

WEBVTT – This file was automatically generated by event.video

0

00:00:08.415 --> 00:00:08.975

Presumed.

1

00:00:10.715 --> 00:00:14.295

Um, we'd really like to get through the issue

2

00:00:14.295 --> 00:00:16.055

of carbon today if we can.

3

00:00:16.395 --> 00:00:19.855

Um, Mr. Reis has still got quite a few questions.

4

00:00:21.405 --> 00:00:23.605

I just want to remind parties that the, the purpose

5

00:00:23.605 --> 00:00:25.405

of these hearings is for the examining authority

6

00:00:25.405 --> 00:00:29.085

to ask the questions and seek responses to them.

7

00:00:29.985 --> 00:00:33.085

That's, you know, we've read all submissions from all the

8

00:00:33.085 --> 00:00:35.045

parties, including Save Honey Hill.

9

00:00:35.665 --> 00:00:37.565

Uh, the important thing for us is to get answers

10

00:00:37.625 --> 00:00:40.845

to our questions from the applicant, um,

11

00:00:41.185 --> 00:00:42.445

as concisely as possible.

12

00:00:43.025 --> 00:00:47.525

So I think that's, that's our primary aim going forward

13

00:00:47.545 --> 00:00:49.885
for the rest of the hearing.

14

00:00:50.025 --> 00:00:54.005
And obviously we'll bring in Save Honey Hill at the, uh,

15

00:00:54.005 --> 00:00:55.765
appropriate time to make comments.

16

00:00:56.105 --> 00:00:57.605
But in the interim period,

17

00:00:58.415 --> 00:01:00.445
we've got questions based on the submissions

18

00:01:00.795 --> 00:01:03.125
that we really need responses to, um,

19

00:01:03.225 --> 00:01:04.845
and we formulate them carefully.

20

00:01:05.905 --> 00:01:08.845
So bearing in mind timing restrictions

21

00:01:09.105 --> 00:01:12.445
and the amounts we also have to get through tomorrow, um,

22

00:01:13.515 --> 00:01:16.125
we'd appreciate concise answers from both the applicants

23

00:01:16.185 --> 00:01:20.285
and, um, we'll bring in Safe Honey Hill at

24

00:01:21.065 --> 00:01:22.005
the appropriate time

25

00:01:23.085 --> 00:01:26.165
pointing. Thank

26

00:01:26.165 --> 00:01:27.165

You. May, may I just

27

00:01:27.165 --> 00:01:30.165
raise one point, um, uh,

28

00:01:30.345 --> 00:01:33.845
Ms. Cotton has referred to the Strategic Carbon assessment.

29

00:01:34.165 --> 00:01:35.725
I don't know, uh, Madam,

30

00:01:35.725 --> 00:01:37.725
whether you've got questions on that.

31

00:01:38.305 --> 00:01:41.805
Um, we would like the opportunity, um,

32

00:01:43.275 --> 00:01:47.205
subject to you, uh, just to respond to Ms. Cotton on that.

33

00:01:47.265 --> 00:01:50.485
It may be that you've got some more focused questions on it.

34

00:01:51.065 --> 00:01:55.205
Uh, there is, uh, a gentleman online who can speak to that.

35

00:01:56.775 --> 00:01:58.215
I don't have specific questions on the

36

00:01:58.415 --> 00:01:59.775
strategic strategic carbon assessment.

37

00:01:59.775 --> 00:02:01.935
However, obviously you're both doing in the,

38

00:02:01.935 --> 00:02:03.015
you're both in the room today,

39

00:02:03.035 --> 00:02:04.375
so perhaps if you've got questions,

40

00:02:04.395 --> 00:02:05.935

you could take them to each other. Yes,

41

00:02:06.195 --> 00:02:10.055

It, uh, it, it does impinge on these wider questions

42

00:02:10.055 --> 00:02:13.415

of baseline, which you, um, touched on at the beginning.

43

00:02:13.635 --> 00:02:15.895

And then I've not mentioned the point before

44

00:02:15.895 --> 00:02:19.215

because you'd said to must cotton that we would come back

45

00:02:19.215 --> 00:02:20.255

to that topic.

46

00:02:20.875 --> 00:02:24.255

So if, if I could just flag that now

47

00:02:24.355 --> 00:02:29.055

and very much taking on, on board, um, also what,

48

00:02:29.055 --> 00:02:31.735

what the chairman of the panel has said.

49

00:02:32.435 --> 00:02:35.935

Um, but we, we'd like a concise opportunity,

50

00:02:36.435 --> 00:02:37.775

um, to, to do that.

51

00:02:38.035 --> 00:02:39.035

Please.

52

00:02:40.575 --> 00:02:42.655

I, I should also said we aim to finish

53

00:02:43.375 --> 00:02:45.815

absolutely no later than seven o'clock.

54

00:02:46.555 --> 00:02:48.655

Um, hopefully it won't take until then.

55

00:02:49.485 --> 00:02:53.775

Hope not. I'll be try and be as quick as I can.

56

00:02:53.775 --> 00:02:55.255

And obviously if we've got time at the end,

57

00:02:55.365 --> 00:02:57.975

certainly we can discuss this, uh,

58

00:02:58.055 --> 00:03:00.365

Ms. Cotton strategic assessment queries.

59

00:03:00.625 --> 00:03:02.325

Um, but I'm obviously conscious that I want to get

60

00:03:02.325 --> 00:03:04.445

through the questions that I've got here as a,

61

00:03:04.445 --> 00:03:05.965

as a principle aim of of

62

00:03:05.965 --> 00:03:07.565

Course, and we're respecting that,

63

00:03:09.865 --> 00:03:12.405

Uh, the examining authority notes that new, um,

64

00:03:12.665 --> 00:03:16.005

PAs 2080 guidance, uh, on carbon management in buildings

65

00:03:16.005 --> 00:03:18.605

and infrastructure was published in April, 2023.

66

00:03:19.345 --> 00:03:21.325

Um, can the applicant confirm whether this is likely

67
00:03:21.345 --> 00:03:22.885
to affect any, the findings within

68
00:03:22.905 --> 00:03:24.085
the environmental statement,

69
00:03:26.655 --> 00:03:28.395
Um, for the applicant?

70
00:03:28.495 --> 00:03:30.835
Um, no. One of the reasons being that

71
00:03:31.535 --> 00:03:33.635
the team were also involved in the update

72
00:03:33.635 --> 00:03:35.355
and understood what the changes were likely to be,

73
00:03:36.015 --> 00:03:37.035
the identification

74
00:03:37.035 --> 00:03:40.595
and two main different, um, additional clauses in the PAs

75
00:03:40.595 --> 00:03:44.195
around taking into account the net zero ambition

76
00:03:44.255 --> 00:03:47.235
for the climate through the updated Climate Change Act

77
00:03:47.235 --> 00:03:48.955
and bringing in a clause on systems

78
00:03:49.455 --> 00:03:53.355
and procurement are two new clauses in the PAs systems.

79
00:03:53.615 --> 00:03:54.835
In terms of the biogas,

80
00:03:54.835 --> 00:03:57.715

the bio methane export has always been a part of the plan.

81

00:03:58.105 --> 00:04:00.075

Procurement is one of the levers

82

00:04:00.075 --> 00:04:02.675

that the applicant will look to continue to push

83

00:04:02.735 --> 00:04:07.195

to keep on optimizing its position towards its 70% target.

84

00:04:09.205 --> 00:04:12.735

Thank you. Page 12

85

00:04:12.795 --> 00:04:16.135

of the PAs 2080 guidance at 2080 guidance states,

86

00:04:16.235 --> 00:04:19.255

the definition of whole life carbon is the sum

87

00:04:19.255 --> 00:04:20.615

of greenhouse gas emissions

88

00:04:20.615 --> 00:04:23.655

and removals from all work stages of a project and

89

00:04:23.655 --> 00:04:26.055

or program of works within specified boundaries.

90

00:04:26.715 --> 00:04:27.815

The guidance confirms

91

00:04:27.815 --> 00:04:29.775

that whole life carbon should not be confused

92

00:04:29.775 --> 00:04:32.655

with design life, which is the life expectancy of material,

93

00:04:32.655 --> 00:04:35.175

product or asset as defined

94

00:04:35.275 --> 00:04:37.495

by its designers within its specified parameters.

