving treatment works. We have also then been looking at the impact of any increase in Fall water discharges from the airport on the network itself, just so we protect existing customers from flooding, if indeed, the

49:56

the flow they're discharging is more than the current network content.

50:00

So, hydraulic modelling is currently underway to understand what upgrades may or may not be required to the network to ensure that fall flows are transported safely to the receiving treatment works. We have also been having discussions about surface water. And in respect of surface water, I personally are we in terms split into two aspects really, the first part of the surface water being surface water that has glycol in it as a result of spreading the isoHunt on the taxiways or the runways, and try and understand what the volumes of that would look like,

50:44

and what the chemical compositions would look like. Because obviously, we have to look at that carefully to try and understand.

50:53

If we're going to take them out, they're receiving treatment works, what additional units we would need in order to do that, obviously, in a commercially viable way, because depending on the rainfall event, we may not be able to take every, you know, every cubic metre of that. So those discussions are ongoing as well, there is a second strand of that, which is surface water in summer days, which has no di sand in it. And we are looking to try and understand whether some of that can come into the surface water network we have nearby and try and understand what flows we can realistically accommodate in terms of a flow rate coming into our network, because that would have to be measured carefully or released in a controlled fashion.

51:54

Thank you, Mr. Ashley, it sounds like you've all been busy. And can I check? All this work that you're doing? Do you have timescales associated with it? When do you expect to finish this modelling?

52:09

Right. I think in respect of the modelling, and we may well have to write back to you on that. But I understand we currently have preliminary results of the modelling,

52:22

which was just this Tuesday. Oh, well, yeah, yesterday. So we, we have preliminary results, which we have shared already with the applicant. And hopefully over the next month or so we should be able to tie that down. But we can write to you formally about that. I would have to speak to the head of modelling and terms and get a definitive date to return to you please.

52:50

Thank you.

52:51

I just like to chase through what happens to these different streams then. So for the foul water, where you potentially need to do upgrades to the treatment works that you've got. Thank you for your submission on this matter. But just so that I am as clear as I can be on timescales, if upgrades are required.

53:12

That is something that you've confirmed that you're duty bound to do. But I want to try and understand how long it might take for those upgrades to come online. So can you talk me through the process, assuming the DCO was granted, and that you accept that you do need to upgrade the works? What would be the timescale then until the extra capacity is available? I will probably asked Zack to come in on that. And then I will support if there is anything else. Zack, did you want to

53:46

I think what would be best is probably giving that getting that back to it or in a written form. But just to give some

53:53

just an initial response on that it will be from from the point in which we've established that the DCO has gone through. And we've had some further conversations with the Luton will then be able to understand what their needs are through the development

54:08

to understand what phasing we might need to implement to make sure that the the treatment works can can handle what it needs to when it needs to, but will come back with a with a written response to those sort of timelines that might be included. Thank you funding for that. Is that something you'd then need to put into an amp cycle? Or is that something that you'd expect the airport to pay for?

54:30

The upgrade of the Shiva treatment works and its funding, it's something we will have to put into our AMP cycle and our price review for offer.

54:44

And that process itself can take time content so roughly, but when would your next cycle be if the DCO was to go through? And you complete your negotiations over volumes with the applicants

55:00

fairly quickly, what are we looking at?

55:04

Did you want to take that, Zach, please? Yes. So are we submitted our PR 24. Plan to off what will be do to get the final determination of that later in 2024. But in that draft determination, there is currently not a not a loss of line for this upgrade, as currently the the trim works can take what we've established as the next five years worth. So what it would be it would be phased into the amp following that sort of, if required, it'd be the amp amp nine, that deadline. Oh, sorry, not that shouldn't be

55:44

2030 to 2035. Yes, yeah, between 2030 and 35.

55:51

And then, assuming you got the money for that, how long would you expect it to take to then build the works?

56:01

That would, that would highly depend on the scale of the works required to upgrade the treatment work. So for that sort of upgrade, scheduling, it would come down to the requirements at that stage.

56:13

I think we've given an initial estimate of the sort of timeframes, upgrades of that scale might take and again, come back to in writing with a confirmation of those numbers.

56:23

That's I was, I didn't see the numbers that you provided it was whether or not you progressed any further than that. But it sounds as though it's still quite uncertain.

