

ISH3 Pt1

0:01

Good morning and welcome.

0:03

It's now 10:00 AM and I am starting the third issue specific hearing for the application made by Associated British Ports

0:12

for an order granting development consent for Immingham Green Energy Terminal.

0:17

We'll introduce ourselves in a few minutes. Just a few housekeeping matters first.

0:23

Could I check with people at the back if you can hear me clearly? Super. And can I check with the case team if the meeting recordings and live streams have started?

0:34

I can confirm that the live stream and the virtual hearing has started. Thank you. Any requests for reasonable adjustments? No. OK. Thank you.

0:47

No fire alarm drills today. So if there is a fire alarm, a continuous alarm will sound. Please vacate the building

0:54

and the assembly point is in the garden outside this room. Uh, toilets are located to my right.

1:03

Onto introductions. I'm Mr High. 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 the above above application. I'll hand over to other members. Mr. Hunter, can we start with you? 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'm leaning on Agenda Item number 5.

1:36

Good morning. I'm Miss Metcalf. I've been appointed by the Secretary of State as a member of the Examining Authority. Today I'll be leading on item agenda item number six.

1:48

Good morning. I'm Mr Paige, and I've also been appointed by the Secretary of State as a member for this examining authority. Today I'm leading on agenda item 3.

1:58

Good morning. Hi, I'm Mr Sheikh, also appointed as a member of this examining authority. Today I will be leading on agenda items 4:00 and 7:00, and I also be taking notes on this hearing actions.

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.

2:27

Also present today our members of the Case Team Case Manager is Mr Carl Jones, Carl Jonas Johansson. Mr Johansson is supported by Miss Gina Shoreland.

2:38

If you have any questions or concerns about the proceedings today, please contact a member of the Case team.

2:44

The audiovisual service today is provided by Mr Michael Young,

2:49

so that's the team on our end. We'll turn to attendees.

3:10

I'd like to acknowledge those who are watching the live stream today. Welcome and thank you for joining us. I'd like to start with the introductions from attendees both virtually and in the room. I'll start by reading out the name of your team and if you could just introduce members.

3:26

My running order today is likely to be the Applicant

3:33

Environment Agency

3:37

IT Operators.

3:43

I

3:45

don't think the harbour master is attending anymore,

3:50

So that's so. That's it. Applicant,

3:55

government agency and IT operators.

3:59

Mr Maker, Phil Parker Free can start with you. Hi. 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.

4:18

And I anticipate calling on seven additional speakers today whose names we gave in the response to the Rule 6 letter, that's PDA 001 and whose credentials will supply to you in writing in the post hearing notes. I'll just run through their names now and then I'll introduce them as we go along. So Mr Alan Lewis from acom, who's the projects EIA lead? Mr Tymon Robson,

4:50

the project Director from Air Products,

4:54

Mr Paul Bristow, Head of Marine Humber at ABP.

4:59

Mr. John Beattie, Director and Principal Risk Analyst at Anotech.

5:06

Mr Adam Varley, the Project Development Manager at ABP,

5:12

Miss Natalie Frost, Head of Environment at ABP Mayor and Mr Philip Rowell from Adams Hendry. Some of those will be familiar to you, others not. But those who are not as familiar will introduce when we come to them.

5:29

Thank you, Mr Philpot.

5:30

I think I've got a I've made a slight mistake with respect to the attendees today. So

5:38

next I will be taking an introduction.

5:42

I believe environment agencies not attending until later on or are they here or they're here now? OK. So Environment Agency,

5:54

good morning. My name is Annette Hughton and I am a planning advisor for the Environment Agency. Thank you and welcome. Is there anybody else joining you or is it just yourself? Is that your team?

6:08

No, it's just myself today. Thank you. OK,

6:13

um,

6:17

IT operators,

6:20

A good morning to the panel and everyone in the room. My name is Alex Minhinnick. I'm a partner at Burges Salmon Solicitors and I'm representing the Io T operators. And I'm joined in the meeting online by Ollie Smith,

6:38

who is the Marine Superintendent at APT. So that's Associated Petroleum Terminals.

6:48

Thank you, Mr Minnick.

6:51

I also understand that CDN Ports Gillingham are present.

6:59

Yeah. Good morning, everyone. Alex, President. I'm an associate at Pinsent Masons LLP acting on behalf of CDM Ports Killing Home Limited. I'll later be joined by Benjamin Dove Seymour, who's a director at LDN who's unavailable to join the start of this hearing but will join later and will therefore be able to answer any technical questions relating to CDN's operations on Agenda item 5, which is the only agenda item that CD and anticipates making submissions on. Thank you very much. Is there anybody else who's in attendance

7:30

and would like to introduce themselves

7:33

that I don't have on my list?

7:37

OK, I don't see any hands up

7:42

which means we can proceed on to agenda item 2.

7:46

A few points to set out the procedure for running the hearing today. Just a few words. First to acknowledge the format of the event.

7:54

This is a blended event. It allows attendance both in person and virtually through Microsoft Teams.

8:01

It's expected that both blended and fully virtual events will form part of the Planning Inspectorate's future operating model.

8:08

The examining authority is attending this meeting from Stallingborough near Grimsby as a several attendees. For those attending virtually, please be rest assured that you have our full attention, even though we may not at all times be looking into the camera. To avoid visual and noise distractions, please keep your cameras and microphones off unless we invite you to speak.

8:30

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

8:52

These timings are approximate. If you are joining for a particular agenda item, we recommend that you join at the start of the session that that item is in. You can keep in touch with the case team who can tell you if the sessions are running a few minutes late

9:09

for virtual attendees. If you decide to leave the meeting during the breaks, then you can rejoin using the same link provided in your invitation e-mail.

9:16

If you're watching the live stream, please refresh your browser to resume each subsequent session.

9:23

The second point today is that just make you aware that this event is both being live streamed and recorded. The digital recording that we make is retained and published, and it forms a public record that can contain your personal information and to which GDPR applies

9:42

The Planning Inspectorate's Policy. Planning Inspectorate practise is to retain and publish records for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision on the Development Consent Order.

9:55

Consequently, if you participate in today's Issue specific hearing, it's important that you understand that you will be recorded and that you're therefore consenting to the retention and publication of the digital recording.

10:07

It is very unlikely that the examining authority will ask you to put sensitive information into the public domain. Indeed, we encourage you not to do so.

10:15

However, for some reason you feel 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 and then explore with you whether the information could be provided in written format which might then be retracted before publication.

10:33

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

10:43

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

10:51

Those are the only matters for discussion today.

10:55

Be clear it's not intended to discuss all matters relating to Marine side issues.

11:00

Some matters will be pursued through rounds of written questions or at future hearings.