95

00:04:38.315 --> 00:04:39.615

The guidance also states

96

00:04:39.615 --> 00:04:41.815

that whole life carbon considerations for a project

97

00:04:41.995 --> 00:04:44.735

and program of works are wider than a typical life cycle.

98

00:04:45.765 --> 00:04:48.415

With this in mind, can the applicant confirm if they

99

00:04:48.575 --> 00:04:50.735

consider that the current whole life assessment covers all

100

00:04:50.735 --> 00:04:52.935

works stages of the proposed development

101

00:04:53.515 --> 00:04:55.455

if it excludes decommissioning

102

00:04:55.455 --> 00:04:57.255

and demolition of both the existing

103

00:04:57.275 --> 00:04:59.215

and proposed wastewater treatment plant?

104

00:05:03.375 --> 00:05:05.995

Um, we do believe it doesn't we, sorry.

105

00:05:06.095 --> 00:05:08.355

It does cover all of those lifecycle stages

106

00:05:08.355 --> 00:05:11.635

because it accounts for the continual operation of that site

107

00:05:11.985 --> 00:05:13.075

with the expectation

108

00:05:13.075 --> 00:05:15.915

that there will be no decommissioning of the works.

109

00:05:16.415 --> 00:05:19.715

Um, and therefore it's an indefinite scheme

110

00:05:19.715 --> 00:05:20.875

that carries ongoing and

111

00:05:20.875 --> 00:05:24.075

therefore the inclusion of the capital replacements

112

00:05:24.075 --> 00:05:29.045

of worn out assets aims to not have to, the, um, aims

113

00:05:29.045 --> 00:05:32.725

to not have to account for the decommissioning at the end

114

00:05:32.725 --> 00:05:34.765

of the proposed development asset life.

115

00:05:35.065 --> 00:05:36.765

We have accounted for the decommissioning

116

00:05:37.265 --> 00:05:39.405

of the existing site within the assessment.

117

00:05:40.425 --> 00:05:43.625

The demolition has been provided separately

118

00:05:44.015 --> 00:05:46.825

because the demolition won't be under

119

00:05:47.475 --> 00:05:48.785

undertaken by the applicant.

120

00:05:50.635 --> 00:05:54.185

Could you just outline how that is, it's different

121

00:05:54.185 --> 00:05:55.385

to then the design life.

122

00:05:55.485 --> 00:05:58.015

So what, can you just sort of explain the difference

123

00:05:58.015 --> 00:06:00.375

between the whole life and then in terms of design life with

124

00:06:00.375 --> 00:06:01.695

what you've assessed?

125

00:06:03.845 --> 00:06:08.425

Yep. So the design life in terms of one asset life of the

126

00:06:09.105 --> 00:06:11.665

proposed development could take from civil structures

127

00:06:11.665 --> 00:06:12.865

might last 60 years.

128

00:06:13.565 --> 00:06:16.505

You could have said the whole design life from, based on

129

00:06:17.285 --> 00:06:19.265

the large, the longest lasting element

130

00:06:19.325 --> 00:06:21.545

of the scheme is 60 years.

131

00:06:22.215 --> 00:06:23.425

What we've done is gone out

132

00:06:23.425 --> 00:06:27.305

to 2019 based on relevant representations to say

133

00:06:27.305 --> 00:06:30.475

what the operational design life is,

134

00:06:30.495 --> 00:06:33.395

but we've then also carried on taking into account

135

00:06:33.395 --> 00:06:36.635

that the whole life of the scheme is like to extend far

136

00:06:36.635 --> 00:06:38.355

beyond that 2090 period.

137

00:06:39.715 --> 00:06:40.145

Thank you.

138

00:06:44.955 --> 00:06:46.935

Can the applicant confirm whether they consider

139

00:06:46.935 --> 00:06:49.655

that the demolition of the proposed development would likely

140

00:06:49.675 --> 00:06:51.615

to be akin to the demolition emissions

141

00:06:51.635 --> 00:06:54.095

for the existing wastewater treatment PR plan presented

142

00:06:54.095 --> 00:06:55.815

by the applicant in the update

143

00:06:55.815 --> 00:06:59.615

to the strategic carbon assessment with reference rep 3 42

144

00:06:59.955 --> 00:07:02.415

of approximately 3,865?

145

00:07:02.795 --> 00:07:04.775

Uh, tons of carbon dioxide equivalent.

146

00:07:06.545 --> 00:07:10.315

Um, again, predicting the future a little bit

147

00:07:10.335 --> 00:07:12.595

but would be significantly lower given

148

00:07:12.595 --> 00:07:14.275
that we'd expect a large part

149

00:07:14.275 --> 00:07:17.115
of the demolition infrastructure to be decarbonized

150

00:07:17.135 --> 00:07:18.955
by the time that was to be come out, come round.

151

00:07:26.835 --> 00:07:27.885
Does the demolition,

152

00:07:27.945 --> 00:07:30.085
do the demolition emissions in the strategic carbon

153

00:07:30.085 --> 00:07:31.765
assessment include demolition

154

00:07:31.765 --> 00:07:33.925
of the existing Water Beach recycling center?

155

00:07:36.595 --> 00:07:39.255
No, it's only the existing Cley Road site.

156

00:07:40.235 --> 00:07:41.055
Why is that?

157

00:07:46.765 --> 00:07:49.015
It's not part of the current scheme

158

00:07:49.155 --> 00:07:51.135
to demo demolish the water beach site.

159

00:07:52.525 --> 00:07:54.485
'cause that's not where the proposed Yeah. Development.

160

00:07:55.185 --> 00:08:00.005
Right. So that's not where, that's not part of the site

161

00:08:00.005 --> 00:08:01.445

that we're looking at in terms of freeing

162

00:08:01.445 --> 00:08:03.465

up the opportunity.

163

00:08:07.225 --> 00:08:11.345

It is proposed to be demolished at some point, presumably

164

00:08:12.875 --> 00:08:14.095

Not under this DC0?

165

00:08:17.965 --> 00:08:21.275

No, neither is the existing wastewater treatment plant.

166

00:08:21.275 --> 00:08:23.035

But you have provided the emissions for all that,

167

00:08:26.185 --> 00:08:27.185

Sorry.

168

00:08:41.395 --> 00:08:43.595

I think the water be site is just completely outside

169

00:08:43.595 --> 00:08:47.235

of the scope that's been assessed in terms of where the,

170

00:08:48.225 --> 00:08:49.785

I guess the kneecap opportunity is,

171

00:08:49.805 --> 00:08:53.915

but also it's not been part of the general scope.

172

00:08:53.915 --> 00:08:57.205

That's what's been looked at at all in terms of demolishing

173

00:08:57.205 --> 00:08:59.005

that or decommissioning that existing works.

174

00:08:59.165 --> 00:09:01.085

I think previously we had allowed for decommissioning

175

00:09:01.085 --> 00:09:03.085
of the existing works, we've now

176

00:09:03.325 --> 00:09:04.885
provided demolition of the existing works.

177

00:09:05.485 --> 00:09:06.565
I don't think we've ever been asked

178

00:09:06.565 --> 00:09:08.685
to assess the water beach element previously.

179

00:09:09.375 --> 00:09:14.215
Thank you. Um, so moving on to potential

180

00:09:14.375 --> 00:09:18.775
for future expansions and upgrades to plant equipment.

181

00:09:19.515 --> 00:09:23.915
Um, so we, we touched on this very briefly earlier,

182

00:09:24.295 --> 00:09:25.315
um, and you said

183

00:09:25.315 --> 00:09:28.035
that the future expansion has not been included within the,

184

00:09:28.295 --> 00:09:30.355
uh, for the carbon emissions for expansion plans has not

185

00:09:30.355 --> 00:09:32.515
been included in in the carbon assessment.

186

00:09:34.375 --> 00:09:36.515
Um, I mean the applicant has confirmed

187

00:09:36.515 --> 00:09:38.555
that there is capacity within the proposed development

188

00:09:38.735 --> 00:09:40.355

to accommodate future expansion.

189

00:09:40.355 --> 00:09:42.275

There's an area within that to allow for it.

190

00:09:42.985 --> 00:09:44.715

Does the applicant therefore have an indication

191

00:09:44.735 --> 00:09:46.275

of the likely future expansion

192

00:09:46.385 --> 00:09:47.915

that could be accommodated at the site

193

00:09:48.375 --> 00:09:50.835

and that could there be therefore be factored into the

194

00:09:50.835 --> 00:09:51.875

operational stages?

