

ISH2 Pt1

0:02

Good morning and welcome. It's now 10:00 AM and I am starting the second issue specific hearing

0:10

for the application made by Associated British Ports for an order granting development consent for Immingham Green Energy Terminal.

0:18

We will introduce ourselves in a fully in just a few minutes. But before we do that, please bear with me while I deal with a few housekeeping matters.

0:26

Can I check if people right at the back of the room can hear me

0:30

OK?

0:32

And could you also confirm that the meeting recordings and live streams have started?

0:37

Can confirm

0:39

recording the streamer started. Thank you. Were there any requests for reasonable adjustments?

0:45

No, thank you very much. OK, so there are no fire alarm drills today. If there is a fire alarm, a continuous alarm will sound. Please vacate the building and follow the hotel team to the Assembly Point located in the front garden directly outside Buttercross Suite

1:02

and toilets are located to my right.

1:06

Onto introductions. I am Mr Hi. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for levelling up Housing and Communities as the lead member of the Examining Authority to carry out an examination of this application.

1:19

I'll hand over to other members of the Examining Authority to introduce themselves. Mr. Hunter.

1:25

Good morning. My name is Mr. Hunter, and I've been appointed by the Secretary of State as a member of the Examining Authority. And today, I believe on matters 3:00 and 4:00.

1:37

Good morning. I'm Miss Metcalfe. I'm also appointed by the Secretary of State as a member of the Examining Authority. Today I'll be leading on item number 7.

1:49

Good morning. I'm Mr Page, and I've also been appointed by the Secretary of State as a member of this Examining Authority. Today I will be noting here in Action Points.

2:02

Good morning. Hi, Mr Sheikh. I've also been appointed as a member of this examining authority. Today I will be leading on agenda items 5:00 and 6:00.

2:13

I can confirm that all Examining Authority members have made a declaration of interest responding to planning inspectorates Conflict of Interest Policy and none of us have declarable interests in relation to this appointment. Also present today are members of the case team. Our Case Manager is Mr Karl Jonas Johansson. Mr Johansson is supported by Miss Gina Shoreland. If you have any concerns or questions about today's proceedings, then please contact a member of the Case

2:42

team.

2:43

The audiovisual service today is provided by a team led by Mr Michael Young. So that's the team on our end. Turning to attendees, we want to 1st acknowledge and welcome those watching our live stream. Thank you very much for joining us.

3:00

I would now like to start with introductions from attendees. When I read out the name of your team, if all members present from that team, please introduce yourselves 1 by 1,

3:11

followed by your introduction.

3:15

My running order today will be the applicant NE Lincolnshire Council

3:22

Anglian Water.

3:25

My understanding is that the Davy family have not joined us yet. OK. IoT operators

3:32

and again, CLDN ports killing and limited have not joined us yet and PD Ports services Limited.

3:42

So if I hand over to the applicant for introductions. Thank you. Good morning, Madam. My name is Harewood Philpott Kings Council. I'm instructed jointly by Bryan Cave, Leighton Paisner on behalf of the applicant, Associated British Ports and Charles Russell Speechley's on behalf of Air Products. I anticipate calling on five other speakers today. I can introduce them now if that's your preference, or as and when they're called forward to speak,

4:13

depending on what's most convenient. Given that there are five, I might just introduce them now if that's acceptable. And as yesterday, their names and credentials will be provided in post hearing notes. So meekly to my right you have Mr. Allen Lewis. He is from acom. He's the environmental Impact assessment lead for the project. To his right you have Mr Adam Varley. He is ABP's project Development manager. You heard from him yesterday,

4:44

his rights. You have Mr Tymon Robson, Air Products Project Director. And again you heard from him yesterday. And then to his right you have Mr Simon Tucker, Director of DTA Transportation Limited. And then I'm currently sitting one row behind you have Miss Fiona Kirkham, who is the Associate Energy Process, Associate Engineer Process Safety for Air Products. And you'll hear from her in relation to

5:16

item 5.

5:19

Thank you very much, Mr Philpott, If you could hear from NE Lincolnshire Council. Yes. Good morning, ma'am. Richard Lemmer from NE Lincolnshire Council Senior Planner. Thank you.

5:33

Anglian Water.

5:35

Good morning panel. Dale Sweetland from Anglian Water.

5:39

Hello.

5:40

Um, don't have IT operators.

5:45

Uh, good morning to the panel. My name is Alex Minhinnick, I'm a solicitor, a partner at Burges Salmon LLP, and I'm here representing the IT operators. Just to introduce a couple of other attendees who are there. In the room with you to the panel we have Mr Stephen Knott who is the Operations

controller and we also have Alan Redfern who is the Health and Safety Environmental and Quality Controller for

6:16

PT. So that's associated petroleum Terminals. Just to make the panel aware, I thought it would be helpful just to make the panel aware the IO2 operators primary interest in the hearing today is to listen to the conversation which happens in relation to agenda item 5. And I just wanted to explain that it's likely that we will leave the hearing once matters on that agenda item have come to a conclusion. And if it is at all possible noting that on the agenda

6:48

that item is listed to be heard at 11:45. I'm particularly would be very grateful if we can run to those timings as I'm afraid I will have to leave the hearing at 1:00. I'm afraid I haven't unavoidable conflict, so I just wanted to make the panel aware of that.

7:08

Sonic will try our absolute level best, but agenda item 3 is actually rather a big one. OK, if we are running late then just remember this recording's gonna be up on the planning inspectors website very soon. If not this week, then next week for sure. So if there are matters that you have missed, then there's always a way to come back to them and writing

7:33

beautiful thank you. But what I can assure you is that agenda item,

7:40

it's agenda.

7:44

It will definitely be in that session.

7:46

Brilliant. Thank you very much. Alright,

7:49

OK.

7:57

PD Port Services Limited.

8:03

Good morning, everybody. My name is Peter Nesbitt. I'm a solicitor and partner at Eversheds Sutherland, and I'm here representing PD Ports Services Limited. Thank you.

8:14

Thank you, Mr Sutherland. Is there anybody else in the room or in the virtual room who'd like to introduce themselves?

8:25

OK, so moving on swiftly to agenda item 2,

8:31

Five points here to set out the procedure for running the hearing today. First a few words to acknowledge the format of the event. This is a blended event. It allows attendance both in person and virtually through Microsoft Teams. It's expected and in fact practise now that both blended and fully virtual events form part of planning Inspectorates operating model.

8:55

The examining authority is attending the meeting from Stallingborough near Grimsby, as are several of the attendees. For those attending virtually, please be rest assured that you have our full attention, even if we're not at all times looking at the camera.

9:09

To avoid visual and noise distractions, please keep your cameras and microphones off unless we invite you to speak.

9:17

The proposed timings of the day will take a 15 minute break at approximately 11:30 AM and lunch around 1:15 PM and a further break at about 3:30 PM. Our aim is to finish at 5:30 PM, but we will keep this under review in line with progress on individual agenda items.

9:36

Timings are approximate, as I just explained. If you're joining on a particular agenda item, we do recommend that you join at the start of the session.

9:46

You can keep in touch with the case team, who can tell you if the sessions are running a few minutes late

9:53

for virtual attendees. If you decide to leave the meeting during the break, then you can rejoin using the same link provided in your invitation e-mail. And of course, if you're watching the live stream, please refresh your browser to resume each subsequent session.

10:09

Secondly, we'd like to make you aware that this event is both being recorded and live streamed. The digital recordings that we make are retained and published. They form a part of public record that can contain your personal information and to which General Data Protection Regulation, or GDPR, applies.

10:28

The planning Inspectors practise is to retain and publish recordings for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision on the Development Consent Order application.