11:06

It is a full and ambitious agenda. We'll keep progress under review, and we may request certain aspects to be 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 these hearings.

11:24

The fourth point today is a note about how we intend to run this hearing. This and all hearings will be presided over by the Examining Authority and they will be held in public.

11:34

The approach to the entire examination is that it's an inquisitorial process. This also applies to this in all hearings, which means that the Examining Authority will ask questions of a person making oral representations. The examining Authority determines the conduct of the meeting and in this case we have decided that we do not intend to allow cross examination.

11:56

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.

12:07

We request that you make your present representations brief, making reference to written submissions where relevant.

12:15

Another point that we want to run about how we want to run our hearings is about sharing visual material on screen. Thank you very much to the applicant for doing that. For the hearings it has been very helpful.

12:29

However, should the applicant or any interested party want to share any material on screen at a hearing, it does need to be submitted into examination even if only a couple of working days prior to the hearing. We would like sight of it beforehand and say most likely yes it's fine for it to be shared or know that this should be a written submission. I appreciate this was not in our Rule 13 notification for these hearings. We will make sure it is from now on ISHIS H1 and

13:00

the first agenda item from yesterday was different because we invited visual material from the applicant, so those were valid exceptions. We will also make an exceptions for all hearings. This round of hearings because it was not specified in our Rule 13,

13:16

5th and final point, is regarding post hearing actions should they arise during this hearing, Mr. Hunter and Mr Sheikh will be noting hearing actions as they emerge 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

13:33

on this. On this occasion, given responses to 1st written questions are expected at deadline one, it is likely that the examining Authority will place many or all of the post hearing actions in written questions to avoid duplications.

13:47

The assumption is that post hearing actions will be expected at the next deadline, which in this case is deadline one, Wednesday 13th of March 2024.

13:57

Acknowledging any resourcing constraints constraints on your end. If you feel meeting that deadline will be difficult, please do raise that at the hearing itself so we can accommodate that in the deadline set out in the action list.

14:11

That's it from me. Does anybody have questions?

14:16

Madam Hereward Phillpot on behalf of the applicants. No questions as such. I I hope it's already been brought to your attention one of the slides we used on issues specific here in Wong. We're going to, with your permission bring up again for the purposes of one of the item the matters in item 5. But it's not a new slide

14:37

that that's fine Mr Philpott. Yeah, that's fine.

14:40

Any other comments or questions about how we intend to run the hearing?

14:46

OK, without any further delay, I'll hand over to Mr Page for agenda item 3.

14:54

Thank you, Miss Sahai. Tune into Agenda item 3 on Flood Risk and coastal change and starting with the first point then

15:04

I appreciate we covered some of the design life principles yesterday. As such, some of the context set in and content of the following questions may have been overtaken to a degree. However, after discussion with the panel last night, it was decided that these questions would be asked as originally drafted, on the basis of the inferences we have drawn from the existing evidence base.

15:31

Among other things, it gives the applicant and any other persons in attendance further opportunity to engage with us on this issue and may well help refine the way forward.

15:43

So with that, I'll move on with the questions.

15:47

So

15:49

the Environmental statement makes assumptions about the design life of the proposed development, and these assumptions are used to inform the temporal scope of each relevant assessment.

16:00

For example,

16:02

the Environmental Statement ELF APP. 058 at paragraph 16.6 point 15 assumes a design life of 50 years when assessing physical processes.

16:16

The Environmental Statement ELF AP 0 Sixty at paragraph 18.6, point 109 assumes a design life of 75 years when assessing flood risk.

16:32

The Environmental Statement ELF APP 061, paragraph 19.6, point 13 assumes a design life of at least 25 years up to 2069 when assessing climate change adaptation. Slash resilience.

16:52

In this context, I have three questions which I will set out in full before asking the applicant to respond.

17:02

Firstly, can the applicant explain the design life of the proposed development, both in terms of the land side and marine side components,

17:13

and whether the relevant assessment should make it clear distinction between these components in terms of their temporal scope?

17:21

Because, for example, based on our inferences from reading the evidence as it is currently presented, notwithstanding yesterday's discussions, the land side components

17:33

which seemed to be subject to decommissioning and are in effect temporary, albeit long term.

17:41

Whilst the marine side components would be maintained in perpetuity as part of the wider port estate and so temporally they would seem to be distinct.

17:54

So if for the sake of argument, the hydrogen projection facility would be to be decommissioned after 25 years,

18:03

should the temporal scope of assessment be 25 years for that component and then be substantially longer for the marine side infrastructure given its greater degree of permanence

18:16

at the moment? As far as we can understand it, it appears the assessments use a single temporal scope for both elements or components. Despite the apparent temporal differences,

18:32

I would draw your attention to EI Reference AP-222, the Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan, at paragraph 1.1.3,

18:47

which gives us a clear impression that the land side elements of the proposed development would indeed be indeed be finite and would be decommissioned.

18:57

I'd also draw your attention to the same document at paragraph one, point 1.5,

19:04

which gives us a clear impression that the marine side elements of the proposed development, particularly the jetty, would be mean maintained in perpetuity.

19:14

And so this document in, and indeed other documents within the application submission

19:21

has altogether given us the impression that this line of questioning on the differences between the design life is indeed necessary.

19:29

So that brings it close to my first question and I'll move on to my second question under the first point of the agenda item.

19:38

Secondly then regarding the marine side components and the jetty in particular,

19:45

can the applicant explain what is the reasonable worst case scenario in terms of the temporal scope of assessment given the jetty would be maintained in perpetuity?

19:59

It might be helpful to think about where the the jetty would significantly exceed 100 year design life and whether there are any points of reference that can be used for context.

20:15

For example,

20:17

it might be helpful to understand the history of the wider port of Immingham,

20:23

such as when

20:25

the existing jetties came into use, and how long

20:29

they have operated for and might operate for moving forward.

20:37

Moving on to the third question under the first point of the agenda item, then,

20:42

and indeed the last

20:44

question under this agenda item,

20:47

can the applicant explain whether the relevant design life assumptions used in the environmental statement are sufficiently robust in the context of the above?

20:59

And whether the relevant assessments should be looking at a temporal scope that extends further into the future than it already has done?

21:08

Perhaps beyond 2100 and 100 year design life for the marine side elements.

21:17

So for example,

21:19

as previously mentioned, excuse me,

21:28

as previously mentioned, Yale Ref. AP-061,

21:35

paragraph 19.6, point 13

21:39

assumes a design life of at least 25 years

21:44

up to 2069 when assessing climate change adaptation slash resilience, but is not clear if this is sufficient

21:52

in the context of the jetties design life that could reasonably

21:56

and substantially extend well beyond this time frame.