195

00:09:52.775 --> 00:09:56.075

Um, and the carbon assessment of that, that stage.

196

00:10:15.615 --> 00:10:17.395

So we have an indication of

197

00:10:17.395 --> 00:10:19.515

what the population requirements might be.

198

00:10:19.515 --> 00:10:21.195

Obviously the farther out you go,

199

00:10:21.195 --> 00:10:22.315

the more uncertain they get.

200

00:10:22.455 --> 00:10:27.075

Um, we also would raise the, any expansion at

201

00:10:27.075 --> 00:10:28.835

that point would be netted off with the works

202

00:10:28.835 --> 00:10:31.035

that would be required at the existing site as well.

203

00:10:31.215 --> 00:10:33.275

Not saying that that's a mitigation,

204

00:10:33.335 --> 00:10:36.875

but there's no difference between the area

205

00:10:36.895 --> 00:10:39.075

that's been allowed for one is

206

00:10:39.075 --> 00:10:41.995

what would be required assuming the same processes were in

207

00:10:41.995 --> 00:10:43.555

place that's been allowed in a modular way.

208

00:10:44.685 --> 00:10:46.915

Again, when you're going out past the second phase

209

00:10:46.915 --> 00:10:49.755

of development, we hopefully expect significant

210

00:10:49.755 --> 00:10:50.835

technological development.

211

00:10:50.835 --> 00:10:54.035

There is also be hard to know how much you would need to do.

212

00:10:54.335 --> 00:10:56.235

Um, on a, like, for like basis.

213

00:10:57.185 --> 00:10:59.915

There's, there could be estimate spade in terms of

214

00:11:00.305 --> 00:11:02.955

what additional modularity would be required to cover

215

00:11:02.955 --> 00:11:06.195

that site, but it's highly uncertain is

216

00:11:06.195 --> 00:11:07.635

what I would say and highly speculative,

217

00:11:25.605 --> 00:11:27.985

Uh, save honey hill in their written representation.

218

00:11:28.365 --> 00:11:32.185

Uh, rep 1, 1 7, 1, consider that the carbon emissions likely

219

00:11:32.245 --> 00:11:34.425

to be generated in upgrading the existing sites

220

00:11:34.445 --> 00:11:35.905

to achieve the same capacity

221

00:11:36.005 --> 00:11:39.585

as the proposed development would be approximately 17,000

222

00:11:39.585 --> 00:11:41.425

tons of carbon dioxide equivalent.

223

00:11:41.925 --> 00:11:44.385

Um, does the applicant consider this fa uh, figure

224

00:11:44.405 --> 00:11:45.905

to be accurate or realistic?

225

00:11:48.325 --> 00:11:50.405

I think it's a nine with what's been presented in the

226

00:11:50.605 --> 00:11:52.805

strategic carbon assessment already, yet it's actually

227

00:11:53.365 --> 00:11:55.005

a little bit higher, so yeah,

228

00:11:55.195 --> 00:11:56.685

it's got an unreasonable figure.

229

00:12:06.125 --> 00:12:09.265

Uh, just moving on to, um, offsetting of decommissioning

230

00:12:09.265 --> 00:12:11.505

and construction, uh, greenhouse gas emissions.

231

00:12:12.165 --> 00:12:14.345

Can the applicant confirm whether the carbon emissions from

232

00:12:14.345 --> 00:12:16.825

decommissioning and construction would be monitored

233

00:12:17.005 --> 00:12:18.905

and if so, how is this secured

234

00:12:23.885 --> 00:12:25.825

And sorry, can I just clarify that that is

235

00:12:25.845 --> 00:12:27.425

for the existing site?

236

00:12:29.215 --> 00:12:30.755

Yes. Um, so the decommissioning

237

00:12:30.755 --> 00:12:32.235

and the construction element of it, so

238

00:12:33.295 --> 00:12:36.275

the applicant isn't proposing to offset all

239

00:12:36.275 --> 00:12:38.675

of its construction and decommissioning commissions.

240

00:12:38.735 --> 00:12:42.395

It is, has got a aspirational target to achieve the 70%

241

00:12:43.195 --> 00:12:45.915

reduction in emissions from its 2010 baseline,

242

00:12:46.495 --> 00:12:49.595

but it is only looking at net zero for the operational

243

00:12:49.695 --> 00:12:51.715

and then the offsets are so far related

244

00:12:51.775 --> 00:12:53.435

to operational emissions only.

245

00:12:53.825 --> 00:12:58.365

Yeah, so just to clarify, so they would, the, uh,

246

00:12:58.725 --> 00:13:00.285

construction emissions would not be monitored,

247

00:13:01.465 --> 00:13:04.815

Sorry, that, that that part they would be monitored in

248

00:13:04.815 --> 00:13:08.215

line with achieving a 70% reduction.

249

00:13:08.435 --> 00:13:12.415

Um, or again, as part of its aspirational target to,

250

00:13:12.635 --> 00:13:16.555

to make sure what it's included within its design is being

251

00:13:16.555 --> 00:13:20.035

delivered and doesn't stray from its detailed design,

252

00:13:20.505 --> 00:13:24.885

they would be monitored in terms of fuel meeting the design

253

00:13:24.885 --> 00:13:28.085

that's been proposed, but not to offset any

254

00:13:28.725 --> 00:13:29.925

emissions if that kind of makes Yeah,

255

00:13:29.985 --> 00:13:31.165

It, it does make sense, I think

256

00:13:31.425 --> 00:13:33.405

so you are saying from a corporate perspective you would,

257

00:13:33.405 --> 00:13:34.685

you would do that monitoring to try

258

00:13:34.685 --> 00:13:36.805

and achieve your corporate, um, aspirations,

259

00:13:36.865 --> 00:13:39.045

but I'm, I just need to be clear from a,

260

00:13:39.045 --> 00:13:40.325

from the DC0 perspective

261

00:13:40.325 --> 00:13:41.445

and control it through the DC0,

262

00:13:41.445 --> 00:13:42.765

there wouldn't be any monitoring

263

00:13:42.765 --> 00:13:45.765

of the carbon operations secured through the DC0

264

00:13:46.635 --> 00:13:47.635

For the construction. Elegant,

265

00:13:47.635 --> 00:13:50.775

no, not beyond the detailed design is what we said.

266

00:13:53.485 --> 00:13:58.345

And in that regard, the, um, the significance

267

00:13:58.405 --> 00:14:01.065

of effect of the construction, um,

268

00:14:02.455 --> 00:14:07.245

emissions would therefore be,

269

00:14:08.075 --> 00:14:09.405

Yeah, I think you're gonna say how,

270

00:14:09.625 --> 00:14:11.645
how are they managed secured?

271

00:14:11.705 --> 00:14:13.605
So there's, again, might have to,

272

00:14:13.905 --> 00:14:15.765
it is the construction management plan,

273

00:14:15.985 --> 00:14:19.085
but also the design codes around what needs to be done,

274

00:14:19.155 --> 00:14:21.645
both secured through the DC0 in terms

275

00:14:21.645 --> 00:14:24.325
of the design codes proposed for deadline

276

00:14:24.345 --> 00:14:28.645
for our covering elements of construction approach, um,

277

00:14:28.785 --> 00:14:30.845
and also the construction management plan as well.

278

00:14:32.925 --> 00:14:34.785
Can I just check that this design code that's

279

00:14:35.385 --> 00:14:38.945
suddenly come about, has this been worked up in

280

00:14:39.745 --> 00:14:40.745
collaboration with other parties

281

00:14:40.885 --> 00:14:43.985
or is this something that no one will have seen yet?

282

00:14:45.575 --> 00:14:47.095
I appreciate that it's been mentioned quite a lot,

283

00:14:47.115 --> 00:14:49.975

but, um, I don't think anyone has men has seen it

284

00:14:50.115 --> 00:14:52.885

yet in terms of other parties they, there, it's in response

285

00:14:52.945 --> 00:14:55.405

to conversations that have been

286

00:14:55.825 --> 00:14:57.445

and issues that have been raised

287

00:14:58.105 --> 00:15:01.765

and trying to find quite a difficult mechanism to

288

00:15:02.525 --> 00:15:05.285

demonstrate this, particularly the commitment

289

00:15:05.665 --> 00:15:06.885

to do everything possible

290

00:15:07.025 --> 00:15:10.685

to achieve an aspirational corporate target in a way

291

00:15:10.795 --> 00:15:13.405

that can be monitored and has some teeth to it.