10:38

Consequently, if you participate in today's issue specific hearing, it's important that you understand that you will be recorded and that you therefore consent to the retention of the publication,

10:49

retention and publication of the digital recording. It is very unlikely that we will ask you to put sensitive personal information in the public domain, and in fact we encourage you not to do that. However, if for some reason you feel that it is necessary for you to refer to sensitive personal information, we would encourage you to speak to the case team in the first instance. We would then explore with you whether the information could be provided in written format, which might then be redacted before publication.

11:20

The Third Point is about the substantive matter of today's issue specific hearing, which is titled Land Side Issues Including Draught Development Consent Order.

11:30

An agenda for this hearing was published on the Planning Inspectors National Infrastructure Project web page on Friday the 9th of February 2024.

11:39

Those are the only matters for discussion today. To be clear, it's not intended to discuss all matters relating to land side issues of the proposed development and some matters will be pursued through whines around the written questions or at future hearings. It is a full and ambitious agenda today. We will keep progress under review and we may request that certain aspects are held over and addressed as part of your responses to the first round of written questions that will be issued alongside the Rule 8 letter as soon as practicable after the

12:11

hearings.

12:13

Now the applicant in paragraph one, point 1.5 of your procedural decision, procedural deadline, a covering letter examination, library reference, PDA-001 requested an adjustment to the agenda. The reason for your request is understood and in order to ensure smooth running of both I H2 and I SH 3 tomorrow, and without making a substantial change to the high level agenda issued in the Rule 13 notification. The discussion on

12:44

Story Matters is now split between the two days. This was clear in the detailed agendas issued on Friday the 9th of February

12:55

4th point. Today is a note about how we intend to run this hearing.

13:00

This and all hearings will be presided over by the examining authority and be held in public. The approach to the entire examination is that it is an inquisitorial process. This also applies to this and all

hearings, which means that the examining authority will ask questions of persons making oral representations.

13:22

The examining Authority determines the conduct of the hearing and in this case we have decided that we do not intend to allow cross questioning.

13:30

All comments, responses and questions will be addressed to us and we will address them to relevant parties or hold them over for responses to be provided on a later date. We request that you keep your representations. Be brief, making reference to written submissions where relevant.

13:51

5th and final point is regarding post hearing actions should they arise. During this hearing, Mr Page will be note noting the hearing actions as they emerge

14:01

at the close of the meeting. We intend to go through the entire list of hearing actions, which will then be issued as soon as practicable on this occasion. Given responses to the first written questions are expected at deadline one, it's likely that the examining authority will place many of the post hearing actions in written questions to avoid duplication.

14:21

The assumption is that post hearing actions will be expected alongside responses to the written questions

14:28

at the next deadline, in this case deadline one on the on Wednesday the 13th of March

14:34

acknowledging any resourcing constraints constraints. If you feel meeting that deadline will be difficult for you, then please raise that at the hearing itself. And if it's possible to accommodate a later deadline, we will, we will, we will accommodate it.

14:53

Are there any questions to the points that I've raised

14:59

Mr Philpott, Madam, not so much questions but I've just had a couple of points if I may. 1st of all to thank you and the panel for the adjustment made in response to what we requested in one point 1.5 that has made matters easier and we're we're grateful for that. The 2nd just picking up your suggestion that it where items are not able to be dealt with adequately today, they might be held over. I'm particularly conscious that the questions towards the end about the

15:31

Draught development consent order may take some time in order to respond to them properly. And in any event it's likely that we will be suggesting in response to some of those that we provide a fuller

explanation in writing afterwards. So if we can see how we go, but if that has to go off, and there may be a role for the written explanation at deadline one,

15:56

followed if required by a further hearing to explore those matters face to face in due course afterwards. So I just plant that idea in case we find ourselves squeezed for time at the end.

16:10

That is a good suggestion and I'm not going to be able to think on my feet immediately right now. But what I suggest we do is that I depending on how we're going, I will prioritise some matters where I can at least bring them up at the hearing. And if there is a need to do that, prioritise certain aspects of that agenda item, bring them up to day and then of course you can give an, you know, a high level response and then provide a detailed

16:41

Johnson. Writing

16:43

doesn't seem

16:44

OK

16:46

all right. Anything further from anyone else?

16:52

OK, good. I will hand over to Mr. Hunter for agenda item 3,

17:01

thank you for that Mister say. So gender, Item 3 deals with with construction effects. And this is a a matter we sort of were going to discuss yesterday, but we've sort of carried over and as we highlighted, a bit of crossover between what we're going to discuss yesterday and and today.

17:16

And basically what we've got 3 aspects that we wish to explore with you today. And the first relates to the time scale for the proposed development. And by that we mean all elements of the proposed development. And the 2nd relates to proposed mitigation measures in relation to construction effects. And the third is in relation to how these measures will be secured, managed and monitored. And I suspect as we go through probably two and three may well be taken together because that would sort of make a bit more sense and just a slight change from yesterday in terms of decommissioning

17:48

like to pick that up probably tomorrow and issue specific 3 because there's some questions on on that. So from our perspective that that probably so we'll just deal with the construction aspects and not worry too much about decommissioning and and like I say pick that up tomorrow.

18:01
And

18:02

what I have is I've got a series of questions mainly for the applicant on this. But we are happy to sort of take any points questions as we sort of work through. And if that's the case if you're online please use the the raise hand function or if you're in the room please just indicate that there's a a point that you wish to make. As we ask the questions, I will pause at various points just to sort of confirm and check if anybody has anything that they they wish to say. So by all means sort of wait till till I sort of invite any comments if you if you want, if that's easier.

18:31

So starting off with sort of the first aspect, then looking at sort of time scales in relation to the the construction of the proposed development. And like I said by this we mean all aspects including the associated development. And can I just ask the applicant to provide a very brief brief overview of the likely timescales for construction, the various phases of the proposed development. But it would also be helpful to provide details of any assumptions you have made, especially around the viability of future markets and how this may well have influenced your construction programme. Thank you, Sir. I'm, I'm going to hand over in a second Mr. Allen

19:03

Lewis from acom. And you'll recall that one of the things we were going to do at the end of yesterday's agenda was provide an overview of the construction process. And we had some slides that we had prepared which we think might may be helpful and if we can

19:20

bring those up for the initial part of the explanation I anticipated you mate. So that's absolutely fine. So I'll I'll now hand over to Mr. Lewis from Macon.

19:31

Hello Sir. Hello Mr. Hunter. Hello to the panel. My name is Alan Lewis for the applicant. I'm the EIA lead for the project with over 27 years of experience in EIA. As as Mr Philpott said, we we do intend to just use the the, the remaining slides from yesterday and I think that'll give a good high level overview of the construction programme and then we'll move on to the the formal items under Agenda 3 today construction effects for.

20:01

Item 3.1, Adam Varley will give an overview, something more detailed in the slides of the marine NSIP programme and then Mr Tyman Robson will give an overview of the terrestrial programme

20:18

in relation to 3/2 and the mitigation for terrestrial noise and air quality and other matters. I will cover that, but I was going to suggest that because there's a traffic element that we pushed that back to item 6 this afternoon. But I don't know if Miss Hunter that makes sense for you, probably not unfortunately. You might be expecting. I've got a series of questions on on those that sort of like to go through the specific, but actually there will be some discussion this afternoon on some of those

20:49

Alex as well. So my questions are sort of probably sort of quite high level, but there's more sort of detailed questions later on because I've got some specific questions. I think I'd be quite happy you could just answer the question that I've asked because I'd quite like to be able to follow my notes then I can take off that if that makes sense. Of course, Sir. And we've got Mr Simon Tucker to the right who can, who can deal with the transport questions as they arise. Yeah, that's fine. Thank you. Thank you very much.