22:00

And I'll pass over to the applicant for their response. Thank you.

22:06

Thank you, Sir. Hereward Phillpott Casey on behalf of the applicant. So before I

22:13

ask those my right to answer or seek to answer those questions, can I just provide some points of context?

22:21

First, whilst there are aspects of those 3 detailed questions which we have anticipated from the agenda item and therefore we have prepared a response to, there are other aspects of that. For example, considering the wider port of Immingham and examples of the age of structures there which we simply have not anticipated from the agenda item. So as matters stand, I haven't got anyone lined up to answer that.

22:52

They haven't prepared to answer that. So I will do what I can with those who are available to answer the questions. We've got a clear note of them insofar as we're not able to deal with them fully now. I would suggest we take them away and deal with them in writing. That's the first contextual point just to manage expectations before I turn to the speakers.

23:16

The second contextual point, you have identified helpfully a number of areas within the documentation, both assessments and other documents where the issue that we explored yesterday is Jermaine and needs to be considered. And as I indicated yesterday, we will be undertaking an audit to make sure we pick up those and of course all other such references and we respond to them as appropriate. Today there are.

23:47

It may be that most of those will be picked up in the responses that you'll hear. If there are any leftover, we'll take those away and deal with them. And the Third Point I want to make is that before I turn to Mr. Lewis to deal with the assessment points, what I anticipate might be helpful in dealing with the 1st,

24:15

the question which is asked to the design life of the onshore elements. I was going to ask Mr Tymon Robson to effectively bring forward what he was going to say and under item 7

24:37

that he was going to deal with these matters. So if I add him in now, it'll save time later. But I think if he provides the Air Products explanation of how they see design life and then how it fits with the operation of the

24:55

the our product side of things, then I think that might assist by setting then context for what you'll hear in due course

25:01

to our our handover First please to Mr Robson to deal with that matter. If I may.

25:08

Good morning, Timon Robson, Air Products Project Director speaking on behalf of the applicant

25:17

in line with similar process or chemical facilities, the equipment and the components within the hydrogen production facility have been designed with a minimum technical design life.

25:31

An example of what we mean by that during the design and the procurement phase, when we specify a piece of equipment or a process package, we will define to the vendor not only the process requirements of that piece of equipment but also its intended design life and the vendor will then design accordingly. And if we take a very simple example such as a pressure vessel, our hydrogen liquid

26:03

hydrogen storage vessels as an example, that might be quite a simple

26:09

a design point for the vendor. It may just be an issue of adding a corrosion or a

26:16

larger corrosion allowance to the wall thickness that he designs into that vessel. For more complex pieces of equipment that design assessment is a little bit more complicated

26:28

so. So at the end of that technical design life, it's likely that pieces of equipment or pipes or process systems

26:40

may be in need of refurbishment or replacement.

26:46

For example, a pump may become unreliable it may become inefficient

26:54

for a vessel. As I mentioned, the wall thickness may overtime become too thin

27:02

and so that that component is therefore considered at the end of its technical and economic life.

27:09

So at that point and as part of an ongoing operational maintenance and integrity check process,

27:20

a technical and economic evaluation is carried out of that equipment or that process system. And at

that point we may opt to repair it or overhaul that piece of equipment. We may opt to replace that piece of equipment like for like

27:40

or indeed we may replace that equipment with a a different piece of equipment to do the same duty

27:49

and and and so through this ongoing process of of refurbishing or or replacing individual components of the facility, we can extend the operation of the overall facility beyond the technical design life of any individual component.

28:11

And so it it through that explanation, it should be understood, as we touched on yesterday, that the operational life of the facility is not the same as the minimum technical design life of any individual component within it.

28:28

Umm.

28:29

And as it was acknowledged in ES Chapter 2, paragraph 2.7, point 2. So that's a BP044. The operational life of the facility could be longer than 25 years depending on its integrity and market conditions at that time

28:52

And and so to to summarise there's no section of the of the facility or piece of equipment that would definitively be decommissioned at the end of its technical design life and so there's no maximum point in time that the overall hydrogen production facility would therefore be decommissioned. Essentially if there's a, if there's the necessary spare parts available, it's still safe and there are favourable economic conditions,

29:25

then parts

29:27

of the facility or all of it would continue to operate beyond that technical design life.

29:36

Obviously at some point in the future

29:39

sections of the facility and possibly the the whole facility may get to a point that it's no longer economic to repair or operate due to various reasons age, the technology the energy efficiency of of the of that facility or business requirements and and so at that point those components or those sections of the facility may need to be decommissioned. But that's driven by those factors that

30:11

just outlined and not the technical design life of of the individual components and and where decommissioning is required in that in that situation it would then be in required in in line with the requirements of the of the temp. Sorry can I just come in there. I think we understand you know that this facility could be maintained to extend beyond the minimum. I think the point we're trying to get to is that, you know,

30:42
the ES

30:44
assesses the minimum. In some instances, you know,

30:49
we need to be dealing with worst case scenario. So if you're saying that it could go on significantly longer than that, that needs to be reflected in the assessment in our view, unless you know you have something else to say on that front, Sir Harry, would Phil put on behalf of the applicant. And I understand that there are parts of the questions that you have outlined which go on to that question of assessment and Mr. Lewis will deal with those. But your first question was about explaining the design life,

31:19
and that's why I've asked Mr Timer to clarify. He's not seeking to deal with the assessment part. We'll come to that. I'm just seeking to take your question in order, and I've also asked Mr Adam Varley to say something briefly about the design life of the jetty. That will be relatively brief

31:42
again. So that you've got that part of the first question hopefully answered as far as we're able to this morning. And then I'll turn to Mr. Lewis. We'll deal with the assessment aspects if if that's acceptable. Yeah, that you know that that makes sense and is acceptable. I was just interjecting because I think we understand, I think the the question was effectively answered quite well there and we we get the idea behind the design life. And

32:07
so please carry on. Thank you very much. I'll hand over now to Mr Varley just to deal with the same issue. Briefly in relation to the jetty, Mr Varney,

32:19
good morning, Adam Varley for the applicant. And just for clarity purposes, per our basis of design and as is common in maritime engineering, the design life of the jetty is or the jetty structure is 50 years.

32:34
Beyond this, the jetty would would likely require maintenance and and potentially overhaul to maintain its ability to operate.