292

00:15:13.905 --> 00:15:15.645

Um, which is really difficult

293

00:15:15.645 --> 00:15:19.045

because we're not working on, is ever evolving design.

294

00:15:19.265 --> 00:15:23.565

So that's hence why it is something that Ang

295

00:15:23.565 --> 00:15:25.645

and Water would do as a corporate element

296

00:15:25.705 --> 00:15:26.765

and monitor internally.

297

00:15:27.465 --> 00:15:29.805

The mechanism in terms of design codes is trying

298

00:15:29.805 --> 00:15:30.845

to understand how you can do

299

00:15:30.845 --> 00:15:32.965

that more transparently with the other. Okay.

300

00:15:32.965 --> 00:15:35.005

But it, it kind of follows what's been set out in the

301

00:15:35.005 --> 00:15:37.045

design and access statement as I understand it.

302

00:15:37.195 --> 00:15:41.095

Okay. So it's not completely new information.

303

00:15:41.355 --> 00:15:43.295

No, no, it's building on that. Okay.

304

00:15:43.295 --> 00:15:46.775

Thank you. Uh, sir John, John Bowles for the applicant.

305

00:15:47.155 --> 00:15:50.335

Um, just to confirm, we haven't engaged outside

306

00:15:50.335 --> 00:15:53.095

of the angling water team on this document,

307

00:15:53.155 --> 00:15:57.855

but as you say, the decision we took was that, um,

308

00:15:58.035 --> 00:16:02.735

in answer to, uh, some of the EQ one questions in relation

309

00:16:02.735 --> 00:16:04.295

to how, uh, whether

310

00:16:04.355 --> 00:16:08.455

or not the, um, commitment, if you like, to the principles

311

00:16:08.515 --> 00:16:11.255

and the objectives set out in the DASS was sufficiently

312

00:16:11.315 --> 00:16:15.375

robust that we felt that adopting a design code

313

00:16:15.675 --> 00:16:19.095

and taking it to the next level would achieve effectively

314

00:16:19.095 --> 00:16:20.975

that design quality requirement.

315

00:16:21.075 --> 00:16:23.855

And so that's, uh, why it's in reduction at the moment.

316

00:16:28.185 --> 00:16:29.715

Just going back to the point, um,

317

00:16:29.975 --> 00:16:31.675

we were making a moment ago, um,

318

00:16:31.775 --> 00:16:35.555

the PAs 2080 guidance states that asset owners as a minimum,

319

00:16:36.135 --> 00:16:39.155

um, carbon asset owners

320

00:16:39.155 --> 00:16:40.835

as a minimum carbon emissions should be monitored

321

00:16:40.855 --> 00:16:44.235

and reported during all work stages are at key points why

322

00:16:44.555 --> 00:16:46.155

decisions are made that influence whole

323

00:16:46.155 --> 00:16:47.235

life carbon reduction.

324

00:16:48.505 --> 00:16:51.035

Does this suggest that both decommissioning

325

00:16:51.035 --> 00:16:53.155

and construction emissions should be monitored

326

00:16:53.155 --> 00:16:55.355

and reported on and secured through the dco?

327

00:16:59.525 --> 00:17:02.165

I think it's important to, you know, I I respect the,

328

00:17:02.265 --> 00:17:03.405

the corporate Yeah,

329

00:17:03.675 --> 00:17:05.645

Yeah, I Was gonna say requirements and, and how you,

330

00:17:05.905 --> 00:17:09.445

but in terms of securing that through the DCO

331

00:17:09.445 --> 00:17:12.365

and giving the e XE assurance that that will happen, we,

332

00:17:12.365 --> 00:17:13.525

we don't have that at present.

333

00:17:14.105 --> 00:17:17.005

Um, and I suppose I just want to understand how does

334

00:17:17.005 --> 00:17:19.365

that align with the requirements of the, the PAs guidance?

335

00:17:20.555 --> 00:17:25.535

Yeah, um, so PAs does recommend that, oh,

336

00:17:25.535 --> 00:17:26.895

sorry, say that you should do that.

337

00:17:27.115 --> 00:17:31.965

Um, There's an element of how would you secure that with

338

00:17:31.965 --> 00:17:34.565

what reporting mechanism on what basis,

339

00:17:34.695 --> 00:17:37.725

given there's gonna be things arriving on site every day.

340

00:17:38.105 --> 00:17:40.165

Um, like we said, those

341

00:17:41.155 --> 00:17:43.385

activities would be monitored against

342

00:17:43.905 --> 00:17:44.945

construction management plan.

343

00:17:45.605 --> 00:17:48.185

Um, all of the other elements that we talked about in terms

344

00:17:48.185 --> 00:17:50.605

of the access measurement, all of those bits are there

345

00:17:50.605 --> 00:17:53.085

to be aligned to deliver good design.

346

00:17:53.825 --> 00:17:57.205

Um, it's the reporting, not, not trying

347

00:17:57.205 --> 00:17:58.445

to avoid saying reporting burden,

348

00:17:58.505 --> 00:18:02.725

but also practicalities of not creating something

349

00:18:02.725 --> 00:18:05.845

that becomes really difficult to a data management exercise,

350

00:18:05.885 --> 00:18:09.645

I guess in terms of there's things that are being secured

351

00:18:09.645 --> 00:18:10.765
that make sure these things happen.

352

00:18:11.745 --> 00:18:14.645
Um, and then reporting an emissions number on the back

353

00:18:14.645 --> 00:18:16.485
of it is something that we, we would try to monitor.

354

00:18:16.715 --> 00:18:21.645
It's really difficult to do on a live construction project.

355

00:18:21.925 --> 00:18:23.765
I think there will be an as-built element

356

00:18:23.785 --> 00:18:24.805
of what comes out of it.

357

00:18:25.065 --> 00:18:26.405
So making sure

358

00:18:26.525 --> 00:18:28.725
what we've said we would deliver is well has been delivered.

359

00:18:29.605 --> 00:18:31.485
I guess the, the diff the difference between

360

00:18:31.485 --> 00:18:35.085
that is the monitoring feels like a ongoing live daily

361

00:18:35.515 --> 00:18:39.165
element compared to a, a position at the end of

362

00:18:39.165 --> 00:18:41.405
what was built to demonstrate.

363

00:18:42.165 --> 00:18:44.605
I think what I'm struggling to understand is if you,

364

00:18:44.705 --> 00:18:46.285

you are doing it from a corporate perspective

365

00:18:46.305 --> 00:18:47.965

and say that you are reporting

366

00:18:47.965 --> 00:18:51.385

and monitoring on it, why can't that be secured through the,

367

00:18:51.565 --> 00:18:54.875

the DCO if you're saying it's difficult to do,

368

00:18:55.685 --> 00:18:57.185

but you, you have said that you will do it,

369

00:18:57.325 --> 00:18:58.865

but just through the corporate management

370

00:19:03.375 --> 00:19:07.605

Madam, the, the plan is to use the design code, um,

371

00:19:08.075 --> 00:19:12.405

like the construction management plan, um, allied

372

00:19:12.465 --> 00:19:17.005

to a requirement, um, that

373

00:19:18.605 --> 00:19:22.045

incorporated into a requirement, um, to, to do that.

374

00:19:31.855 --> 00:19:34.825

Okay. I think until we see the design code,

375

00:19:34.855 --> 00:19:36.905

it's obviously, it's difficult for us to comment on the,

376

00:19:36.925 --> 00:19:38.865

um, efficacy of that. Um,

377

00:19:39.085 --> 00:19:40.945

We accept that, um, Mr.

378

00:19:41.045 --> 00:19:45.865

Bowles has explained what the, um, objective is, uh, behind

379

00:19:46.395 --> 00:19:48.145

developing this mechanism.

380

00:19:48.485 --> 00:19:52.585

And obviously as with so many other things in this area,

381

00:19:52.845 --> 00:19:54.105

it is new and evolving.

382

00:19:54.885 --> 00:19:59.105

Um, but that's, that is what we're trying to, to address

383

00:19:59.105 --> 00:20:00.345

through that mechanism.

384

00:20:01.055 --> 00:20:02.605

Would there be any benefit

385

00:20:02.665 --> 00:20:05.005

of having it within the commitments register, for example?