21:14

So in relation to the slides, I think the first slide is on the screen now. The indicative construction programme and phasing are set out in Table 210 of the environmental statement Chapter 2, which is APP 44 and that's replicated on the slide.

21:31

As we outline in the S phase one would consist of the construction of the entire jetty access ramp and dredging of the berth pockets, which essentially is all of the works #1 and so all of the ends. Zip and Mr Varley will give more details on that shortly and the Access Rd that's also included. Also included the first phase of the green hydrogen production facility including works on both East and West sites and that comprises the ammonia storage tank and associated process

22:03

and utility units. On Work #3,

22:07

the underground pipeline corridor and culvert which are Work #4 and #6, Two hydrogen production units, one liquefier associated storage and loading and utilities which is work #7 on the West side. And also the use of two temporary construction areas which are Work #8 and 9. And phase one is likely to start in early 20/20/25 with with a good wind subject to the Co being made and are successfully

22:38

discharging requirements with Nell and other parties as we need to. And we think the programme will last between 2 1/2 and three years and those are the assumptions

22:49

in the environmental statement.

22:56

This is an important slide because I think this was used yesterday by Mr Robson and what it does demonstrate is phase one in green showing how extensive phase one is.

23:09

But it's even more expensive than that because as I said on the previous slide, it includes works #8 and 9 which are the use of the temporary construction area is not so shown here. So you can see that this phase dominates the consideration of construction impacts including all of the marine construction impacts and and many of the terrestrial impacts think things like material use and transport.

23:31

And on the slide we also show phases 2 and six and as you you'll be aware those are the latest later

stages of the build out of the hydrogen production facility which I'll cover on the next slide. The purpose of this of that slide simply to show the extent of phase one essentially.

23:51

So for phase two onwards, and this relates solely to the hydrogen production facility, this would be constructed incrementally

24:00

to increase the processing capacity as the market for green hydrogen increases, taking up to 11 years.

24:09

We acknowledge that market demand could accelerate the programme for phases 2 to 6, but phase one would represent the peak of construction for relevant impacts such as material movements, HIV numbers irrespective of the subsequent programme. For phase two onwards

24:27

there may be some overlap between the phases to account for market development and whether demand is greater for liquid hydrogen for HGV's or industrial hydrogen at that time, and that is shown as an example of for phases 4 and five where they are shown as overlapping.

24:44

Again important to realise that the EIA uses the worst case for any topic. So for example, for noise, construction and operational phases 2-3 and four typically dominate the impacts at receptors to the West. So the east side of Immingham and those later phases both in construction and operation become important

25:04

At the start of construction of phase two would again depend on a number of factors including market demand for hydrogen at that point in time, whilst the timing of subsequent phases would be subject to the same tests. So the EIA uses worst case across the piece but again phase one is, is critical to that assessment

25:27

and I'll be brief on on this slide. In relation to operation the operational phase simply because we sort of covered some of the material previously. But obviously for the end ZIP, we expect that to be fully operational in year three with a fair wind you know towards the middle of that but potentially somewhat later for hydrogen production facility phase one against expected to start operation in year 3 comprising above ground piping, ammonia ammonia storage tank,

25:58

underground pipeline corridor, 2 hydrogen production units, 1 liquefier and the associated tanker loading and storage.

26:08

And then obviously the operation of hydrogen production facility follows on from what I said on the previous slide of it will become operational as as market demand

26:19
he finds

26:21
and then the next slide is decommissioning and we'll we'll skip straight past that. I think I'm on the on your advice earlier, Sir.

26:31
So now we're onto item three, one on today's agenda and as I indicated earlier, I'll now hand over to Adam Varley who will give a more detailed account of the the programme for the end ZIP.

26:45
Good morning, Adam Barley for the applicant. As Mr. Lewis mentioned, I would like to share some more detailed information relating to the N SIP construction programme.

26:56
To start, and to repeat what Mr. Lewis mentioned earlier I'd state that all of the works for the NHS fall within the described application.

27:05
Phase one of the project.

27:09
Prior to commencing works on site. The contractor would be responsible for discharging

27:14
or the conditions set out within the Co,

27:18
including the DML Schedule 3 within AP006.

27:26
Initially a scope of enabling works is required. This includes the planting of trees to compensate for those lost in the long strip as part of the works. We envisage this happening in quarter 4/20/24,

27:41
establishing offices and welfare facilities within the east side in quarter 1/20/25

27:48
and establishing a marine loadout facility within either the Port of Immingham or the Port of Grimsby in quarter 2/20/25

27:59
to deliver to deliver the jetty aspects of the project within the required time scales, multiple interconnected work fronts are required.

28:08

The construction phasing outlined in the application is subject to a main works contractor being appointed, but generally consists of the following stages.

28:18

One tree clearance within the long strip, followed by topsoil removal and a hall road construction to facilitate access to the river wall.

28:28

This would happen between Q1 quarter one and quarter 2/20/25

28:35

2.

28:36

As the whole Rd progresses, culverts will be constructed to bridge the drainage ditches on the site in accordance with the drainage strategy.

28:44

This is AP

28:47

210.

28:50

This would happen between Q2 and Q 3/20/25

28:55

three. Following completion of the Hall Rd, the River wall modifications would be completed

29:02

in around quarter 3/20/25.

29:05

The jetty approach ramp will then be constructed followed by the remaining Access Rd Works and Landslide Pipe rack foundations between quarter 3/20/25 and quarter 2/20/26

29:19

in parallel to the landside Works 2. Jack Up barges will be mobilised.

29:25

The first Jackal barge will work from the jetty. The jetty landfall into the river installing Access jetty piles between quarter two and quarter 4/25

29:38

and the second Jacker barge will work at the jetty head installing piles for the loading platform and the dolphins between quarter 2/20/25 and quarter 1/20/26.

29:51

Once the Access Jetty jetty parts have progressed far enough into the river, it is proposed that a crane barge will be mobilised to install the crossheads on top of the piles, primary bridge beams between pile bents and the pipe racks for Air Products.

30:09

The crane barge will work from the landfall into the river.

30:13

On completion of the access jetty substructure it will be demobilised. This will happen between quarter 2/20/25 and quarter 1/20/26

30:26

6.

30:28

The in situ concrete access jetty. The in situ concrete access jetty roadway on top of the primary beams will be installed from land.

30:37

This will facilitate safe and efficient delivery of in situ concrete along the sections of completed jetty access.

30:45

This will happen between 3:45 20/25 and quarter 3/20/26.

30:52

On completion of piling works, the two Jacob barges will be repurposed to install precast concrete and in situ concrete elements

31:01

of both the jetty head structure and the the dolphins.

31:05

The in situ concrete component will be pumped down the partially completed access jetty

31:11

if programme requirements dictate. Maritime delivery of insecure concrete may also be required.

31:17

This we envisage will happen between quarter one to quarter 3/20/26

31:25

fendering quick release hooks, MLAs, marine loading arms and other key furniture will then be installed before the jacket barges are demobilised

31:36

between quarter three and quarter 4/20/26.

31:42

Finally, dredging of the berth pocket will then be undertaken once all marine construction plants has been demobilised. This we envisaged will happen in quarter three to quarter 4/20/26.

31:54

Thank you.

31:58

And now turning to Mr Timon, Robson is going to cover the terrestrial programme.

32:06

Good morning. Tim and Robson, Air Products Project Director speaking for the applicant.

32:13

Thank you. I'll give you an overview of the time scale for the terrestrial associated development. As Mr. Lewis outlined, phase one of our project contains the main components of the associated development such that we can get the hydrogen production facility operational.