32:45
Thank you. So I was then going to go to Mr. Lewis to deal with those matters in terms of the way that this has been approached in the assessment

32:57

Alan Lewis with the applicant, hello Sir, hello panel. The first thing I wanted to say was that obviously you've drawn attention in your initial opening question today to the relevant assessment periods for different topics. So flood risk to 2100 physical processes, which is obviously only relevant to the marine environment to 2077 and climate change of 2099. And that this draws us to a really important point that we are responding to in detail in the written

33:29

questions about temporal scope. And that is that each individual topic has its own guidance, has its own professional standards in assessing. And also it's a for example in relation to flood risk we we depend on Environment Agency guidelines to inform the assessments. So that explains why there is a variation in the temporal scope process simply because it depends on those relevant guidelines. So I think that's the the first point

34:00

to to to to outline certainly in respect of the landside development and the there's no suggestion. I I don't think although we will clarify this in our written response that any of these temporal scopes that we're discussing aren't relevant to the land side. If you you know we talked about the design life being

34:20

25 years but but but would be extended with refurbishment in respect of the land side development. I don't see any problems in relation to those assessment, those temporal assessment periods in relation to the marine aspects. We will take that away and address it further in writing and I note your point about precedence for developments in perpetuity. We will go away and look across other relevant port projects to see how they've addressed it to, to demonstrate

34:51

that we're concurrent with their their type of approach. I don't think there's any precedent in my knowledge for taking these assessments you know sort of beyond 100 year time frame. But we will look into that and we will demonstrate that through our written responses at deadline one. Does that help Sir? Yeah, I don't want to overcomplicate the the question of looking at examples. You know, maybe I'm oversimplifying it, but in my mind it it's it's quite straightforward in terms of looking at you know

35:24

how long jetties generally

35:26

function for or are in situ in. You know in a practical sense not necessarily how other sort of precedents or other precedents that are available necessarily because it's it's plain, isn't it? You know if

35:41

you look at a cross section of jetties and they're all you know in situ for a significant period of time, then that's a real world example that can be related back to this

35:53

this project. Again you can cover that in your written response and give your opinions on that and and

you know and and so forth. So that is helpful. And can I just also make a point which or emphasise a point which I I made yesterday,

36:12

You've heard about the ability to take the design life and potentially the operational life may extend beyond that

36:23

pursuant to maintenance defined in the way that it is in the DC O.

36:30

But as I emphasised yesterday, where that maintenance crosses the line into something which gives rise to materially new materially different environmental effects, it ceases to be maintenance. It's not authorised by the order.

36:43

So if towards the end of the expected lifespan of any of these elements of the works, maintenance had to be undertaken to keep them going, that gave rise to materially new, materially different effects in whatever sphere within the environmental statement, that work would not be authorised.

37:05

That would go beyond the development Consent Order. It would be a criminal offence. And so when considering these matters, one also has to look at them against the way that the Development Consent Order does and does not authorise any works that would be necessary to extend the operational life

37:25

based on maintenance. That's not to detract from the work that will be done to answer the question. But in terms of understanding the way the Development Consent Order allows the works that you've heard that would be needed to go beyond the time frames that have been described, it's important to have that safeguard in mind.

37:43

I, I take your point on the safeguards of potential safeguards and I'm sure you'll

37:49

let us know more about that in writing. But I think going back to first principles and the ES assessment assessing the worst case scenario, I think that's an important factor too. So

38:02

cover both of those in your note and and we can take a view on it basically. So we we will. And I as I said I that's not to detract in any way from the work we'll be doing in terms of the environmental statement, but just to reassure you, we're not seeking a development consent order that allows these things to evolve in ways that go beyond what's been assessed. But we'll deal with both and the way they connect in the written material.

38:27

39:46

OK. Yeah, thank you for for that. Is there anything else to add on those questions, not not on those first three questions under item 31. As I said we we'll we'll provide a a detailed response in writing once we've completed the audit that I alluded to.

40:06

Thank you. Is there anyone else, anyone else in the room online who'd like to make any comments at this point?

40:16

Can't see any hands so I'll move on to

40:20

apologies. My colleague has a question,

40:24

sorry question most probably for Mr Robertson in terms of your intention.

40:29

I understand after 25 years the design life of the equipment is such it may need replacing

40:35

unless you've explained. If you take a typical post installation

40:40

during the the lifetime, you'll have a reactive, you know, maintenance and you have a preventive maintenance plan and

40:47

you know the come intervention plans and all. This would carry it as and when things need to happen and things may change. Couldn't will be changed, you know, as the need arises.

40:58

But it's like

41:00

after 25 years,

41:02

if everything is as it should be,

41:05

can I confirm your intention is actually to continue operating?

41:10

It's not a case of, you know, 25 years and that's it. You know everything needs to be overhauled. If everything is, you know, if you think integrity of the plant is actually absolutely, absolutely fine,

41:23

you know, and all the various specialisms from different regulating authorities say you're OK to continue.

41:28

There's no reason why if the market is still there, you just carry on.

41:36

Timon Robson speaking for the applicant, yes, you're correct. That is our intention that if all aspects of the facility allow us to continue operation and the market conditions demanded, it is our intention to continue to operate.

41:54

And in terms of the the draught ECO as it stands, am I right in thinking it doesn't actually stop you from actually continuing the environmental impact assessment aside,

42:06

if there's no fundamental change to the equipment and it's pretty much the same as it is now. It's not like technology, you know where

42:15

things are moving rapidly. You know, it's quite likely that in 25 years,

42:21

you know the chemistry and the process is very much the same and therefore there's no need for an overhaul. It doesn't make economic sense to actually change everything and they're fundamentally is the same as how you've described it currently in your application.

42:34

Sir Harry would philpot on behalf of the applicant. And so far as the first part of the question is concerned, the Development Consent Order is not framed so as to make this a temporary development. And if there's anything else Mr. Robinson wants to add in terms of the nature of the process and the nature of the equipment that is authorised by the Development Consent Order allow him to do so. But certainly the Development Consent Order is not intended for this to be something that must come to an end at 25 years. Is not

43:06

is not drafted in that way. There's no requirement put in place intended to achieve that as I understand it,

43:16

Tom Robinson from from the applicant. Just the other point that I would add is the technology is inevitably evolving

43:26

and at some point the current technology may no longer be energy efficient or or meeting the market demands and so there may be requirements to refurbish or overhaul

43:42

at some point in the future.

43:51

OK. Thank. Thank you everyone.

43:55

I'll move on to

43:58

Sir, if I may. I'm sorry, Mr. Lewis just has something wishes to add in relation to the 25 years point before we move on. If I may,

44:08

Alan Lewis again for the applicant. And just to say very briefly, it does touch on something that we talked about yesterday was that there is not something special that happens at 25 years that is not, if you like, a worse case for assessment. That is an assumption that feeds into the IA process. But nothing changes if that that that design life will be operational life, sorry, changes to 30 or 40 or 50 years. There's nothing magical that happens at 25 years. The only case in which I think it would be a worst case, and we need to refer back to the documents

44:41

on this, is climate change, because you wouldn't accrue the the beneficial effects of the hydrogen production beyond the 25 years. So assessing it at 25 years for climate change is a worst case because you don't accrue the subsequent benefits of hydrogen production. That helps.