56:30

To add towards access, because we are currently undertaking hydraulic modelling, we will get a very good idea of incoming flows, and be able to use that to make projections for the future. So we will be very clear on what upgrades we need and how soon they are needed. Please. Thank you. So up to now we've been talking about the foul water. What about the trade effluent? Are you including that in this discussion? Or is that a separate stream that you'll be dealing with? Differently, I'm on a different timescale.

57:03

We are still having discussions with the applicant. But as far as I know, in the hydraulic modelling, we may also add an element of the trade effluent into the hydraulic modelling. So we will be talking to the applicants to understand the flows, they are likely to discharge into the network because their trade effluent will go into the same network anyway. And so we need to understand how much they can stall, what rate they can discharge into our network, and which specific locations they're going to discharge that into, and what impact that would have on existing users of the network. So yes, we will look at that. And that would be worked into any upgrades required.

57:50

Thank you. So you are saying that there's a very good chance that you are prepared to take the trade effluent because you're not duty bound to take that in the same way as you have to take the federal water, you have to correct so we will have those discussions. But we will work with Lutz the applicant very closely to understand what flows and what loads they intend to discharge, and have those back and forth discussions to ensure that any upgrades we make are commercially viable, one for the business, and for the paying customer as well will be funding these upgrades. Thank you. That's been

very helpful. Mr. Slaton? Did the applicant want to comment on what they've just heard? Rebecca Clutton for the applicant? Yes, I think I'm just gonna pass over to Mr. Choudry on this one who can just give you some reassurance from outside.

58:40

Thank you, fidelity for the applicant. So just to add to what Mr. Ashley said, one clarification is that for the fall, I'll start with the order he just described on the founder network or the founder capacity, we looked at the change in phase one, and we

59:04

looked at the passenger demand and also the load that's going into the found network and we found that only during one hour period

59:15

in the peak time, it will exit the

59:20

exit follow this existing follow to discharge going to the Thames Water. So, we have provided additional capacity or storage capacity under

59:32

the proposed development for the assessment phase one, so that we restrict the flow and it is discharged in the

59:41

off peak period. So on that basis, for the Fall water itself.

59:48

We don't anticipate a any improvement is needed capacity improvement is needed in the East height. So then we are going to face to a

1:00:00

estimate face to end date will be. And

1:00:04

from now we are in the pricing field 2020 basically 24. So based on the discussions with Thames Water, we believe that the app the business case for this can be included in the price review 29. And then we'll have another cycle, which is the 2034. So we'll have two price reviews one for the business case and another for the construction. So, we are quite confident that

1:00:32

we will based on that collaborative, what we are doing with Thames Water will be able to agree the improvement needs needed both on the network and on the east side before pricey between the four

so that the application can be made to offer what the next period and followed by the construction in by 2034. So, the start date of phase two in 2035, I think we have a

1:01:01

we have a feasible workflow or the process to implement that

1:01:08

before the phase two becomes online. And just to confirm that

1:01:14

the trade effluent potential contaminated surface water discussion, we is happening at the same time. So when the network document analysis was undertaken, it included both foul water and the contaminated

1:01:33

surface water or the trade effluent. And

1:01:37

we have seen the results that came out recently the Indicative I think only localised improvement is needed and output, I don't think there is any significant improvement in the network is needed. So the main uncertainty or the work to be done is with respect to the east side's capacity to treatment, treat the contaminated surface water, I think the foul water on the network side, I think we have a very good position are working with Thames Water. And that will be that is already reflected in the draft statement of common ground. So we're working on the last remaining issue. And you're pre emptying my next question, which is what's the next step with this then okay. So, next step is we have provided the flow to Thames Water for the modelling, I think we are looking at the

1:02:33

load or the quantity of contaminant that's that might be diverted to is tight. And there are two constraint obviously, that is the existing capacity and also the expansion potential. So we'll be looking at both working with Thames Water. And we are also keeping a Plan B, because there is a water treatment work included in the works description for the proposed development. So if we are keeping the option open, that we might do some pretreatment or partial treatment on site before giving it to Thames Water to reduce the load or the improvement needed or the land constraints in terms of submissions to this examination, what's the next stage for that? The modelling is obviously going to be completed and reported on have we got a timescale for that? I think I'm assuming it'll be in your hands rather than Thames Water to submit that to us? Yes, that's correct. So the modelling is expected to be finished by in a month's time. So I think the new year, so I think it will go into the seventh, or possibly the eighth depending on the outcome. But we're still waiting for the seven day lesson. Thank you.