32:36

And so the time scale and our schedule for performing that works is very well developed in terms of engineering works, engineering deliverables, procurement activities and delivery of equipment and also through the construction phases.

32:56

Subsequent phases of the associated development, as Mr. Lewis indicated will build production capacity, typically process unit by process a unit and they are much smaller in scope than the phase one works.

33:16

The detailed timescale and the schedule for the subsequent phases is much less developed than it is for phase one.

33:28

Speaking specifically for phase one, so the the key components as as we've outlined are the jetty topsides and the above ground piping to get the ammonia from the jetty to the tank. Our ammonia storage tank which includes a utility units around it, We have our underground pipelines corridor connecting the tank to the

33:57

to work seven and then within work seven we've got the hydrogen production units,

34:05

22 process units, one hydrogen liquefier, the hydrogen storage, the tanker loading and the associated buildings and utility units to service those sites. So if I run through those units, just to give you an overview of the time scale,

34:25

the Jesse topsides and the pipelines associated with that, so works 1-2 and four. They're very closely interlinked with the Jetty construction programme that Mister Varley has outlined.

34:44

Based on award of our detailed design contract being made in the next few months,

34:51

we would anticipate that the first pipe rack

34:55

modules are installed on the jetty as it's constructed

35:00

and we would expect that to be commencing in quarter 2/20/25 and then that process runs through to quarter 1/20/26.

35:10

We expect mechanical completion of that section of the ammonia topsides to be around quarter 4/20/26. And just as a point of clarification, mechanical completion is, is an industry milestone at which all of the components of the process facility are all installed and connected which then leads on to a pre commissioning and a commissioning stage,

35:42

the ammonia tank storage tanks and the associated process and utility units that support it. So that's work three is one of the two main critical paths for the overall hydrogen production facility.

35:59

So that is very key to us. Based on the award of an engineering, procurement and construction contract in February 2024, we anticipate completion of the tank and associated process units to be complete quarter 2/20/27.

36:23

The next section of the underground pipeline corridor that connects WORK Three to WORK 7

36:32

would be one of the first pieces of work that we do following

36:39

DCO consent and associated discharge of requirements. That's because the construction methodology for the underground pipelines causes quite a lot of disruption to works ongoing in Work 7.

36:57

And so we need to get that that work installed as soon as possible to allow Work 7 to progress. So we would anticipate that that work would be complete in quarter 3/20/25.

37:14

The the remainder of the of the process units in work seven. So the hydrogen production units, the hydrogen liquefier, the storage tanks, the tanker loading area and all of the associated utility buildings, site roads, security

37:34

in order to complete the operational facility. That's the second critical path for the overall hydrogen production facility.

37:45

It's it's planned that the mechanical completion for this section will be around quarter 2/20/27

37:53

and commissioning would then follow the commissioning of the ammonia tank and the and the jetty topsides. So we would expect on our current planning that commissioning would be complete around quarter 4/20/27.

38:15

And and just just a a point to note that UH,

38:19

the the overall schedule UH

38:23

for the operation and commissioning of the facility is critical to our products. And so whilst I've indicated the schedule that we currently have, it is our aspiration that we can beat that schedule or at least maintain it

38:40

in in terms of

38:43

key assumptions that go into this time scale.

38:47

With regard to phase one the the the assumptions and the estimates built into the schedule

38:56

are typical. You know they they they feature on aspects like labour productivity how many piles per day that we can install and so there are largely that drives the schedule that we have

39:14

Also featuring into that is, is procurement deliveries any potential weather disruptions. And

39:23

and clearly we have an assumption that we can

39:27

that we can get detailed consent and clear our commencement requirements to allow us to start in quarter 1/20/25.

39:36

In terms of assumptions for the later phases, I think those have been outlined by Mr. Lewis in that they are largely driven by the developing market that we have for this this very young industry. And so and so they're less well defined and also as as noted they they may overlap in terms of how the demand for industrial hydrogen versus.

40:08

To transport hydrogen varies

40:16

Alan Lewis from the applicant. So that's the end of our overview of three. One, Sir,

40:23

that's very helpful. Thank you. And my question actually sort of follows on from that point that you were just making in terms of sort of the market and the assumptions that you've made. Suppose there's two possible scenarios. One is that things don't happen as quickly as you expect, which is from what we heard yesterday, it seems to be unlikely in your view. So what is more likely is that actually things happen and there's more demand than you anticipate and it comes through a lot quicker. What are the implications for either of those scenarios? So for example, if you find that the market isn't quite as well established as you expect or alternatively the market is

40:56

more established than you expect and you're required to deliver soon as quick hydrogen quicker than you you're anticipating. How does that impact on the the programme And from an environmental impact assessment as well,

41:11

Mr Robson for the applicant, if I take the the second scenario first in that the market develops quicker and we need or we have a desire to bring more capacity on stream sooner.

41:29

One of the other aspects of the phasing

41:34

is that from a pure constructability point of view

41:40

it's it's not really possible to build all of the facility in one go that drives it drives site workers

41:51

higher, traffic higher and and the congestion of the site makes it very difficult to do that And and that's part of the reason that why we have a phased approach one from constructability but obviously the second one from market demand the and and so

42:10

the

42:12

the intent is that we will always bring phase one on 1st and we will have that facility up and running.

42:22

The question is, is is at what speed that we build subsequent phases and whether there is any potential overlap. I think the the point to note is that those subsequent phases are significantly smaller than the main phase one build out

42:42

and so

42:44

the effect of potentially overlapping some of the phases still keeps the overall construction and the impacts of it much, much smaller than the overall impact from from phase one.

43:02

I think to answer the the the the first point in in that if the demand is slower than expected, I think as we outlined yesterday all of the drivers for the for the project in the 1st place indicates that that will not be the case and indeed that the ammonia supply that we have contracted to is is also is also available.

43:31

We have allowed UH within the schedule UH the the two year slot. So it's quite a slow build out in in, in any case and we don't foresee that it would be any slower than we've outlined in the in the application

43:47

Mr. Lewis for the applicant just to pick up on the EIA point. But timings obviously covered for it. Mr Robson's covered the, the build out from an engineering perspective and an operational perspective. But from the I perspective it comes back to the point I made on the slides whereby because phase one dominates the the impacts and is so much greater in terms of its material movements, HGV movements etcetera, Phases 2 to 6. Even if you were to compress those, the aggregated impacts of that

44:18

impression would would would sit within the the envelope for phase one. So acceleration of the of

those phases wouldn't cause a problem in in terms of you know any sort of lacuna in the assessment at all.

44:41

Thank you that that that's helpful.

44:44

I was just gonna sort of see if there's anybody this sort of point to put us pause and just see if there's anybody online or in the room who's got anything that they wish to say on on what they've heard. At this point,

44:57

I'm not seeing any hands up anywhere or or in the room and I'm not sure whether any of the panel members have got any particular questions or comments on that. And so now I think that's that that's helpful and providing sort of a good summary on on that one.

45:12

Think what I'd now like to sort of move on to sort of more of the sort of predicted effects from from construction sort of getting to some of the more detail if you like. And but just before we sort of start going to some of the specific topics, there's just sort of one question

45:26

that I have in terms of sort of overarching sort of mitigation and and it comes from some of the points that we just been hearing in terms of the detailed design, it's clear that there are some aspects of the detailed design that perhaps haven't yet been worked up and haven't been sort of fully progressed at this stage. So just considering this along with the time scales that we've been discussing. So how can the Secretary of State be sort of confident that the mitigation which is proposed is actually sufficient to sort of mitigate those impacts given there's still a bit of work to do on those design matters.