44:57

Yeah, that's helpful. I think my colleague has a question. He does help, yes. I suppose the obvious question is where is the evidence in the US that supports that point that you've just made and is that in there.

45:11

We'll certainly do a note on that in follow up and in written questions. I I don't have access to that at the moment. Can't signpost exactly where we refer to that in each technical assessment and it may be as simple as the fact that most of the technical specialists they they have a project description they take that and they they use the assumptions that they need for their technical assessment. So not every technical topic refers to everything in the project description. They they take the assessment that they that the that the parameters that they need

45:41

in the project description, if that makes sense. Does that help, Sir?

45:47

Yes, he does. He does not think. I think that's as you can probably sort of appreciate that it's a point that we're wrestling with and I think that's the key point is where is the evidence that leads us to that point Because you appreciate the role that we've got in terms of the recommendation we've got to make to the Secretary of State.

46:04

We need to give the Secretary of State's comfort that what has been assessed accords with the development consent order,

46:11

we may find that that may not be the case. And I suppose there's a follow on question that goes if that is the case, how would you respond to that. But it's the evidence that we need to sort of go this actually is what it is and that's probably what we're lacking as a panel at the moment is where the evidence that that gives us that information and and if it is in there that's fine. We're not, we're not expecting the full sort of ESA signposting document that gives us where they are for each of those elements would be enormously helpful.

46:40

Hello, Sir Alan Lewis again for the applicant. I think there are three additional written questions on temporal scope for marine ecology, terrestrial ecology and Ornithology, which have got a similar sort of intent, I think. And just very briefly in relation to marine ecology and terrestrial ecology, I think there's a sort of intimation that we should be trying to use one single assessment year for construction or for operation or for decommissioning. And again, it goes to the point I've just said each specialist

47:12

takes the, the, the description of development to determine where the worst case is for them. So just using terrestrial ecology and we're stirring a long way from Fr at the moment, but just taking terrestrial ecology and the big impacts there, land take you know almost day one when you clear the site. So that is so typically terrestrial ecology will use you know, sort of year one as an assessment. Why not say that in the assessment, But that is what they will where those substantive impacts arise. But if you look at the marine environment, and obviously this is a quite heterogeneous project,

47:44

marine environment,

47:45

the peak of land take the where all the piles are in place will be probably in year 2. So you build the piles. It takes quite a long time to build the piles and that will take you well into year two, possibly even into year three of the build out of the jetty. So you can see the marine ecology team will have used a different temporal scope for consideration of land take compared to the terrestrial ecology team. Hopefully that example is useful to understand how the different specialists take the project description and then assess it.

48:15

Hopefully that's useful Sir. And and so just to supplement that that that's by way of example of the sort of things that we'll set out in the note. So that topic by topic you can understand the significance of the temporal scope and the significance or otherwise of the 25 year point.

48:37

I just suppose there's only one final sort of comment more of a comment. I think this is something we will probably end up coming back to at future hearings. So really just to perhaps sort of just signpost that and you probably second guessed that one anyway, but I think you probably is,

48:53

I can see that the Environment Agency has their hand up online. So we'll, we'll come to them next

49:03

if you introduce yourself please and then see what what you wish. Thank you. And and I hear it's them for the Environment Agency. I just wonder if I can provide a little bit of information that may be helpful to the panel in terms of the, as Mr. Lewis said, there is specific guidance on the sort of the assessment and the temporal. Over which they should consider things. And and in terms of flood risk, I think there's a distinction to be made between the fact that the guidance says that

49:36

and commercial type development should look at a design life of 75 years and what the assessment in terms of flood risk does it. It's looking at it from 2 angles, if you like. And one is the assessment of over that 75 year. And the impact on third parties of that development being built in that location and also mitigation for the development itself. Now we wouldn't expect a commercial development to provide mitigation

50:09

necessarily for the climate change predictions over a 75 year. However, we would expect them to provide mitigation so they don't impact third parties over that 75 year. So hopefully that's a bit of helpful explanation into the differences between the, you know, the operational life and what the assessment requires in terms of protecting third parties.

50:37

I think that's helpful

50:40

writing saying 75 years is a starting point and that the test is if major infrastructure significantly exceeds 100 years then the

50:50

the the guidance is different,

50:54

sorry, go ahead that's correct. Yes, it's it's the the national planning practise guidance says that 75 years is a starting point and like you say major infrastructure it's it's usually looked at beyond that. As sort of a sensitivity test. But you wouldn't expect any mitigation at this stage. Sometimes if you're talking about mitigating the impacts on the development itself, you would look at doing a managed

51:24

adaptive approach for the years beyond that, which is generally the way I think the ports operate

anyway, because of obviously the location and the need to adapt to climate change to keep their commercial operations going.

51:41

That's helpful. Thank you

51:44

as the applicant. Want to come in on that? I mean

51:47

it

51:48

the the I mentioned it in my question about significantly exceeding 100 years and the guidance specifically mentions major infrastructure which this clearly is.

52:02

So is there an argument that 75 years is, you know,

52:06

not sufficient or does there need to be a a greater. Looked at.

52:12

Thank you.

52:13

Hello Sir. Alan Lewis again for the applicant. I can answer that I think in part and that relates to the point about mitigation that was just raised by the Environment Agency in respect of mitigation. We have taken that to 2115, which I think is approximately 90 years, so that we do push that out further. And the other point to mention in relation to all FRA modelling the the climate change guidance does not extend beyond 2115. So you you're you're, you're really struggling to do any modelling

52:45

thought beyond 2115.

52:49

However by note here from our FRA team says that under the H plus plus scenario which I should be more aware of of of that, that be more aware of than I am. That represents an extreme worst place case climate change scenario and allows for 1.9 metre increase in tidal water levels as detailed in the Environment Agency climate change guidance and that's been considered in the FRA. So we take it to the, if you like the maximum

53:18

assessment. That we're able to technically bounded by the availability of the predictions provided by the Environment Agency. But of course we can develop that further in the note. Yeah, that's that would be really helpful. And you know if there are limitations in terms of how far you can reasonably

forecast things, then I think it would be helpful to understand that too. So yes, thank you very much. We'll do that, Sir.

53:44

Does anyone else have anything on this item? Appreciate. We've spent quite a bit of time on this. So I'd like to move forward

53:54

2.2, um,

53:57

I think .2 was essentially I think we're comfortable with the dredging sort of

54:06

mechanisms and the context surrounding that. So this is very much a

54:11

contact setting question and I think because time is getting on and there are other things we'd like to potentially focus on, I propose skipping this point and moving on to .3 unless anybody has any objection to that.