1:03:57

Thank you, Mr. Lettin.

1:04:00

The backlog without can obviously as well, we do have already in the timetable provision for the further rounds of statements for common ground and we'll be updating it with any further agreed matters. Those who already agreed timetables. Thank you

1:04:19

I want to move on to discussions with the Environment Agency now and I appreciate they're not here. So we might not be able to have a very rich conversation around this topic. But

1:04:28

applicant can I turn to you to ask for an update and I need discussions with the Environment Agency with regard to discharge treated surface water runoff and foul effluent to the ground.

1:04:42

The chase on turbine for the Aklan Yes. So we are continuing to engage regularly with the Environment Agency having fortnightly, more meetings. We're moving forward on this sort of statement of common ground and those will be captured in the deadline six and mission. We've been exploring the sort of pathways

1:05:00

To contenting, those preferred and reserve options in the deadline for drainage design strategy. It's fair to say the Investment Agency have a strong preference for the deadline for drainage sign preferred option where the foul water and the contaminate surface water is discharged to the Thames Valley network. We're also discussing if the reserve option, which is where the discharge of surface and off outer ground was required, what further information would be required, and we're working through the design principles that have been put in place to secure those constraints such as no hazardous, no pollution required. We understand from meetings with investment agency that they're currently reviewing the trench design statement from deadline for the updated hydrogeological risk assessment and the other documents. But we are looking to agree within the statement of common ground possibly not at deadline six, but that may be at the next deadline to get that that pathway for both consent, pathways to be agreed and the bounds of the design principles adjusted to support that process.

1:06:11

Obviously, you can't speak on behalf of the Environment Agency. And I will be asking these questions. But I get the impression from you that Environment Agency sounds as though they're more positive about the idea of discharging to the ground, and they were at the beginning of the examination, then? I think so. Yeah, I think we've been exploring the design principles and how they offer those protections and the requirements of ultimate permitting of non polluting no hazardous and then developing and covering a bit more on the sort of treatment solutions that are available, obviously, where we are now common where we will be in phase two in the 2030s. At the moment wastewater our water can where required be treated for direct or indirect rate use or there is technology available?

1:06:53

And obviously meeting the requirements of the consent down the line.

1:06:58

So yeah, definitely going in the right direction.

1:07:01

I'll ask the Environment Agency about that through written questions. But you're anticipating on giving us a full update and the statement of common ground then that's the next time we'll have you on this is it. Jason Burbank, we happen yesterday, we've got the updates in deadline six document for next week. Great. Thank you, Miss Davis disconfirm. I've put it as an action point for the Environment Agency to listen to this recording to respond to deadlines sick so that that can feed into any questions.

1:07:37

Was there anybody else who wanted to comment on that matter discharge to the ground? I know affinity water, you've raised concerns about that.

1:07:49

Mr. Farley, is that he's still on the line.

1:07:54

Yes, I'm indeed, madam.

1:07:56

We've had

1:07:59

very regular meetings also with

1:08:02

the applicant, and likewise are in a reasonable position, we think in the way the discharge is going. Like as with the Environment Agency, our preference is if possible, that it takes it to 10 water. And that would actually obviate a lot of the issues that could otherwise be rising.

1:08:21

Thank you.

1:08:44

Also, questions for the Environment Agency, around the risk towards quality works in and around the landfill materials. And I do appreciate that our job is not to duplicate existing pollution regimes. But I want to try and understand in principle, whether or not the Environment Agency are happy with what's being proposed. So looking at the piling and the landfill works, waste recovery plan and the related hydrogeological risk assessment. All these things were going to be developed in the background. I wondered if you give me an update on your discussions on those matters. And if they're positive or not, for a better client for the applicant? I think this is a an entry where I'll need to call on Miss Lapponia till

1:09:25

A Yes, thank you have a lower budget at all for the applicant. And so, yes, we've been having discussions with the Environment Agency.