386

00:20:07.235 --> 00:20:11.575

We can consider that. Um, suggestion, madam.

387

00:20:11.985 --> 00:20:12.455

Thank you.

388

00:20:23.805 --> 00:20:26.545

So if the applicant is doing monitoring,

389

00:20:27.255 --> 00:20:29.815

appreciating the difficulties that that involves

390

00:20:29.915 --> 00:20:34.775

and reporting why, why would they not be prepared

391

00:20:34.775 --> 00:20:36.335
to offset the carbon emissions

392

00:20:36.335 --> 00:20:38.015
from construction, for example?

393

00:20:44.305 --> 00:20:48.075
I think that would be a, it's never, if it was possible

394

00:20:48.095 --> 00:20:52.115
and if it felt its emissions were, sorry, let me just kind

395

00:20:52.115 --> 00:20:55.035
of get offsetting capital carbon emissions,

396

00:20:55.275 --> 00:20:59.035
construction emissions can end up being paying for emissions

397

00:20:59.035 --> 00:21:03.475
for a cement manufacturing company that can only reduce, its

398

00:21:04.175 --> 00:21:06.435
paying it off kind of element of it.

399

00:21:06.455 --> 00:21:08.915
The focus is on reducing emissions as much as possible

400

00:21:08.915 --> 00:21:10.355
through design choices, et cetera.

401

00:21:10.695 --> 00:21:12.035
It becomes a financial ticket

402

00:21:12.055 --> 00:21:14.675
to offset someone else's embodied emissions largely.

403

00:21:14.775 --> 00:21:18.395
And it's not an efficient way of any, um, organization

404

00:21:19.175 --> 00:21:20.635

to run itself.

405

00:21:20.635 --> 00:21:23.595

Whereas the, the applicant has taken a much more procurement

406

00:21:24.315 --> 00:21:26.515

collaborative approach to make decisions to work

407

00:21:26.515 --> 00:21:27.715

with low carbon suppliers

408

00:21:27.715 --> 00:21:30.075

that are making those investments themselves.

409

00:21:31.895 --> 00:21:35.195

Um, offsetting credits are mentioned within the carbon

410

00:21:35.195 --> 00:21:36.755

management plan as a solution

411

00:21:39.345 --> 00:21:40.925

For operational ions.

412

00:21:41.145 --> 00:21:44.005

And because they, those are direct emissions that are

413

00:21:44.835 --> 00:21:48.645

operationally delivering the, the applicant's

414

00:21:49.235 --> 00:21:50.845

operation of the wastewater treatment works.

415

00:21:51.105 --> 00:21:54.645

The capital construction emissions are

416

00:21:55.525 --> 00:21:58.165

somewhat out, out of the direct control of the applicant

417

00:21:58.395 --> 00:22:00.765

because there's a global supply chain that it's

418

00:22:01.275 --> 00:22:04.885

procuring off of and the local supply chain best,

419

00:22:05.545 --> 00:22:08.085

and this is long established in terms the applicant is

420

00:22:08.085 --> 00:22:09.325

working with its suppliers

421

00:22:09.625 --> 00:22:12.485

to decarbonize rather than end of pipe.

422

00:22:13.305 --> 00:22:16.175

Let's just pay that off set off kind of element of it

423

00:22:16.175 --> 00:22:19.455

and long term it has a view that's the best way to get

424

00:22:19.455 --> 00:22:22.415

to a transition to an a net zero approach.

425

00:22:23.695 --> 00:22:25.495

I think it's possible to demonstrate that

426

00:22:26.235 --> 00:22:28.775

you've done everything you can through the, you know,

427

00:22:29.175 --> 00:22:30.455

choosing of suppliers, et cetera,

428

00:22:30.455 --> 00:22:33.655

to reduce the carbon emissions associated with construction.

429

00:22:33.655 --> 00:22:36.535

But fundamentally, if there is a way, a methodology

430

00:22:36.555 --> 00:22:39.575

to offset the carbon emissions associated with construction,

431

00:22:40.195 --> 00:22:42.415

my question is still, why isn't this being done?

432

00:22:43.735 --> 00:22:46.825

Yeah, I think it comes back to the applicant feels it,

433

00:22:46.925 --> 00:22:48.625

it is going beyond any

434

00:22:49.215 --> 00:22:52.425

requirement in national local policy in terms

435

00:22:52.425 --> 00:22:54.665

of the reductions that it's aspiring to.

436

00:22:55.285 --> 00:22:56.625

You could always go further.

437

00:22:57.125 --> 00:22:59.985

You would wanna spend your time, effort

438

00:23:00.165 --> 00:23:03.185

and focus on reducing emissions where you can, um,

439

00:23:04.255 --> 00:23:05.515

it could be asked to go further,

440

00:23:05.855 --> 00:23:10.035

but there's no relevant policy legislation, even guidance

441

00:23:10.065 --> 00:23:12.555

that would suggest that its current target isn't

442

00:23:12.705 --> 00:23:14.195

extremely ambitious, I would say.

443

00:23:23.855 --> 00:23:26.685

Thank you. Um, so just moving on to, um,

444

00:23:26.865 --> 00:23:28.325

net zero and carbon offsetting.

445

00:23:29.065 --> 00:23:32.285

Um, so I'll be referring to the carbon management plan, um,

446

00:23:32.305 --> 00:23:34.765

within this, which we've obviously already strayed into it,

447

00:23:34.765 --> 00:23:36.805

that's a SMO 76.

448

00:23:38.145 --> 00:23:41.285

Um, the applicant committed a deadline one, um,

449

00:23:41.345 --> 00:23:45.045

to amend the wording of requirement 21 of the draft ECO

450

00:23:45.585 --> 00:23:47.965

to ensure that the carbon management plan will be submitted

451

00:23:47.965 --> 00:23:50.925

prior to first operation of the wastewater treatment plan,

452

00:23:51.505 --> 00:23:53.765

but I can see that this hasn't been actioned.

453

00:23:53.825 --> 00:23:55.965

Is that an oversight or is it intentional?

454

00:24:05.145 --> 00:24:07.285

Uh, Paul May for the applicant, ma, to the extent that

455

00:24:07.285 --> 00:24:09.325

that is intended, it's an oversight and we'll correct that

456

00:24:13.045 --> 00:24:14.045

As a follow up.

457

00:24:14.365 --> 00:24:18.115

Um, should requirement 21 actually be amended

458

00:24:18.115 --> 00:24:20.395

to require provision of the carbon management plan prior

459

00:24:20.395 --> 00:24:23.355

to construction of the proposed development to ensure

460

00:24:23.355 --> 00:24:25.715

that the carbon saving technologies are adequately embedded

461

00:24:25.825 --> 00:24:26.875

into the design of the project?

462

00:24:27.055 --> 00:24:30.295

Or is this something that you're saying is now captured

463

00:24:30.355 --> 00:24:31.615

by the design code?

464

00:24:34.825 --> 00:24:37.725

Uh, again, Paul May, the applicant, um, uh, yes,

465

00:24:37.725 --> 00:24:39.085

that's, that, that's correct.

466

00:24:39.705 --> 00:24:42.125

Um, the carbon management plan is, is there

467

00:24:42.125 --> 00:24:45.005

for operational carbon as far as design and,

468

00:24:45.145 --> 00:24:46.605

and those kind of matters are

469

00:24:46.605 --> 00:24:47.845

concerned it's coming through the design code.

470

00:24:57.325 --> 00:25:01.315

Could the applicant share rep three 19,

471

00:25:01.645 --> 00:25:04.635

which is ES chapter 10, figure 4.9,

472

00:25:04.635 --> 00:25:06.555

which is on page 52, please.

473

00:25:24.355 --> 00:25:26.235

ES chapter 10 was updated at deadline three

474

00:25:26.235 --> 00:25:27.235

to include an assessment

475

00:25:27.375 --> 00:25:30.275

of the proposed development carbon emissions against the UK

476

00:25:30.335 --> 00:25:31.435

six carbon budget

477

00:25:31.975 --> 00:25:34.475

and the pathway to achieving net zero by 2050.