54:32

Hello, Sir Alan Lewis, the applicant. I give you a very, very brief answer on on context there, if it's helpful. I've got all the numbers in front of me. That's fine. If it's brief, go ahead. Yeah. So the, the capital dredge is 4000 cubic metres associated with the birth creation and the jetty. And just by way of context, the maintenance dredging in the Humber between 20 to 2004 and 2013 was approximately 4.5,

55:01

1,000,000 cubic metres. So you can see it's an absolutely tiny number in the context of the the maintenance dredging that goes on every year already within the Humber. Hopefully that's helpful. But of course we'll put that into a written response. Yeah, that's helpful. I think my colleague has a question just declaring that number that you just gave the 4.5 million is that per year or is that 2003 to 2000, what cause the presumed the 4000 you've given us is a one off. So I'm trying to comparing apples and oranges. How does that work?

55:32

Sorry Sir, if I wasn't clear, Alan Lewis again for the applicant that is per annum 4.5 million cubic metres per annum.

55:43

Thank you. Does anyone else online or in the room have any points on this?

55:50

I don't see any hands,

55:52

so I'll move on to

55:54

.3.

55:58

So in terms of .3 then Anglian Water Services Yell Ref. R-001

56:07

notes that there are planned updates to the Environment Agency flood models in 2024 which will include revised climate change allowances. So my question to the applicant is, are they aware of these updates and do they know whether there are any implications for the assessments within the Environmental Statement and indeed the design of the proposed development?

56:29

Thank you.

56:31

Hello Sir. Alan Lewis again for the applicant. Just to say that we are well aware of the likely release of the hydraulic modelling by the Environment Agency as per the Humber Estuary 2100 plus strategy. However, as I understand it, there is no definite date for when the output of this modelling will be available and so we we're unable to predict the impacts on the proposed development in, in light of those that that hydraulic modelling. What I can commit to is if that is released

57:03

in let's say the next four months, we will update the the relevant parts of the FRA and submit that into examination. If it goes much beyond four months, we might be struggling but we'll use best endeavours to update and and submit by the final deadline. So that that's my commitment and we'll do our very best to update and submit into the examination. Thank you for that. I I can see the Environment Agency as they hand up. So I'll hand over to them for their response.

57:34

Thank you and not Annette here. It's some for the Environment Agency. And I believe that actually the Environment Agency flood model that Anglian Water are referring to is not in fact that to be released under the 2100 plus scenario at 8 is relating to the new National Flood Risk Assessment which will be known as NAFRA 2, which we're currently developing. And it will provide a single picture of the current flood risk from rivers, the sea and surf

58:06

surface water, um, using both detailed model local modelling as well as improved national data

58:15

as you can imagine. Think things have improved since we, we did the original National Flood risk assessment some time ago and our understanding of flood risk modelling and surface water etcetera has has improved since then.

58:31

But in terms of the applicants project, they've undertaken their assessment using local modelling and that local modelling will be feeding into this NAFRA 2 work. But we already have like the site specific assessment for this project. So that we don't anticipate that the outputs will be released until

58:54

at the end of 2024, which will be after the close of the examination. But neither do we think that it will materially affect the applicants assessment. But if by any chance it's released before the end of the examination, we'll review that position, but we don't think it will impact the the applicant's assessment.

59:36

Thank you very much everyone for that. I think it would be helpful if we could get some a joint note from the applicants and the Environment Agency on this, just setting out the assumptions that they're working on and then we can consider that going forward. So we'll put that as an action point

59:56

for the hearing.

59:58

Is there anything further from anyone on this?

1:00:05

Not from the applicant, Sir. Thank you. Thank you.

1:00:08

So I can't see

1:00:11

any hands and I don't think any of my colleagues have any further questions.

1:00:24

So I'll bring a close to this agenda item and hand over to Mr Sheikh, who will now cover gender Item 4 on water quality and resources. Thank you very much.

1:00:58

Thank you, Mr Page. Moving on to item Agenda 4, Water Quality and Resources,

1:01:05

I have three questions in total on this topic. So the first one relates to pollution prevention.

1:01:11

When a site is in close proximity to controlled waters or there is a pathway to these, the risk of pollution contamination will always exist.

1:01:21

Can the applicant explain what measures they all have in place to ensure that this risk is kept to a minimum?

1:01:29

Thank you. So I'm going to ask Mr Robson to deal with this matter. He'll also be dealing with the other matters under this item unless anything arises which I need to assist with

1:01:46

time and Robson speaking for the applicant. I'll address this question in two parts if I may. Firstly, the construction phase and then secondly the operational phase.

1:01:58

So the outline CMP UP APP 221 commits to the development of a water management plan and the outline of that water management plan is given in the outline Kemp in Table 15.

1:02:17

If I quote from section 1.1.9 of the outline SEMP, the water management plan is to include measures necessary to avoid, prevent and reduce adverse effects where possible upon the local surface water environment. This will include steps to remove the risk of damage to water assets, and the water management plan will be incorporated into the final CMP.

1:02:46

As further explanation, I'll give you an indication of the type of things that will be covered within the Water management plan. So it will include measures to control fine sediment, surface water runoff, flooding and dewatering.

1:03:02

It will provide details of temporary drainage facilities within the work areas and including within the temporary work areas

1:03:12

to ensure controlled discharge of surface water runoff and this will cover items like swales or silt fences cut off ditches. It will include requirements that the site access points are regularly cleaned to avoid buildup of dust and mud. It will

1:03:34

require oil interceptors to be installed, notably on the outfall of settlement ponds, to reduce potential risk for contamination of groundwater and and run off. The plan will also include a prevention plan and an emergency response plan, which will include containment measures such as drip trays, bonding, double walled fuel tanks and such. Like it will include an emergency spillage

1:04:07

plan, and it will include measures to ensure that mixing and handling of materials will be undertaken in designated areas away from surface water drains, and measures to ensure that plant and machinery, wherever possible, are kept away from surface water bodies. And issues like refuelling and delivery areas will be segregated and kept away from surface water drains.

1:04:39

If I may move on to the operations phase. So the indicative details of the Drainage Scheme is, is in the Outline Drainage Strategy AP210

1:04:55

and that will be included within the Final Drainage Strategy approval of which is secured through requirement 12AP006 Schedule 2.

1:05:08

I'll I'll take some time to just elaborate technically. Technically on the on the drainage scheme that is intended.

1:05:19

So within the landside facilities

1:05:24

civically Works 35 and Seven,

1:05:28

the drainage system will consider the segregation

1:05:33

of of the following types of water on the site which may drain into the drainage ditches and ultimately into N Beck and the Humber.