1:09:34

And the applicant is obviously

1:09:37

producing the waste recovery plan, as outlined before.

1:09:44

The Environment Agency have also given us some further advice about

1:09:53

recent guidance that they developed, about piling through landfills however, that end

1:10:00

has not been formally issued yet, that's only been issued to us as a to the applicant as a sort of guidance note at this stage. So the applicant is considering how that guidance may have to be or may could be in the future incorporated into the sort of proposed development plans

1:10:23

and requirements that would need to be followed, for example, the applicant is aware that they may need something like a groundwater authorization, which again, would require them

1:10:38

specific,

1:10:40

specific consideration of measures to protect and limit

1:10:45

risks to groundwater. So as you recall, there's also the

1:10:51

HRA piling, that will document that will be produced, which kind of goes with the deposit for recovery permit. So there will be further risk assessments that will be produced. And I think at this stage, the Environment Agency is

1:11:10

in agreement with the approach that we're taking in terms of the applicant has to provide all of this documentation. But obviously,

1:11:21

will need to see those documents to be able to,

1:11:26

to further comment on those. Thank you. At the beginning of the examination,

1:11:34

you appeared hopeful that some of those key documents would at least be agreed in principle before the examination. So do you think you're on track to achieve that?

1:11:44

So the waste recovery plan was slightly delayed from our last to think that the previous issue specific hearing, we were hopeful that that would be submitted fairly soon, however, it had to be delayed as there was updates to the waste quantities that needed to be incorporated in that document.

1:12:05

So that is now again, in the final stages of review. And sort of we're hoping to submit that imminently. Obviously, then that depends on the

1:12:18

the speed at which the Environment Agency process that document to come back with comment.

1:12:28

So when will we hear from you next on this matter? Is that also going to be in the statement of common ground?

1:12:39

I mean, yes, I think that there is an item in the statement of common ground.

1:12:45

And yeah, the statement of common ground will be will be issued in D six.

1:12:52

Thank you.

1:12:56

Did anyone else have any comments they wanted to make in terms of Environment Agency permits,

1:13:02

waste hydrogeological risk assessment.

1:13:06

Thank you.

1:13:07

And the underground liquid storage tanks.

1:13:11

Environment Agency, in response to our first written questions,

1:13:16

confirmed that regard to the landside drainage attenuation tank, which would be constructed within landfill material, and the below ground grey water storage tank which would be underneath the terminal to building that they would clearly prefer that these storage tanks were placed outside landfill materials and in a place where they can monitor them. So I wanted to get the applicants response to that

1:13:43

JSON verb and on behalf of the applicant so yeah, with respect to the P seven car park and the other underground storage within the footprint of the former landfill, we acknowledge and note the government agency response rep 4165 and also a similar response from in affinity water rep for 108. On both of those, in we also provide a written response deadline for to that question as rep 406 and covered aspects of the design principles which were put in place to ensure the structural integrity of the tanks but also the with respect to the risk of possible settlement subsistence, that connectivity to minimise leakage in the response as well, we've acknowledged the options to include monitoring proactive maintenance to reduce the risk of that and discussing the option to include aspects of that in the design principles to kind of capture those extra

1:14:45

mitigations.

1:14:47

So at D five, he did say that discussions were ongoing with the Environment Agency. So are you hopeful that there will be a positive outcome to those or are they still saying that their preference is that those tanks are put somewhere else?

1:15:03

Yeah, I think they're waiting for the design principle discussions that we're having regularly.

1:15:10

Okay, thank you. I'll be putting that question to them on that anyway. So we'll see.

1:15:17

Moving on to the pattern discharged from the implementation tanks and groundwater mounting.

1:15:25

I would say the responses to our written questions on water, were all very helpful. So thank you for that. I still got a couple of questions regarding the risk of groundwater mounting and the flooding associated with the infiltration tanks. So the development will change the landforms significantly upgraded front of the infiltration tanks, and I can't see that it's been taken into account in terms of groundwater levels, is that correct?

1:15:52

The construction, as in the reprofiling of the site and the changes to potential groundwater, the groundwater is you understand is obviously at significant depth, generally

1:16:04

1510 12 metres below ground level, there is reprofiling. So yes, the clay could change. We I think we could probably have a look at that. Okay, back to you. I think that would be helpful. I know, it's an average depth, it does vary quite a lot.