478

00:25:35.345 --> 00:25:39.595

Paragraph 4.6 0.228 of ES chapter 10 states that

479

00:25:39.595 --> 00:25:42.075

for the baseline option, the scale

480

00:25:42.075 --> 00:25:44.675

of emissions is greater than those tested against a sick

481

00:25:44.675 --> 00:25:47.835

carbon budget sector de uh, decarbonization trajectories

482

00:25:48.935 --> 00:25:51.515

on the basis that the examining authority, uh,

483

00:25:51.515 --> 00:25:52.595

and Secretary of State have

484

00:25:52.595 --> 00:25:54.235

to consider the worst case scenario.

485

00:25:54.825 --> 00:25:56.355

Does this therefore suggest

486

00:25:56.355 --> 00:25:58.235

that the proposed development does not align

487

00:25:58.235 --> 00:25:59.715

with the UK six carbon budget

488

00:25:59.975 --> 00:26:02.515

or trajectory to net zero in 2050?

489

00:26:05.815 --> 00:26:09.675

Um, can I just firstly say this exercise was done to try

490

00:26:09.675 --> 00:26:13.655

and take an interpretation of what alignment

491

00:26:13.835 --> 00:26:16.335

to the six carbon budget would be, just to make it clear

492

00:26:16.335 --> 00:26:18.775

that the six carbon budget takes economy level

493

00:26:19.575 --> 00:26:22.855

reductions from 1990 levels out to 2050.

494

00:26:23.605 --> 00:26:27.295

It's a very top down exercise just, just to understand

495

00:26:27.295 --> 00:26:29.575

that this is an interpretation that the applicant has made

496

00:26:29.575 --> 00:26:33.575

to apply it to these emissions to provide

497

00:26:33.885 --> 00:26:37.855

what the six carbon budget might, uh, um, require

498

00:26:38.395 --> 00:26:39.655

the proposed development to do.

499

00:26:40.035 --> 00:26:42.695

Um, I think everything we've just discussed around

500

00:26:43.705 --> 00:26:45.725

the baseline itself wouldn't be aligned.

501

00:26:46.105 --> 00:26:49.165

Um, hence why we, one of the reasons why we presented that

502

00:26:49.165 --> 00:26:51.325

as the baseline to then demonstrate

503

00:26:51.625 --> 00:26:54.165

and provide focus to the team to get down to what we needed

504

00:26:54.165 --> 00:26:56.605

to and to demonstrate that we're going beyond

505

00:26:56.995 --> 00:26:58.125

that trajectory as well.

506

00:26:58.745 --> 00:27:00.845

The dis I don't wanna keep on saying the design code,

507

00:27:00.845 --> 00:27:03.445

but the design code, the other operational mitigation

508

00:27:03.445 --> 00:27:05.645

measures and yeah, in the, in the, um,

509

00:27:05.745 --> 00:27:09.805

of the carbon management plan are all there to ensure

510

00:27:09.805 --> 00:27:12.325

that we don't deliver the M zero,

511

00:27:12.385 --> 00:27:15.925

we deliver the proposed development as it's been presented.

512

00:27:16.265 --> 00:27:20.125

And, and I guess what the exercise does highlight is

513

00:27:20.125 --> 00:27:23.445

that the level of reductions identified to date, um,

514

00:27:23.665 --> 00:27:26.605

and be in the design codes as well are

515

00:27:26.935 --> 00:27:28.805

below what could be.

516

00:27:28.805 --> 00:27:30.765

And again, that's why I wanted to kind of caveat

517

00:27:31.075 --> 00:27:32.245

what could be interpreted

518

00:27:32.515 --> 00:27:34.605

that the six carbon budget might require. Okay.

519

00:27:34.655 --> 00:27:37.085

Sorry, can we have that the document back up again?

520

00:27:37.305 --> 00:27:41.805

Um, so I think we've got the, the base, the DMM zero,

521

00:27:42.625 --> 00:27:47.405

um, tracking against, um, the UK six carbon budget

522

00:27:47.745 --> 00:27:49.845

and the preferred option, but we didn't,

523

00:27:50.075 --> 00:27:52.445

therefore, if I've understood this correctly based on

524

00:27:52.445 --> 00:27:54.725

what you've just said, the CHP option

525

00:27:55.765 --> 00:27:57.985

and an assessment against the six carbon budget

526

00:27:58.125 --> 00:28:00.865

and the, um, trajectory to net zero.

527

00:28:01.245 --> 00:28:03.305

We, we don't appear to have that as far as I can see.

528

00:28:13.585 --> 00:28:17.755

That is correct. It's not in the, um, chapter, so,

529

00:28:18.415 --> 00:28:22.635

but we can provide that if you want as an update to, um,

530

00:28:23.275 --> 00:28:25.595

I can tell you what the results we did do the work, um,

531

00:28:25.695 --> 00:28:29.675

it does still come below the dotted line in terms

532

00:28:29.675 --> 00:28:31.075

of the six carbon budget line.

533

00:28:31.455 --> 00:28:34.715

Um, I dunno if that was, that wasn't,

534

00:28:34.795 --> 00:28:36.995

I think we have just presented our preferred

535

00:28:36.995 --> 00:28:38.075

option in this case.

536

00:28:38.075 --> 00:28:38.995

Yeah. But com um,

537

00:28:39.315 --> 00:28:40.395

completeness, I think we need to see that.

538

00:28:40.445 --> 00:28:40.915

Thank you.

539

00:28:50.145 --> 00:28:52.925

The, um, the outline carbon management plan, uh, states

540

00:28:52.925 --> 00:28:55.445

that land use change monitoring would be in accordance

541

00:28:55.445 --> 00:28:58.125

with the landscape monitoring set out in table 5.1,

542

00:28:58.305 --> 00:28:59.405

the landscape ecological

543

00:28:59.585 --> 00:29:03.485

and recreational management plan reference as six, uh, 66,

544

00:29:04.055 --> 00:29:06.005

which secures monitoring for 30 years.

545

00:29:06.985 --> 00:29:08.045

Can the applicant confirm

546

00:29:08.145 --> 00:29:10.685

how would the carbon sequestration from the proposed

547

00:29:10.685 --> 00:29:12.205

deciduous woodland be monitored

548

00:29:12.665 --> 00:29:14.725

and factored into the net operational emissions

549

00:29:14.725 --> 00:29:15.765

for the proposed development

550

00:29:15.975 --> 00:29:18.525

after the period of landscape monitor set out in the

551

00:29:18.525 --> 00:29:21.005

landscape, ecological and recreational plan finishes

552

00:29:21.145 --> 00:29:23.805

to ensure net zero operation emissions beyond this?

553

00:29:26.275 --> 00:29:29.445

Yeah, currently. So in terms of

554

00:29:29.465 --> 00:29:30.605

how they would be monitored,

555

00:29:31.045 --> 00:29:32.725

I wouldn't be the right person to answer that.

556

00:29:32.745 --> 00:29:34.325

It would be, um, how we've

557

00:29:34.325 --> 00:29:36.605

therefore allowed for those in the assessment is

558

00:29:36.605 --> 00:29:38.325

that we haven't carried on any benefit

559

00:29:38.575 --> 00:29:40.445

after the period of the monitoring ends,

560

00:29:40.445 --> 00:29:41.685

the sequestration benefit

561

00:29:41.745 --> 00:29:45.835

and the assessment is zeroes out to, to, to account

562

00:29:45.895 --> 00:29:47.195

for the fact that we haven't

563

00:29:47.625 --> 00:29:49.235

concluded what that monitoring might be.

564

00:29:49.545 --> 00:29:51.515

Okay. Yeah. So it's not, it's not carried forward in

565

00:29:51.515 --> 00:29:54.275

assessment, but I suppose can, can another member

566

00:29:54.275 --> 00:29:55.755

of the team, um, clarify

567

00:29:58.725 --> 00:30:00.165

I think what you're asking for the clarification,

568

00:30:00.165 --> 00:30:01.325

how it would be monitored, how

569

00:30:01.325 --> 00:30:02.325

It would Yes, please. Yeah.

570

00:30:02.325 --> 00:30:02.845

571

00:30:13.145 --> 00:30:16.845

Um, perhaps I, I I could answer that, um, Andrew part,

572

00:30:16.865 --> 00:30:18.605

the applicant if that, if I may.

573

00:30:18.705 --> 00:30:21.365

Um, I think it wouldn't be monitored,

574

00:30:21.395 --> 00:30:23.285

it's not included in the, in, in the assessment.