1:05:45

So these types of water, which I'll elaborate on

1:05:51

shortly, is clean stormwater,

1:05:54

accidentally oil contaminated water,

1:05:59

potentially ammonia or chemical contaminated water and firefighting water. In the event of a fire event,

1:06:10

look the water quality component of the site. Drainage will also be controlled through the environmental permit.

1:06:17

So if I elaborate on these different types of of water and the containments and the testing to ensure these potential sources of contamination are not able to impact the surrounding water courses. So clean storm water

1:06:36

is is rainwater which falls on areas of the site which are not normally at risk of contamination and and examples of this would be the roofs of of buildings, paved areas that are away from any process equipment or or gravelled areas around the site.

1:06:58

The clean storm water is collected and routed to a a large water retention pond

1:07:06

and water from the retention pond would be released into the adjacent drainage ditch at a maximum rate which has been agreed separately with the internal drainage board.

1:07:22

The the retention pond will have an isolation valve

1:07:27

so that it does not automatically discharge and it will be part of our operations routine to regularly visually inspect the retention pond prior to any discharge

1:07:43

if I move to what we term accidentally oil contaminated water.

1:07:49

So this would be rainwater which falls on areas which are at risk of minor oil contamination. And examples of this would be the the Rd trailer parking areas around the tanker refuelling areas which get high levels of traffic

1:08:08

and any heavy traffic roads or around equipment which uses lubricating oils.

1:08:18

Drains from these areas are routed to a number of oily water separators

1:08:27

and from the oily water separators. Clean water oil free water would then be routed to the water retention pond as I described earlier.

1:08:41

Umm

1:08:43

equipment with potential for oil leaks such as pumps or or compressors would be contained within a Bund or a curbed area with a sump in that area. The sump will be connected to the to the oily water drain and routed through the separator, but that those in those areas the sump would have a normally closed valve such that water wouldn't be released from that curbed

1:09:15

area until an operations personnel had inspected and then released. The water

1:09:21

equipment which has a larger inventory of oil and and specifically I'm talking about Transformers

1:09:29

would be contained within a bunded area or a pit which is isolated from the drainage network And so any oil or water collecting in that pit would then be removed by a suction tanker rather than discharged to the drainage network.

1:09:49

Another example that I mentioned was potentially ammonia or chemical contaminated water

1:09:57

and an example of this is that rainwater which falls around. For example, the ammonia pumps adjacent to the to the large ammonia storage tank

1:10:10

in. In this situation that area would be bunded and and it would have a collection sump

1:10:19

and the sump will be connected to the

1:10:26

a water retention pond. But there will be an isolation valve on that sump and there will be an instrument which would detect any potential contamination in the water and automatically close the isolation valve. So there is no operator intervention required at that point.

1:10:50

The the final part of water is is in the in a fire event when there is a lot more water into the system. So during a fire event the the fire water would route to the water retention pond either through the clean water system or through the accidentally oil contaminated water system. But in that situation, the pond is suitably sized with the capacity to contain two hours worth of retention.

1:11:22

Maximum fire water discharge

1:11:26

and the pond isolation valve would therefore be closed in that event and the pond water inspected and tested prior to any discharge to the adjacent ditch.

1:11:44

So Harry would philpot on behalf of the applicant if I can just complete the picture by dealing with the jetty side of things that that this is dealt with as you might expect in the Dean Marine licence. So that schedule 3 to the Draught Development Consent Order and there are two conditions which I just draw attention to. So in Part 2 of the Draught de Marine licence these apply to

1:12:14

all licensable activities. The 1st is condition 14, which effectively incorporates the requirement for a construction Environmental Management plan within the deemed marine licence for the licensed activities and then the other one which is particularly relevant, or two which are particularly relevant here,

1:12:40

condition 18 and condition 19. Condition 18 is to do with the coatings and treatments that are used in the marine environment to make sure that they're suitable for use in that environment. But 19 is dealing with pollution and spills,

1:12:57

and that requires that bunding and storage facilities must be installed to contain and prevent the release of fuels, oils and chemicals associated with plant refuelling and construction equipment into the marine environment. Secondary containment must be used with a capacity of no less than 110% of the containers storage capacity. And then Part 2 deals with what happens in the event of a spill and what has to be done and who has to be contacted. Subparagraph 3 deals with the storage of waste

1:13:31

in designated areas isolated from surface water drains, open water contained to prevent any spillage, and then four is the obligation to comply with existing Marine Pollution Contingency Plan that's in place with the Port of Immingham, as detailed in the Construction Environmental Management Plans. I believe those are the relevant parts of the DE Marine licence that deal with the construction and operational side for the jetty.

1:14:02

Thank you. In so instantly, just to make sure that I've got it right, there is only one discharge point from the site, so that's via the retention pond. So if it's clean storm water as an example, what you've said is it'll go straight to the retention pond.

1:14:17

You will then make sure there's no contamination and then release accordingly

1:14:21

for the other aspects in terms of contamination from vehicles with regards to oil and grease etcetera. That will again end up at the retention pond, but it will go via the interceptor.

1:14:35

The other where there's more has these chemicals, the MU stool region and other fuels and etcetera

1:14:41

that will be bunded

1:14:43

and

1:14:45

obviously when it's full, you know you'll test it and then either pump out to the retention pond or take it away for disposal off site.

1:14:57

Mr. Robinson, for the applicant, yes, what you've described is correct.

1:15:03

In in the full phased development there may be more than one retention pond

1:15:12

and therefore more than one discharge point to to the surrounding ditch. But the the concept that you've described is correct.

1:15:22

1:15:26

Thank you, Mr Robertson.

1:15:28

My second question relates to the the need for non potable water.

1:15:33

So

1:15:35

sorry,

1:15:45

OK. My second question relates to the need for non potable water

1:15:49

to understand the requirements. Can the applicant explain the use of non possible water throughout each of the project phases,

1:16:00

time and Robson? For the applicant?

1:16:04

Yes, the main use of water on the site is for cooling water

1:16:12

and and the design has accommodated the fact that this can be non potable water.

1:16:23

So if I describe the the the cooling water system we have a traditional industry induced draught

cooling towers which cool the water with with funds and that cool water is then circulated to the users of the cooling water which in the case of the hydrogen and production facility is almost exclusively the liquefier process unit. There are some other users of cooling

1:16:54

water around the the facility but overwhelmingly the largest user is the is the liquefier process unit.

1:17:05

The the nature of cooling water systems such as I describe is that water is consumed by the cooling water system and that water has to be replaced and that generates the demand for the water. Water is consumed by the cooling water system in two ways. Evaporation, which which is inherent in the in the cooling process

1:17:36

is is the major consumer of of the water. Approximately 70 to 80% of the water consumed is lost through evaporation.