1:16:23

And where the lower tank is going, in particular, probably doesn't have that sort of unsaturated zone. And I think if you're removing all of that area from behind it, we probably do need to have a think about the implications of that for the water table and then subsequent flooding.

1:16:42

I did have a question, it's stated that the tanks have been designed so that they remain dry in all but the most severe of rainfall events. And I can you explain to me what was meant by that, because I didn't quite follow it

1:16:58

either Chowdhry on behalf of the applicant. So, what

1:17:04

we mean there is that obviously, there we looked at the total runoff coming into going into the ground, and also to the ground investigation, we have estimated the infiltration rate at that location at both tanks. And so, there is obviously a difference of water coming in and going into the ground. And the difference of that is

1:17:36

a commodity in the commodity and the storage of storage volume is based on that. And also the storage

1:17:47

from the tank to which is the bigger 170 5000 metre tube. So that water from that tank will also be used for grey water reuse scheme. So that will be taken out taken out and treated. And we're using the terminals for non potable purposes. So when we have the rainfall that exceeds that demands within the airport, then it is going into the ground. So there is a and it's not a storage tank for storing water on a continuous basis. When we have the rainfall, it will be stored and discharged slowly after that it will be dry. And also you're using the water for non potable purposes. So that's that's where we're coming from that is not a continuous storage that will have the risk of infiltration continuous imputation in the ground. Thank you that cleared that up. Thank you.

1:18:51

Going back to the highest water levels, so the levels below tanks two and three are about one metre below the base of the tank at their highest

1:19:02

not allowing for all the uncertainty around that and then all these landform earthworks that are going to be done.

1:19:09

So given that the maximum levels are likely to be that at about the same time as highest rainfall realise it might be a bit of a lag, but it's going to be a similar source of time. Doesn't that significantly increase the risk of flooding in the area? Because you're gonna have the maximum groundwater levels at a similar time and you're gonna have the maximum rainfall where those tanks will be discharging, potentially.

1:19:30

I think Jason Fairburn on behalf of the applicant. So in terms of the strategy for the discharge to the tanks and utilising those tanks as feeder Mr. Choudry just outlined there is significant upstream storage in line there's obviously going to be water reuse is in line with water cycle strategy. The amount of water reuse is going to significantly reduce the amount available to discharge and the water will be available when when that when that rainfall events will be harvested so that will minimise the amount

1:20:00

to water that goes into the infiltration, I think the the sort of risk of probabilities, I guess so the highest levels are the one in 100 year, groundwater so yet very infrequent that those extreme weather events would also the sort of compounded consideration of both of those occurring at the same time would reduce that likelihood as well. We've with the tank two, we've got the storage within the tank. And depending on the different types as for a normal event, there's possibly so four volumes of a normal one in a one year event that could be captured within the storage of the tank. So think the nature of those discharges is very infrequent, we've also got the various design principles that include the consideration for maintaining that one metre on saturate down and no downstream flooding. So as we go through the sort of further define read, refinement of the design with more characterization at the footprint, more understanding of those different options for water reuse, and kind of actual likely discharge into the infiltration tanks that that would be modified to manage. And then the other aspect is with these footprint tanks, they're quite large footprints. So there's natural capacity to infiltration is over a very large area and would deal with the kind of volumes that we're anticipating.

1:21:30

Thank you. Yeah, the default you do say the ends actually design could be full up in two to three hours, which is obviously not very long, but from what you're saying it will just be pulses of water and you won't be forced to discharge it because of the volume. You've got a storage Chase from him for that point. Yeah, the upstream storage to manage the actual discharge arrangements at the soakaway. Thank you.

1:22:00

Probably a couple of fairly quick questions for the applicant. Can you provide an update on any progress on assessing opportunities for improvements to the surface water drainage system to avoid diversion of the nine hectares of the River Lea catchment to the river, remember, and this was something that came up earlier when you were going to do some work in the background on it. Jason Furman on behalf of the applicant, so yes, we did put and that was covered in the written question, deadline for web 1.9. We explained the general philosophy to maintain the integrity of the groundwater surface water catchments, with the exception of that nine hectares over to the west, which was included incorporated during the DCO prep to capture potentially contaminated water into the system. We understand the airport operator has engaged designers to develop the Western drainage upgrades harmful or the curiam applications. And that those work that design is underway with construction plan for 2024 2025. And then that would obviously then remove the requirement for that segregation of catchment.