45:54

Alan Lewis for the applicant. And I think this goes to the whole sort of approach to assessing EIA that we we assess an envelope of effects and the mitigation response to that addresses that envelope of effect. So as long as the

46:12

the construction works it within that ambit, there's no further need, deep further need for any additional control because the control measures deal with the envelope of effects rather than the effects that that may eventually arise. The envelope encapsulates all the effects that we that we that we think may arise.

46:30

Does that make sense It it does make sense and it's probably the answer I was expecting to to receive. So I suppose that the following question is sort of whereabouts in the the application the US is is that done. So if you're able to sort of sign posters to the sort of the key reference points chapters I and that sort of location. So we've we've got that information in front of us,

46:50

yes Sir and analysis again for the applicant. So the key document that I'm sure that you you may be

referring to it later is the outline CMP which is APP 221 which has been prepared and accompanies the DCO

47:06

application and it's that document which sets out the key measures to be employed during construction of the project. Would you like me to go into more detail or or would you like to prefer that to cover in a follow up, no, I don't there's any need to sort of go into the detail. I think it's just for us to sort of have that that reference of sort of where does this point you've been made are are contained within the application really.

47:28

And so I think that's my sort of overarching sort of kick off to sort of construction and and mitigation effects. And I think the next item we'd like to move on to is sort of terrestrial base noise will be picking up sort of marine noise later on. So I'd like to just focus purely on on terrestrial noises at this stage. And so it would just be helpful perhaps if you can just sort of explain to us the anticipated noise effects from the the proposed development and and also sort of briefly highlight sort of the mitigation measures that you're you're looking to to introduce as well

47:58

of course Sir Alan Lewis again for the applicant. I'm I'm not a noise expert but I'm I'm very familiar with the control measures that that that we do have.

48:08

The most important in terms of control in relation to noise is the the O SEMP and the O SEMP at table two. Does provide the noise limits which will apply at the relevant noise sensitive receptors NSR 1 and NSR 2 which are on Queens Road. Can I just? Sorry, So I'm just going to find that if you could just bear with me a second then I've got that in front of me. So what was the the It's Table 2

48:39

think in Section 3 and I'll try and find it in my own version now just to make sure I have pasted it into my own notes but we'll just have a

48:52

so Section 3 Table two sorry Table 4. Noise and vibration Exam ref Library reference number. Sorry, I didn't scoop. I do

49:02

and it's 221. Thank you the outline, Samp.

49:19

Yeah, I've got that now. Thank you.

49:21

So the the noise limits are obviously a very powerful way of of controlling noise and signing up to those and of course the the OSEM has then to be translated into the stem for the project and it seemed to be the most appropriate way of controlling noise. So just going back to NSR One and SR2, those are the properties on Queens Road and obviously closest particularly to work number 7. And then NSR 3 and NSR 4 are on the east edge of Immingham and other

49:52

this next closest residence. And we set out there the noise limits that would be applicable during daytime, evening and weekends and also importantly at night.

50:05

So that's the main control measure in respect of noise.

50:10

There is also a control in relation to the working hours and the working hours are addressed in Draught Requirement #9

50:21

and particularly Part 2 of Draught Requirement 9, which provides for the works to be able to to to be undertaken which do not give rise to any materially new or different effects than those assessing the environmental statement. And that that gives a further element of control in relation to noise. So I think those two, those two points are the main points of of of quite powerful control for noise during construction.

50:53

Thank you for that and thank you for for those references that that that's helpful.

50:58

My sort of follow-up question probably isn't yourself, it's more for the local authority actually. And and and whether you have any particular issues or concerns, whether your colleagues have raised any sort of point in this or whether you're sort of your sort of general view on the the applicants approach but perhaps their assessment but also their their identification of mitigation.

51:18

Ohh, yes, thank you Sir Richard Lima NE Links Council. And in terms of sort of the high level principles and my understanding is we don't have any objections to that. My colleagues in environmental Health are still obviously reviewing some of the information. But in terms of the principles of how the applicant's gone about it, we don't have an objection to that and we anticipate being able to resolve any issues that we do come across and there with the applicant. Thank you.

51:46

Thank you for that.

51:49

Again, it's anywhere online or or in the room he's got any particular questions just on the noise aspect of things,

51:56

but I'm not seeing any any comments out. I don't know if there's any sort of final points the applicant want to make on on on that, whether you're happy

52:04

Howard, Philpott, Casey on behalf of the applicant? No Sir. Obviously if you have any further questions no doubt will come in writing, but that's what we have to say at the moment.

52:16

That's fine. Thank you. And so moving on to the next aspect which is sort of air quality and emissions and

52:23

this sort of two aspects I think I quite like to cover under this in terms of their quality emissions. First being sort of dust and sort of issues around dust and the second one being around sort of carbon emissions from the construction process itself and materials etcetera and sort of how that's been factored into your your sort of thinking and your assessments. So

52:45

starting briefly with dust and I think we can probably do the same things we do with noise. And the question is sort of just just a brief explanation of sort of your, your mitigation measures, what the impacts are first perhaps and then what the

52:56

the mitigation measures are.

53:01

Yes, Sir. Alan, this for the applicant again in relation to our quality,

53:06

there is a table, I think it's table three, although the references are slightly mixed up. I think it might copy. But there's an air quality table in section three of the O SEMP which is the obviously the document we just referred to and that commits the contractor to developing a dust management plan in accordance with the outline dust management plan which is included as Appendix C of the outline SEMP. So there is a a control mechanism for dust there in relation to

53:38

equality more generally and emissions more generally. We we don't propose a a control measure or a control plan there. There is no suggestion that there would be any significant adverse effects in relation to emissions per se other than dust. And we we don't propose such a such a control measure

53:59

so just but it's probably also worth just noting in that Table 3 on Air quality. The first matter is construction dust emissions. The second matter emissions from non Rd mobile machinery and site plant marine vessel emissions. Rd Traffic Emissions does identify the measures being released. Best practise to mitigate emissions by, for example, prohibiting

54:30

unnecessary vehicle or vessel movements, unnecessary idling of vehicle and vessel engines, encouraging and promoting the use of cleaner engines and and fuels, discouraging single issue. Single users are, sorry, car journeys and so there are those general matters to encourage the contractor to avoid unnecessary emissions as part of a best practise approach.

55:01

Thank you. That that that's the second bit quite helpful except probably sort of then leads on to my sort of next second sort of question in terms of sort of

55:08

and measures that you've taken to sort of look to sort of reduce carbon emissions and both sort of as we sort of discussing plant machinery construction movements of sort of staff etcetera but also perhaps some sort of embedded carbon within materials as well. And and what you're sort of approach has been on that and sort of how you would look to make sure that the sort of best practise and I think Mr has sort of almost sort of given the answer to to how that met will be delivered and and secured through the COT that would be helpful to sort of get some explanation on that as well.

55:41

Yes Sir. If I prefer again to the

55:45

the O sump, which is the document we've referred to earlier, I just find the relevant table in relation to carbon and greenhouse gases.

55:57

So climate change is at Table 16 in in in my version which is page 56.

56:04

And if we turn to that

56:07

page that will outline the approach in respect of carbon emissions.

56:24

I don't know if you got that to hand, Sir, I have, yes, you've got it. You've got it quicker than I have because I'm working on a paper copy. But so you can see that there is there is that the approach there is which is applicable to all, all numbers, all work numbers. So a risk assessment in relation to the severe weather impacts and climate change

56:44

objections, wishful to form part of the design has not directly relevant to your particular point there. But the main contractors, environmental management systems would consider all measures deemed necessary and appropriate to manage those those whether impacts and events. In terms of the greenhouse gas assessment, which I think actually is, is is your your key point. There the measures will be implemented to reduce embodied carbon in construction materials. Examples including

57:16

prioritising, sourcing secondary recycled materials particularly materials within energy intensive processing, utilising locally sourced products and those with higher recycled content wherever feasible, incorporating recycled content into concrete and replacing cementitious materials with secondary materials.