575

00:30:23.625 --> 00:30:27.405

Um, uh, and, and therefore would be no ongoing monitoring

576

00:30:27.405 --> 00:30:29.245

after the 30 year BNG process.

577

00:30:30.225 --> 00:30:32.215

There would be no need to monitor it, would there?

578

00:30:43.665 --> 00:30:44.835

Okay. Thank you. Um,

579

00:30:45.095 --> 00:30:46.755

Ms. Wilkinson, I understand you've got your hand up.

580

00:30:46.755 --> 00:30:47.955

Did you have some comments to make on

581

00:30:50.445 --> 00:30:51.445

Thank you. Yes. Sarah Wilkinson

582

00:30:51.445 --> 00:30:53.275

for Cambridge County Council.

583

00:30:53.495 --> 00:30:56.515

It was just a quick comment on, uh, your previous point

584

00:30:56.545 --> 00:30:57.635

regarding that.

585

00:30:57.635 --> 00:31:00.275

The graph that's on, on the screen there about alignment

586

00:31:00.305 --> 00:31:02.995

with the six carbon budget, um,

587

00:31:03.945 --> 00:31:06.865

I was just interested in why the red dotted line

588

00:31:07.545 --> 00:31:10.625

wouldn't be at zero by 2050.

589

00:31:11.035 --> 00:31:12.035

Thank you.

590

00:31:18.165 --> 00:31:20.855

Yeah. Okay. Yeah, so that's

591

00:31:20.855 --> 00:31:23.135

because again, interpretation of

592

00:31:23.135 --> 00:31:25.775

how we've applied these emissions is that we've taken

593

00:31:26.535 --> 00:31:28.575

construction manufacturing sector

594

00:31:28.795 --> 00:31:31.455

or manufacturing construction sector applied those

595

00:31:31.455 --> 00:31:34.655

percentage reductions to the construction emissions.

596

00:31:34.705 --> 00:31:36.695

Hence why they flatline

597

00:31:36.745 --> 00:31:39.295

after, we can't influence construction emissions

598

00:31:39.585 --> 00:31:41.215

after they've taken in place.

599

00:31:41.315 --> 00:31:43.575

So what we're saying is in the period

600

00:31:43.635 --> 00:31:45.295

of time we're doing the construction,

601

00:31:45.745 --> 00:31:48.855

there is a certain reduction that the sixth carbon budget

602

00:31:49.705 --> 00:31:52.995

expects to happen over those years from its starting point.

603

00:31:53.295 --> 00:31:55.315

That's what we've applied, but then at flat lines,

604

00:31:55.525 --> 00:31:59.275

there isn't any other emissions that we would expect

605

00:31:59.335 --> 00:32:02.355

to see decarbonize and the operational part already goes.

606

00:32:02.375 --> 00:32:06.075

So therefore the dotted line is the bit where we have

607

00:32:06.075 --> 00:32:07.435
that influence over those emissions.

608

00:32:07.575 --> 00:32:10.075
We can't apply a reduction

609

00:32:10.075 --> 00:32:12.075
to construction emissions in 2014.

610

00:32:12.085 --> 00:32:14.355
We've already built them. So we've applied, thank you.

611

00:32:14.415 --> 00:32:17.395
The 2025 to six Yeah. Emissions.

612

00:32:20.065 --> 00:32:21.105
I could see Ms. Wilkerson nodding.

613

00:32:21.205 --> 00:32:23.225
So I assume you don't have any follow up points on that.

614

00:32:26.275 --> 00:32:27.135
That's fine, thank you.

615

00:32:32.975 --> 00:32:34.835
We, we've touched on this slightly.

616

00:32:35.295 --> 00:32:37.875
Um, the applicant confirmed at deadline one

617

00:32:38.145 --> 00:32:40.365
that it is committed to securing sufficient carbon

618

00:32:40.365 --> 00:32:42.445
offsetting credits to meet, um,

619

00:32:42.965 --> 00:32:45.205
expected operational emissions if ne necessary.

620

00:32:46.585 --> 00:32:47.685

Um, the only reference

621

00:32:47.685 --> 00:32:49.925

to carbon credits within the outlined carbon management plan

622

00:32:49.925 --> 00:32:52.485

is a general description of paragraph 2.1, 0.4.

623

00:32:52.985 --> 00:32:54.845

Should this document therefore be updated

624

00:32:54.865 --> 00:32:56.245

to provide a stronger commitment

625

00:32:56.245 --> 00:32:58.965

to purchasing carbon offsetting credits if required?

626

00:33:04.445 --> 00:33:06.305

Um, I think the wording can be strengthened.

627

00:33:06.305 --> 00:33:08.225

I think we are looking to keep this as a live document

628

00:33:08.225 --> 00:33:09.865

that would provide even more certainty of

629

00:33:09.865 --> 00:33:12.905

what those credits might look like through that engagement.

630

00:33:12.965 --> 00:33:15.265

Um, I think there is a commitment that we will

631

00:33:15.785 --> 00:33:17.825

purchase enough long-term credits

632

00:33:18.325 --> 00:33:19.465

for the expected operation.

633

00:33:19.505 --> 00:33:21.305

I think that is the wording in the plan.

634

00:33:21.305 --> 00:33:22.785

If it needs to be strengthened, we can,

635

00:33:23.295 --> 00:33:25.985

Yeah, I I think it's, it's giving clarity about

636

00:33:25.985 --> 00:33:28.265

what the options are, how this can be achieved.

637

00:33:28.325 --> 00:33:30.545

So yes, I think if you can strengthen their wording

638

00:33:30.545 --> 00:33:32.305

around there, that would be very helpful. Yeah,

639

00:33:32.495 --> 00:33:34.585

Just to, that might not be

640

00:33:35.695 --> 00:33:37.625

immediate in terms of data.

641

00:33:37.625 --> 00:33:39.545

There's engagement to be done to kind of make sure

642

00:33:39.545 --> 00:33:42.065

that we've got stakeholder views on

643

00:33:42.065 --> 00:33:43.825

what credible offsets would look like

644

00:33:43.845 --> 00:33:45.625

and then committing to that. Yeah,

645

00:33:45.985 --> 00:33:47.745

I think it's about giving us the confidence that

646

00:33:48.305 --> 00:33:51.145

securing offsetting is, is achievable. Yeah.

647

00:33:51.875 --> 00:33:52.165

Yeah.

648

00:33:58.025 --> 00:34:00.125

Uh, the applicant states within their planning statement

649

00:34:00.385 --> 00:34:04.765

rep 1 0 4 9 at paragraph 1.6 0.1

650

00:34:05.235 --> 00:34:06.285

that an additional benefit

651

00:34:06.385 --> 00:34:09.165

of the proposed development is significantly reduced carbon

652

00:34:09.445 --> 00:34:10.725

emissions compared to the existing

653

00:34:10.725 --> 00:34:11.845

wastewater treatment plant.

654

00:34:12.445 --> 00:34:14.655

However, given that the current operational emissions

655

00:34:14.655 --> 00:34:17.175

of the existing wastewater treatment plant have not been

656

00:34:17.415 --> 00:34:20.575

provided, how has the applicant concluded

657

00:34:20.575 --> 00:34:22.775

that there would be significantly reduced operational

658

00:34:23.095 --> 00:34:24.815

emissions compared to the existing

659

00:34:24.815 --> 00:34:25.895

wastewater treatment plan?

660

00:34:31.085 --> 00:34:34.615

I think that's gonna be addressed at deadline for

661

00:34:34.615 --> 00:34:36.335
that we know what the operations are

662

00:34:36.475 --> 00:34:37.935
and they just need to be presented.

663

00:34:37.975 --> 00:34:39.975
I guess if you need to provide the evidence base, we know

664

00:34:39.975 --> 00:34:42.255
that we've chosen more efficient care,

665

00:34:42.385 --> 00:34:44.615
we've been more efficient in our design than the current

666

00:34:44.725 --> 00:34:46.935
site and we know at the ND months, so yeah.

667

00:34:47.585 --> 00:34:48.055
Thank you.

668

00:34:53.375 --> 00:34:56.315
So could a carbon management plan

669

00:34:57.025 --> 00:35:00.035
with carbon offsetting achieve a similar overall net carbon

670

00:35:00.135 --> 00:35:01.875
saving as those suggested for those

671

00:35:01.935 --> 00:35:04.195
as the proposed development for operation?