1:23:06

We understand as well that the employment agency Thames Water and others are due to be consulted on that shortly.

1:23:13

So is that something you'd be submitting to the examination?

1:23:17

Sorry, pardon? Is that something you'll be submitting to the examination?

1:23:23

Rebecca club for the applicant, it's that's a matter that's within the operator's gift at the moment. So I don't think it's something that we as the applicant can submit, that's just the update that we've been given by them. But I suppose it may be possible to ask you a question of the operator. Okay, thank you.

1:23:40

And then at rep 4168, the environment agency confirmed that the Water Framework Directive compliance assessment should incorporate the 2022 interim classifications and the latest River Basin Management Plan. So is has this been done? Or is there an intention to do it? Jason Furman on behalf of the applicant? Yeah, so we acknowledge that response in deadline for the WSD compliance assessment was updated at deadline for Rs. 4027. Really to align with the change notification for the drainage arrangements, it didn't incorporate the WSD update. Although we did introduce the last issue specific hearing, though the comparison between the 2019 2022

1:24:21

and that has been captured now in the EA socg which were just signing off with. So that'll be submitted at deadline six. The EA have agreed our position in terms of the wo t that there's no material change

1:24:36

with the 2019 That's great, thank you.

1:24:43

That's the end of my questions on water. Is there anything else anybody would like to contribute?

1:24:55

Moving on to land use.

1:24:58

Natural England submit

1:25:00

waited a rep yesterday in lieu of coming to this meeting.

1:25:05

It's available on our website.

1:25:10

But in summary, their soil specialist has considered the information and is now satisfied that this address is natural England's comments regarding a soil balance breakdown. There is still an outstanding comment from their relevant representation regarding the soil management plan, but they seem content that that detail is submitted post consent. So, applicant, I wondered if you had any comments that you wanted to make on that submission. And two days ago,

1:25:43

Rebecca clutton for the applicant, and we don't have our soil specialist here today. But the update that I'd been instructed to give was in the same terms as the update that was received a few days ago. So we are, you know, obviously, we were pleased that the information that we've provided with them has been satisfied with them. The remaining comment about clarifying the text in the outline, SMP is going to be addressed in our update in an updated outline SMP, I understand that start with three requirements, or let's start with three requirements seven. So I think that's why they're satisfied that we are taking on board that final comment. Yeah, great, thank you.

1:26:26

And then I'd still like to discuss the need to use the best and most versatile land. So its deadline for in response to action point 17. Rep. 4070. The applicant wrote the following, which was the best and most versatile and was not considered as a specific criteria in the options appraisal.

1:26:48

So I just want to be clear that it wasn't considered as part of that, and if not, should it have been

1:26:56

Rebecca clutton for the outcome and we're going to have to come back to you on that one in writing

1:27:04

something you might be able to answer in the moment one of the things that was stated in the same section

1:27:12

was that retaining with more Valley Park would have required extensive loss of best and most versatile land.

1:27:22

And I was curious to understand why that was the case.

1:27:26

And a Rebecca and the the applicant again, madam will have to address that in a response in writing at deadline six. Okay, thank you Mr.

1:27:49

The defeat

1:27:52

excuse me, the default response also said, and this might be something else to add to the same response. The area set aside for replacement park in the green horizons Park extant Planning Commission was required for excavation and material to construct the aviation platform.

1:28:11

And this was environmentally preferable to importing material, which then made it practical for use as car parking, rather than impacting the best, most versatile and further to the east. So I do appreciate that the carbon emissions of using local soils rather than imported material for earthworks will be lower. But I want to understand the overall impact environmental impact behind that decision, which is going to be dependent on more than just the carbon emissions and that loss of best, most versatile land and whether that's been taken into account. From your responses so far. I'm assuming that's something else you'd like to take away and come back to us on. Rebecca, clap for the applicant? Yes, please.

1:28:52

And that concludes my questions on land. Was there anybody else that wanted to add anything to that discussion?