57:39

Designing for minimal waste creation and reusing site one materials wherever possible

57:47

and there are three other bullet points there at the back of the other measures to reduce emissions include switching off vehicles and and those go to the point that that Mister Philpott drew attention to which appear elsewhere in the air quality table. So there are a series of measures there that are captured in the outline semper and of course the SEMP that's the simple steps are brought forward will be expected to to pick up on and develop those further as necessary. So that's the main control mechanism for for emissions,

58:17

carbon emissions. Sorry Sir. Yeah, that that that's fine that that's helpful to sort of walk through that and

58:24

just sort of putting together sort of what we heard earlier on in terms of the time scale that we've got of course technologies etcetera likely to sort of move on quite quickly. What potential is there in terms of reviewing what you're committing to now to make sure that actually in, you know, five years time, for example, 6-7 years time that actually there are not better, more efficient plant machinery, electric vehicles, whatever it may be?

58:46

Are you committed to sort of making sure this is sort of kept continually under review to ensure that you know you're using the most efficient, that you can adapt that point in time? So Howard Philpott Casey on behalf of the applicant. I would suggest that the starting point for that is requirement 6,

59:04

because requirement 6 requires the Construction Environmental Management Plan for the relevant part to be submitted to and approved by the the relevant authority. And that applies, as you'll see, in relation to each element of the works. And so when the the plan is submitted to, let's say it's in relation to land works that submitted to now for approval, they will have to form a judgement

59:36

at the time as to whether the measures that are proposed to reduce embodied carbon are acceptable. And of course, those measures which are identified in the list that Mister Lewis was just running through are examples of measures that could be included. And so at whatever point in time now has to exercise its judgement, it will do that against current best practise that one would expect.

1:00:05

Mr. Lewis, for the applicant, and just just to add to that, in the O sent there is provision for the the submission of more than one final CMP. And we do envisage each phase of the construction and also the marine side and terrestrial sides of phase one coming forward with their own final stamps. So you can see that in phases 2 and six, as those are built out, those will have their own final sentence associated with them. So that gives the opportunity over time

1:00:36

to build in additional measures as as as relevant over time.

1:00:41

Thanks Sir. Thank you. That that's that's really useful. Actually I think Mr Sheikh has a question if I could. Thank you. Just a quick question in terms of you know carbon embodied in the materials that you suggest, but we're using construction.

1:00:54

You mentioned the measures that were being placed including using less energy intensive, you know concrete, all the construction materials. Do you intend to do a carbon life cycle assessment? So that would help sort of helps focus see where the, the major, you know, energy usage comes from and that way maybe focus on where you can sort of make improvements.

1:01:17

Hello, Sir Alan Lewis for the applicant. And there's no intention to do that at the moment. But of course, certainly on the terrestrial side, there's been a huge emphasis on the sustainability of the the, the, the product and all of those embodied carbon emissions are rolled into the carbon intensity figures that Mister Robson explained yesterday. So I don't know if that helps. I don't. Mr Philpott needs to say something else as well.

1:01:41

So yes, Howard Philpott on behalf of the applicant. It comes back, Sir, to the point that I was making earlier about the need for these measures to be submitted to and approved by Nelk, in that if they consider that in order to form a judgement about those matters, they need that, or indeed some other form of assessment to satisfy them that appropriate measures have been taken, it will be open that for them to say, well, we need that in order to make a decision.

1:02:12

And so if if they don't get the information that they think is required in order to show that it's satisfactory, it will be open for them either to request further information and you'll see the mechanisms available to do that, or indeed to refuse it if they don't think it's been justified. And then the matter goes off to be decided by an independent body.

1:02:33

What organisation do you mean? Nelk in the first instance. So Nelk will have to form a judgement as to the acceptability of the final version for that part of the works which is submitted to them for approval. When they get that, they will need to have with it or as part of it information that satisfies them that it's satisfactory.

1:02:56

If they take the view that appropriate assessments of whatever sort have not been undertaken or not been submitted, it's open to them to ask For more information if they see fit or if there's a dispute for that, so lead to refusal. And then an independent person has to determine the application.

1:03:17

Thank you and thank you. I suppose I just have one question which is you've heard the approach the applicant of outlined. Is that something that you or your colleagues are content with or are considering?

1:03:28

Richard Lyman NE Lincs Council? Yes, I think we're content with that approach and there might be an air of caution as to how much expertise we have to determine embodied carbon through those assessments. So that might be something to have a bit of a think about there. Thank you,

1:03:48

thank you. I've got nothing further on to the air quality and emissions in particular, but just before I sort of move on, I just wanna make sure

1:03:56

there's nobody online or in the room who's got anything that they wish to raise on that matter. No, I'm not seeing any hands and I don't have any the panel have got any

1:04:05

other questions? OK now thank you. So the next one is sort of construction traffic and

1:04:12

and we will pick up this later on in the agenda. And I've got sort of quite a specific question that I'd just like to sort of pause if I could, which is taken from the ES Chapter 2, which I think is the LFA P044 and where at paragraph 2.5.35

1:04:33

it refers to a temporary overnight Rd Closures would be required on an occasional basis. And it gives the hours to all construction traffic on LaPorte Rd Queen Jordan Kings Road. And it gives a requirement of approximately 30 occasions over a six month period during phase one.

1:04:50

And really sort of my questions are based around a bit more detail on on those proposed closures, how we've got the 30, are they front loaded, are they spread out the back end of the the construction programme? And has this been discussed and agreed with with the highway authority? And I'm also a similar sort of questions have been discussed and agreed or discussed with local residents, local businesses And if so how will they be notified of of what and and when these will occur? Thanks. I'm going to pass on to Mr Simon Tucker to respond to that.

1:05:23

Thank you Simon Tucker from DTA on behalf of of the applicant. So in terms of the road closures and note that you'd you'd also ask the same question I think

1:05:33

HQ 1.13.4.1. So we will provide a full breakdown of that in detail at deadline one. In simple terms though,

1:05:44

as an explanation, works are required in the highway

1:05:49

predominantly to create temporary and permanent accesses to the site, so that would be sort of standard Rd works if you like. There's also the requirement to enter the highway

1:06:00

to connect to services which are in the highway

1:06:04

and in the May, and all of those works will be undertaken using on street traffic management. So if if we can't keep two lanes of traffic open at all time, there will be traffic lights as you you'd expect.

1:06:17

Very short closures might not need traffic lights, they might just have stop go boards, for example. So there's there's a

1:06:24

a varying level of of degree of how much control is going to be required depending on the on the works in the main construction site access is probably gonna require

1:06:35

traffic management traffic lights for two, two to three-week sort of

1:06:42

The there is a Rd closure proposed and that's work #4 shown on APP012.

1:06:52

If you want to just scrub that, it's on page, it's on sheet 4,

1:07:00

so that's PDF page 7

1:07:10

you've got. Yeah, so you can see work for their crosses over LaPorte Rd connects work site 3:00 and 5:00

1:07:18

and the intention of that work is, is to provide an under Rd culvert and within which pipe work will be provided in due course. So it's basically a bridge effectively to connect the two sites together and then the infrastructure required in terms of pipe work and services under the road.

1:07:37

At the moment, the US assumes that that will require full closure of Report Rd for four weeks.