1:17:49

The the second method by which we we consume cooling water is through discharge to in that

1:18:01

over time the level of suspended solids and other sort of contaminants in the cooling water volume build up and that needs to be discharged to keep water quality to a level. So about 20 to 30% of the water consumed is through is through the discharge.

1:18:22

The design of the hydrogen production facility has incorporated a a water treatment package

1:18:34

in order to reduce the the amount of water that's needed to be discharged and and thereby reduce the non potable water supply requirements and and so that that system, that filtration system has been incorporated into the design.

1:18:57

And so with that system, we've been able to reduce the water demand requirements from what has what was anticipated in the earlier stages of the project.

1:19:14

If I if I run through the demand through the phases and essentially these align with when we will build liquefier process units. So in phase one, when we will install the first liquefier, our water, non potable water demand will be in the region of 833 cubic metres a day. In phase two, when we build the 2nd liquefied process unit, that demand will rise to approximately 1000

1:19:45

and 16 metre cubes per day.

1:19:49

In phase three, when we installed the third Liquify unit, it rises again to approximately 2060 metre cubes per day.

1:20:00

And in the phase four when we installed the 4th liquefier, it rises to approximately 3072 metre cubes per day In in phases 5 and six we're not installing any future any further liquefier units and therefore that water demand

1:20:23

risk stays approximately the same.

1:20:29

It it it should be noted that Air Products have been in

1:20:33

extended discussions with Anglian Water regarding supply of the non potable water water and and we have a a commercial offer and a commitment from Anglian Water for supply of 3456 metre cubes per day. So which will satisfy the normal demand figures which I've outlined to you above and also some allow some flexibility for periods of higher demand.

1:21:03

It it, it should be, it should be noted that our discussions with Anglian Water are are both regular and productive and these will continue through to actual delivery of the water.

1:21:22

Thank you, Mr. Robinson, that was really helpful. So can I confirm the figure that you quoted in terms of the water need in the application is

1:21:30

you've now revised and is it still the same or has it changed

1:21:37

Mr. Robinson for the applicant in the in the application I think there is a figure quoted of 3640 metre cubes per day as the total water demand as the as the design evolves that water demand figure is being revised. So, so the the figures that I have indicated to you now are the current design and those are the figures that we are in

1:22:08

discussion with Anglian Water regarding.

1:22:13

Thank you. My final question on this topic sort of follows on from what I've just asked and that's regarding sustainable non potable water resources. So you've mentioned that you've got a formal agreement with Anglian Water for them to supply with the water requirements for your for the plant.

1:22:31

And then you talked about the answer, your first question which is about you know storm water

1:22:38

and then being collected in the retention pond. Have you explored sustainable sources in terms of water supply, for example harvesting that rainwater which is effectively as you've said uncontaminated. Is that a possibility for you to actually use that uncontaminated water as a means of a top up if you you know

1:22:58

for your water process requirements?

1:23:04

Timon Robson for the applicant.

1:23:08

Yes, at at the the concept design stage of the of the project, we did consider a number of different water supply options in order to to get to the most sustainable source. And if I if I touch on a couple of those

1:23:31

sources that we have explored rainwater harvesting was one of those

1:23:39

and and we did some assessments of rainwater falling on the site and

1:23:49

what level of water could be could be collected. The the issue, the reason why this was discounted

1:23:59

in in that whilst there is water, it is an inconsistent supply and the level of water that could be collected in this way on average over the year would probably only amount to 5% of the of the total water demand for the for the cooling water system. And at times it would be 0%. And it was considered that the level of

1:24:29

of CapEx in terms of additional infrastructure and in terms of construction work required to make that water harvesting

1:24:46

effective for such a small percentage of the water demand did not make that a a sustainable source just due to the level of construction work and for for such a small amount of the water demand. Given that discussions with Anglian were progressing,

1:25:10

if I if I cover another option that we explored, we did have some and we continue to have some discussions with Anglian Water about reuse of final effluent from the local wastewater treatment centre at Pyewipe near near Grimsby

1:25:32

and in in discussion with Anglian Water. This was discounted for this project for a number of reasons. It it couldn't be delivered within the time scales to suit the project and and part of the reason for that is that it's not a proven technology at this stage nor approved by the Environment Agency. Although there is a trial project underway to to address that issue.

1:26:04

And because of the extensive infrastructure required to deliver that source, not only the additional processing units at the Pyewipe Centre but also a pipeline to bring the water to the facility. It was considered that was not a a cost of effective way to do it unless the water demand was much larger than

1:26:35

for this project alone.

1:26:38

So uh,

1:26:41

in in the future whether there are other projects that may be something that Anglian Water considers. The other point that was brought into the discussion in this regard is that the reductions in water demand that have been achieved particularly through the

1:27:05

through the water recycling and water treatment package that we have within the project means that the water,

1:27:14

the water requirements that we now have can be supplied from using existing infrastructure by Anglian Water. And the fact that

1:27:27

the water can be supplied without significant additional infrastructure or significant

1:27:35

a capital expenditure makes itself the a sustainable source. And so in in summary and the question of have we selected the most sustainable source for non potable water.

1:27:53

We believe that the agreement with Anglian Water to receive non potable water via the existing pipeline that runs down the Port Rd

1:28:04

is is considered to be the most sustainable source for two key reasons. The 1st, as I mentioned, is that the water can be supplied without additional infrastructure being installed with all of the

1:28:21

extensive construction works and associated and viral in environmental impacts of that work. And secondly, that Anglian Water through the Water Resource Management Plan programme is separately committed to providing water in the most sustainable method.

1:28:45

Thank you, Mr. Robinson. That was really useful given that Anglian Water isn't present here today.

1:28:50

We may give them an action to review what you've just stated, particularly knowing that the water requirements

1:28:57

it's quite crucial and limiting factor in terms of your process needs.

1:29:02

So it may be covered in the statement of common ground between yourselves and them, but I'll but for now I'll put it down as a possible action.

1:29:13

Mr Mr. Robinson for the applicant, yes, certainly. And just to emphasise that we are in regular discussion with Anglian Water on this on this issue. Unfortunately I I sit whilst he was here the previous two days, he's not here today.

1:29:31

OK. Are there any comments or questions from anyone else in the room?

1:29:38

Anyone else online

1:29:41

can't see any hands,

1:29:43

so no. OK. So that concludes item, Agenda 4,

1:29:49

I believe it's now time for a break.

1:29:57

OK. In that case that concludes the first part of of the session hearing. Thank you.

1:30:06

Sorry, the time is just past 11:30. Thank you.

1:30:12

And we will be retaining it

1:30:14

11:45.

1:30:17