1:29:04

In which case,

1:29:07

I do have a very short question on green belt before I move on to climate change.

1:29:14

Rebecca clutton for the applicant, in which case then can I just introduce the gentleman to my left

1:29:23

and who I'm actually going to ask to introduce himself and send written over down your details. I'm sorry, Tom. Okay. Um, hello, my name. My name is Thomas Smith. I'm a charter town planner and a technical director at AECOM. On behalf of the applicant.

1:29:39

Thank you for your comments regarding the effects on the Greenbelt. I think we've got one question that we'd like to discuss today in relation to the fuel above ground installation, which includes monitoring systems fuel pumps, landscaping, security, fencing, light, gates, vehicle access track, parking loading area

1:30:00

and some equipment, there'll be up to 4.2 metres height and this would be in the Greenbelt. In rep 4064. You agree that it's inappropriate, but the very special circumstances apply.

1:30:13

But we didn't feel the rep addressed why very special circumstances applied? So would you like to take the opportunity to explain that now?

1:30:24

Yes, Thomas Smith, the applicant, it's to do with what the purpose of the AGI and the fuel pipeline that it serves, is all about. And it's all about taking fuel tanker deliveries off of the road. So by tapping into the existing fuel pipeline delivering fuel directly to the airport, that makes a reduction of up to 134 fuel tanker movements every day to the airport. So, associated with that, then there are clearly kind of carbon quality noise surface access benefits with that reduction in number of vehicles. So that has kind of weighed into the

1:31:08

sort of professional planning judgement, when considered as a as an other consideration to be balanced against the that the harm to the Greenbelt that the AGI particularly would result in. So I completely take the point that it's, there are lots of good reasons to have the a GI in proximity to the airport. Does it need to be in the Greenbelt? Bearing in mind that it's very close to the boundary of it, where it's located? Yes, and I'm not necessarily the expert on this, but I'll give it a go. And I Marcus can jump in if needs be. So the AGI has to be at the it's basically kind of where the new fuel pipeline that runs to the airport where that T's into the existing fuel pipeline that runs through the Greenbelt north to south. And if

1:32:08

I point you to spring the figure up.

1:32:13

It's figure B 1.1. In the Greenbelt assessment, that indicates the approximate alignment of that national fina pipeline that that we are teeing into

1:32:29

a PP. 196 is the reference for the the Greenbelt assessment. So the AGI has to be located at at a point along that existing pipeline because it's required where it tees into it, so you, you can't have the AGI somewhere closer to the airport away from that pipeline, if that makes sense.

1:32:54

It does. But the airport the pipeline goes all the way to the airport through quite big tracts of land that don't go through a Greenbelt

1:33:05

the existing pipeline

1:33:07

runs

1:33:10

did you want to jump in market and market scrapping for the applicant? Now we've checked this I think we made a written submission on this. We checked the the from either direction propose for the existing pipeline is in the Greenbelt, at least three kilometres to the north and three kilometres to the south. So in terms of any practical alternative, would result an extensive environmental impacts of Andover much, much longer spur from a location on the existing pipeline that was not in the Greenbelt. So, we were selected a point to give the minimum length of spur resulting the minimum and the impact on the Greenbelt in totality. But we have double check this there is no real proximate alternative that avoids the suburban and the connection point being within the Greenbelt.

1:33:58

Okay, so that sounds like you've done the balance and come to the conclusion it needs to go somewhere else. But for us to work through the test the tests, are you confirming that it could have gone somewhere else, it's just that on balance, it's better at this location.

1:34:15

Mark has come for the applicant. I think we exhausted our thoughts on this when we were asked just how far the existing pipeline ran through through the Greenbelt. So an alternative would really be not very sensible or logical and put it like that because it would just be so far away from the airport that we've ended with a much, much longer spur and the harm that would would impact other areas in the vicinity of the wider vicinity. Thank you.

1:34:49

brings us the end of the Greenbelt section unless anybody's got anything else that they want to add?

1:35:00

I

1:35:01

think it's appropriate that we adjourn briefly now to give us a brief break and we'll come back to climate change and greenhouse gas emissions. I was going to propose and one,

1:35:13

I'm going to pose a 15 minute break. So if you want to come back at 350