1:07:43

The process set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan includes for

1:07:52

notification, advanced notification of of those works

1:07:56

to to the local authority and to local residents and stakeholders. And the detail of that will be secured through

1:08:04

the requirement

1:08:06

in the DC that relates to work #4. But at all times there'll be an alternative route available which you can't see on that plan. But if you zoom out, there's an alternative route. Rather than coming down Kiln Lane and LaPorte Rd, you'd use Queen Queen Road and then the A1173. So at all times there'll be a signed diversion route for that.

1:08:31

Thank you. That's certainly the the the divide, the diversion route is something we're going to pick up later on. So that's something we will explore later on.

1:08:38

Just one sort of follow up on that, all of that I think relates to sort of the phase one aspect of Phase 1-2. And three, are there any proposed Rd closures as we then sort of move through the other stages of the developments that you're aware of Simon Sucker for the applicant the the intention is that the predominantly the works will take place during phase one.

1:09:00

I don't think we can rule out the need for temporary entering into the highway during those future phases for connections to services and the like and and perhaps finalisation of

1:09:10

one or two of the permanent access points, but that will follow the same process as as I've described previously.

1:09:19

Thank you.

1:09:21

Probably not gonna do. What I always do is just send to Northeast Lincolnshire and ask whether your colleagues have been in discussion and whether they have any sort of particular comments that they've raised.

1:09:30

Thank you, Richard Lemon, NE Lincs Council. And there are ongoing discussions with the applicant and our highways team. And I think there are various issues as Mr Tucker's outlined there, but they are being sort of worked on and negotiated between the parties. So I think we're anticipating a a solution being able to be found there. No principled objections

1:10:00

that's that's helpful. Do you have an idea what those objections actually are or the the sort of issues that you currently have at the moment

1:10:08

Richard Lemon, NE Links Council. I think it's just understanding the scale of those works and and the extent of any closures and and sort of agreements that need to be undertaken there. So I think it's just that that further round of discussion between the My highways team and the applicants,

1:10:31

thank you very much. Is there anything having heard that the applicant wish to sort of just come back on?

1:10:38

So if I could Simon Tucker for the applicant, Mr Room is right. We are in discussions with with the highway authority about the detail. There are some details which will

1:10:48

to be possibly refined. Now, there are other matters of detail which necessarily need to be controlled by the requirement. For example, the precise length. Once the precise length of time of any road works are known,

1:11:00

the appropriate traffic management will be defined at that point in time, in agreement with with now. So we're just trying to work through which bits we need to fix in the ground as part of the examination and which bits necessarily need to be left for future discussion.

1:11:18

OK. Thank you very much.

1:11:21

I think that probably about wraps up the questions I have on construction effects cause I think certainly the the third bullet point about sort of mitigation measures managed and monitored. I think we've we've sort of dealt with that in the round as we've we've been through. So I think that's been been helpful. But just before I finish off on three in terms of construction effects, just want to confirm if there's anybody online or in the room just got any points that they wish to raise

1:11:43

at this stage. Just sort of final points.

1:11:47

Again, I'm not seeing any hands up. So I think that probably brings to the end sort of agenda item 3 and now that sort of move on to

1:11:56

agenda item 4, which is which is cumulative effects.

1:12:01

So in terms of this what we what we'd like to do is sort of look at the impacts of the proposed development with other planned schemes in the vicinity. I think we've identified 2 in the the agenda which is the Immingham E Rora terminal which I suggest perhaps we refer to as I ERT if that's easier

And then the Viking carbon capture scheme which I suppose we can acronym as VCCS as well. So I think perhaps we adopt those. And the first question was around sort of the long list and the short lists that that we've done. However, just sort of looking at the time and conscious that I think we have asked questions on that in terms of our written questions

1:12:33

as well just to seek some clarification. I'm not sure there's any sort of benefit perhaps in sort of going over that because I suspect we'll be getting the answers to that in, in the written questions. And so I think it would probably be sort of helpful then to sort of perhaps sort of move on to the IRT and sort of that that sort of aspect of

1:12:51

also the cumulative side of things. And and sort of given the construction sort of programme that we've been talking about, there seems to be sort of another sort of potential scenarios that sort of could happen. We could have your proposed element could be in construction at the same time as the the the RT, there could be operational and construction sort of implications and that side of things. And it would just be helpful if you could sort of give us a short summary sort of what you've assessed in the US And and also conscious of that examination has recently closed, is that position that you've assessed

1:13:23

in the same position when that examination closed.

1:13:30

Hello, Sir Alan Lewis for the applicant. Again, I can give you a brief summary of where we are with the iget and I ERT proposals

1:13:41

as you will read in the Cumulative Effects Assessment and there are quite a number of references and I'm not sure if the the panel are familiar with all of these, but I can I can read them out. The chaps are itself is in in the environmental statement is app 067, the detailed assessment is App 220

1:14:05

and there are also a number of others, but I can cover those in the the written responses. I think there's about 6 elements which form part of the environmental statement where I get and I are relevant, but the the the main detail is found in app 220.

1:14:21

So in terms of the scenarios that we looked at for iget and IoT, there were three cumulative scenarios which were possible and looked at that IRT is under construction at the same time as the project at least in part

1:14:38

that is that is operational by the time the project construction for for iget commences and also that IET and the project are operational at the same time. So and that's the expected long term scenario. So those are the three scenarios that we looked at it. It would be helpful to the panel I can give an overview of of the results or or is there a follow up there Sir.

1:15:05

I think another you might be really pretty short of you might be helpful because that will hopefully either sort of cross off some of the questions or might naturally lead into other questions. OK. I'll do a quick review of the the relevant topics then. So a number of the topics were scoped out and and the reasons for those will be given in the the written response. But the of the topics that we looked at, landscape and visual, we don't see any potential for for cumulative effects because they're obviously spatially separated and I hurt his well enclosed

1:15:36

within the port of Immingham said. An opportunity for for a cumulative effect to arise in relation to historic environment. Again there are no sensitive receptors that are so spatially extensive that that that both projects that could impact upon them

1:15:58

for terrestrial nature conservation and there's no potential for cumulative effects as again they're spatially separated and and no very extensive terrestrial ecological receptors.

1:16:11

The same type of approach applies to ground conditions and land quality, again because the spatially separated and major accidents and disasters and

1:16:21

both projects would be managed to be as low as reasonably practicable through the deployment of appropriate safety management systems.

1:16:29

The in the assessment as presented in the application, the only significant cumulative effects that we see arising in relation to Ayrton I get are socioeconomic effects which we regard as significant and those accrue as large beneficial cumulative socioeconomic effects due to the construction of the projects with with with a series of other developments coming forward in the local area and during operation moderate

1:17:00

beneficial effects due to the operation of the project together with IRT and and and and ID 116 which is another project in the area.

1:17:11

I think Mr Tucker can probably talk to the traffic point

1:17:16

but but that's an overview of what we've said in the application to date. And you know I think we in one of the written answers, we have committed to keeping all of this under review providing an updated cumulative assessment at the midpoint of the examination and then we'll do a final version of the CA at the end of the examination. So we can pick up all the any additional detail that flows from from from the I heart information that wasn't available at the time we prepared the assessment of that's helpful.

1:17:47

It is I think that that latter one certainly helpful given the potential sort of time scales and and where they are in in the process. So that would be that would be enormously helpful and I think the transport thing will be quite so cause that's certainly was my sort of list of sort of follow up questions. But again, it may well be that you can sort of pick up pick up those and it's just the the the position that you have you've got to be assessment and the and the effects were helpful.

1:18:14

Thank you, Simon. Simon Tucker for the applicant, Sir. So I have the

1:18:20

benefit, if you like of having been through the eye examination, having dealt with the the traffic matters for for that site as well. So I'm familiar with with, with both.

1:18:29

In terms of I get. Firstly the you asked the question about the cumulative operational traffic effects. In terms of I get the

1:18:38

operational traffic effects were effectively scoped out of of assessment in the environmental statement and

1:18:48

that was because or is because the traffic generation of the site when operational is very modest indeed. It's forecast to generate 50 or 48 HTV loads per day. So that's 96 movements, roughly speaking two or three in and out per hour in terms of HGV's and 120 staff movements across the day. Those staff movements are

1:19:16

working on shift patterns, so they're generally avoid peak hours. And in terms of the overall assessment for the guidance on environmental assessment of Rd traffic

1:19:27

well below the threshold of the 10% change. I think on well in all cases those levels of movements would be within the variation in traffic anyway on the network. So they were scoped out and that position

1:19:41

has been agreed with both national highways and is accepted by Nelk. So there is no operational assessment of of the of the site as it's been appropriately scoped out.

1:19:52

In terms of I,

1:19:54

the the opposite actually was the case, whereas the predominant impact is is an operational one that's been through examination as you've just mentioned and was found to be.

1:20:07

Acceptable in terms of the traffic movements on the local network and and the areas of that local network which are shared with iget predominantly Kings Rd, Queens Road and the A1173

1:20:20

and that position was agreed with Nelk as the local highway authority here. It was also agreed with national highways and and

1:20:29

not so relevant to us here, but also North Lincolnshire who who are highway authority further to the West. So the position in terms of cumulative impact is that Iraq has assessed and been found to be acceptable by the statutory Hwy authorities. I get doesn't have any material or even, sorry, get my terminology correct

1:20:53

the the impact of I get is negligible to the point that it wouldn't affect any outcome of the IT assessment or vice versa.

1:21:03

So there is no cumulative adverse effect at all.

1:21:09

Is that just to clarify that's both construction and operation or is that just from an operation point of view. So from the that was predominantly from the operational perspective in terms of construction traffic. Again if if you, well I could take you actually to app

1:21:28

OHH 5/3,

1:21:32

I'm sorry, we just find it's it's table 1125.

1:21:50

So this is the assessment of construction traffic for iget. As you can see, it sets out an assessment of that, those potential impacts based on traffic and transport as a topic, which is basically congestion and junction operation, severance,

1:22:09

pedestrian amenity, fear and intimidation and Hwy safety. And as you can see, the predominant

1:22:16

conclusion of all of that is that the magnitude of impact will be very low. The only points where there's a above that is on the A1173IN Kings Rd where there's a medium impact in terms of

1:22:29

traffic and transport. That's due to the change in flows. So the proportional change in flows, if you scroll down to table 11 to 6, which is on page 60 of the PDF,

1:22:44

you'll see that those are defined under links two and three there as minor and not significant. So that's the that's the construction impact of of iget in terms of IoT as as has just been said, there are possibly 3 scenarios. One is that

1:23:03

construction takes place at the same time. One is that operational takes place at the same time and and vice versa.

1:23:09

The impact on that that link which is the critical one, the A1173 with I

1:23:17

at being constructed will be less because the construction traffic profile via was a lot lower than the agreed impact of the operational traffic. So although that hasn't been modelled because it wasn't a, it was scoped out of the iget assessment, the the conclusion would be if construction

1:23:38

overlaps, there'd be less of an impact than if operational overlap overlapped, if that makes sense because of the amount of traffic that IRT is generating at at its operational stage.

1:23:52

Thank you. Yeah, that that's helpful and that will come in, in your written. So we can sort of just digest that a little bit if there's sort of any followers on that be that'd be useful. Yeah, it's certainly,

1:24:02

I suppose I'm gonna do it again to the local authority and just sort of ask if they've got any

1:24:06

issues that are they're aware of in terms of that sort of cumulative aspects of the of the two developments and in particular from a, you know, transport aspect and the matter you've just heard there.

1:24:17

Yes, thank you. Sir Richard Limon, NE Lincs Council. And no, I mean as sort of discussed earlier, there's ongoing discussions between the highways team and the applicant at the moment not aware of any sort of principles, objections or concerns being raised. It's a bit of a case of ironing out those final details and just making sure we're happy with the with the final details there.

1:24:39

Thank you.

1:24:42

Thank you.

1:24:44

I think I'm happy in terms of that sort of cumulative salary thing with the the Hyatt and and the the the sort of the last project that we had identified as I mentioned earlier the Viking carbon capture storage. I appreciate as probably sort of overtaking events in terms of sort of your assessments and and that side of things. And again we have posed a a written a written question on this. So I accept that maybe a little bit of crossover, but it would just be sort of helpful to get indications sort of how you're looking to sort of approach that just so that we know what we can, what we can expect from you and

1:25:15

and at what point in the, the process.

1:25:18

Alice for the applicant, yes Sir. So it's a happy coincidence in in some ways that the many of the technical specialists that worked on the environmental impact assessment for the Viking CCS proposals also worked on the EIA for the iget proposals. We have had a a joint a team meeting between the two teams so that we can prepare an assessment with the updated

1:25:50

information from Viking that both of the project teams can rely on in examination in respect to the cumulative effects of both projects. And I've seen a draught of that updated assessment for Viking with with I get and we will commit to submitting that at deadline one and I can commit to that today. I have as I say, I have seen a copy of that already, so it will be available at deadline one if that's helpful. Sir,

1:26:20

it is helpful

1:26:22

and I'm gonna change my arm a little bit and ask what was in that draught and if there's anything that we need to be that you sort of we we should be considering and and starting to sort of think about in terms of that that cumulative side of things.

1:26:36

Just very briefly, I do have a page of quite dense text in front of me just to say that I don't think we pick up anything any new significant adverse effects other than those other than the effects already reported in the existing cumulative effects assessment. And we do pick up one new effect that we think is beneficial and again it goes to the point about beneficial socioeconomic effects and gross added value and gross vatted value added in the local

1:27:06

area. And but we'll obviously report all the details at deadline one on that. But but all of the other topics that I'm looking at, I'm not seeing any new significant adverse effects that arise from those from the new information that we've got in the environmental statement for biking.

1:27:23

OK. Thank you. And

1:27:26

just sort of a final what discussions are you having discussions with NLC and and other sort of statutory bodies in terms of sort of those effects. And then that side of things,

1:27:36

I don't lose for the for the applicant. We, we haven't contacted, recontacted Nelk in relation specifically to the Viking update but we're more than happy to share a draught with them if that would be helpful to the to the panel for their views. I from my perspective I think it might well be because but I've sort of turned in Elgin just to see if they're happy to to do that. Yeah. Richard Lima from NE Lincs Council. Yeah we'd be happy to engage in that that would be really useful. Thank you.

1:28:05

We'll commit to doing that, Sir. Thank you. That's that's great. I think that's probably an action. Excellent. Thank you.

1:28:11

And

1:28:16

I think from my perspective that hopefully answers all the questions that I had on agenda item 4. But just before I sort of wrap this one up, I just want to see if there's anybody online or anybody in the room who's got any

1:28:31

particular questions or issues that they wish to pose at at this point in relation to their the cumulative

1:28:36

aspects of the proposed development.

1:28:43

I'm not seeing

1:28:46

any hands up or anything in the room. I'm not sure anybody the panel have got any any questions. Well, I think that that probably sort of deals with everything that I wanted to deal with in terms of agenda item 4

1:29:01

and I think the next item is, is a break actually this point which I think is probably conveniently waiting for the time to Click to 11:30. So we've hit the exact time, but it's not quite a work. So it's it's 11:29. So I suggest we take a a short break and and that's in the agenda, we'll resume at 11:45. And so thank you for all your inputs and and this hearings every adjourned to 11:45.

1:29:24