672

00:35:10.805 --> 00:35:14.205
I think this is asking could the current works be made

673

00:35:14.205 --> 00:35:17.405
operationally net zero through offsets and upgrades?

674

00:35:17.745 --> 00:35:20.525

Yes. Yep. Um, feasibly, yes.

675

00:35:20.985 --> 00:35:24.485

Um, I think this comes back to Liz, Liz, um,

676

00:35:24.935 --> 00:35:29.125

Liz's point earlier around the regulatory framework

677

00:35:29.125 --> 00:35:31.125

that would need to be in place to allow that to happen

678

00:35:31.425 --> 00:35:35.435

for the applicant in terms of this is an opportunity

679

00:35:35.535 --> 00:35:40.285

to substantially improve the efficiency of the works, which

680

00:35:40.535 --> 00:35:43.565

where the applicant is currently regulated in five year

681

00:35:43.625 --> 00:35:47.125

cycles, where investment plans need to be put in place

682

00:35:47.785 --> 00:35:48.885

for a given reason

683

00:35:48.985 --> 00:35:51.565

or a policy change, um, that are outside

684

00:35:51.565 --> 00:35:52.565

of the applicant's control.

685

00:35:52.565 --> 00:35:56.885

There works, as I think has been noted, operates, um,

686

00:35:57.045 --> 00:35:59.965

operates within its requirements at this moment in time.

687

00:36:00.345 --> 00:36:04.405

So there wouldn't be regulatory approval for funding to do

688

00:36:04.405 --> 00:36:07.885

that from a its existing commitment point of view.

689

00:36:08.025 --> 00:36:10.125

Um, operationally, um,

690

00:36:10.255 --> 00:36:12.925

it'll be covered under its operational net zero

691

00:36:13.105 --> 00:36:15.805

by 2030 commitment regardless of

692

00:36:16.745 --> 00:36:17.745

The ation. So it's a

693

00:36:17.745 --> 00:36:18.605

offending issue.

694

00:36:21.515 --> 00:36:24.725

It's a, it's a regulatory issue in terms of

695

00:36:25.545 --> 00:36:29.365

The, the point is that the regulator

696

00:36:30.205 --> 00:36:32.525

wouldn't approve the expenditure

697

00:36:32.665 --> 00:36:36.845

unless it were required, um, by some, um,

698

00:36:37.145 --> 00:36:38.645

for some regulatory purpose.

699

00:36:41.555 --> 00:36:45.935

So an Ang water doesn't have total freedom about

700

00:36:45.995 --> 00:36:47.015

how to spend its money.

701

00:36:48.015 --> 00:36:51.115

No, the, the water sector has committed towards

702

00:36:52.065 --> 00:36:54.715
operational net zero by 2030, though,

703

00:36:56.415 --> 00:36:59.145
Just to clarify that last point, with

704

00:36:59.145 --> 00:37:02.305
or without this relocation, yes, the applicant will

705

00:37:03.415 --> 00:37:05.795
invest in terms of, but through offsetting

706

00:37:05.935 --> 00:37:08.155
and reductions across its portfolio

707

00:37:08.375 --> 00:37:09.675
to achieve operational net zero.

708

00:37:10.055 --> 00:37:12.875
But that doesn't mean the site, every single site,

709

00:37:12.875 --> 00:37:14.995
it has needs to be operational net zero.

710

00:37:15.335 --> 00:37:17.795
The commitment is at a sector level

711

00:37:18.055 --> 00:37:20.555
and then taken on as a company level, and

712

00:37:20.555 --> 00:37:24.475
therefore through its operation of its whole asset portfolio

713

00:37:24.985 --> 00:37:26.835
will achieve operational net zero and

714

00:37:26.835 --> 00:37:30.075
therefore it will invest efficiently across its board,

715

00:37:30.125 --> 00:37:33.915

which might involve some investment at the current works.

716

00:37:33.935 --> 00:37:36.555

But that doesn't mean that it would get approval to do that.

717

00:37:36.775 --> 00:37:38.115

It might do certain bits,

718

00:37:38.285 --> 00:37:39.675

there might be more efficient areas

719

00:37:39.675 --> 00:37:40.795

where it could invest money

720

00:37:41.255 --> 00:37:43.875

to achieve operational net zero course its portfolio.

721

00:37:44.245 --> 00:37:49.095

Thank you. So just moving on to significant of effects.

722

00:37:49.515 --> 00:37:53.695

Um, so the a, uh, the examining authority notes

723

00:37:53.695 --> 00:37:54.855

that the applicant is committed

724

00:37:54.855 --> 00:37:56.695

to ensuring the proposed development would be

725

00:37:56.695 --> 00:37:57.895

operationally net zero.

726

00:37:59.035 --> 00:38:01.375

Um, with that being the case,

727

00:38:03.035 --> 00:38:05.855

and this again, you might respond with the deadline four,

728

00:38:05.855 --> 00:38:06.895

we'll make this clearer,

729

00:38:07.275 --> 00:38:11.895

but ES chapter 10, paragraph 4.4 0.17 states

730

00:38:11.895 --> 00:38:14.975

that the residual effects from the net operational carbon

731

00:38:14.985 --> 00:38:17.975

production would be casted a significant moderate adverse.

732

00:38:19.865 --> 00:38:21.525

Why is it that the carbon management plan

733

00:38:22.365 --> 00:38:24.815

that the applicant proposes would offset these emissions?

734

00:38:25.675 --> 00:38:27.695

And you, you seem quite confident that it will,

735

00:38:27.795 --> 00:38:29.015

it will function to do that,

736

00:38:29.595 --> 00:38:31.175

but why isn't that taken account

737

00:38:31.175 --> 00:38:33.135

of in the residual effects for operation?

738

00:38:37.375 --> 00:38:39.215

I think 'cause we were trying to provide a reasonable

739

00:38:39.785 --> 00:38:43.455

worst case, and maybe we've been too conservative in that

740

00:38:44.055 --> 00:38:47.055

allocation of we've presented, like we say,

741

00:38:47.055 --> 00:38:49.215

without the benefits of solar without the

742

00:38:49.215 --> 00:38:50.255
offsets being in place.

743

00:38:50.835 --> 00:38:53.055
And we've taken the gross emissions into account

744

00:38:53.055 --> 00:38:54.695
and the net emissions into account there,

745

00:38:55.075 --> 00:38:59.775
and we've tried to be quite open to the fact

746

00:38:59.775 --> 00:39:01.695
that there are remissions that need to be mitigated

747

00:39:01.695 --> 00:39:04.135
and hence using the 2022 I EMA guidance,

748

00:39:04.405 --> 00:39:05.895
they have been partially mitigated,

749

00:39:05.915 --> 00:39:07.375
not fully mitigated at this point.

750

00:39:07.425 --> 00:39:09.255
Hence they're moderately adverse and

751

00:39:09.255 --> 00:39:11.415
therefore significant if

752

00:39:17.035 --> 00:39:19.775
The residual effect shown for the operation

753

00:39:19.775 --> 00:39:22.535
of the proposed development under table five dash one

754

00:39:22.635 --> 00:39:25.535
of ES chapter 10, which is the summary of greenhouse gas,

755

00:39:25.835 --> 00:39:27.975

gas emissions is a little confusing.

756

00:39:28.675 --> 00:39:30.895

It states significant as a residual effect,

757

00:39:30.955 --> 00:39:31.975

but then goes on to state

758

00:39:31.975 --> 00:39:34.255

that the CHP option would be reduced,

759

00:39:34.335 --> 00:39:37.535

a neutral negligible effect non-significant through the use

760

00:39:37.535 --> 00:39:38.695

of the carbon management plan.

761

00:39:39.335 --> 00:39:42.725

I think it's important to just give

762

00:39:42.725 --> 00:39:45.845

that clarification again, um, through the es.

763

00:39:46.225 --> 00:39:47.805

So do,

764

00:39:47.905 --> 00:39:50.245

do you consider the residual effect to be not significant?

765

00:39:53.475 --> 00:39:56.155

I think that's an alignment issue there in terms

766

00:39:56.155 --> 00:39:58.235

of we've assessed the main body of it

767

00:39:58.255 --> 00:40:00.315

to be moderate adverse given

768

00:40:00.825 --> 00:40:02.835

what it's been partially mitigated at the moment.

769

00:40:03.055 --> 00:40:05.395

And I think that's what five one should show.

770

00:40:06.415 --> 00:40:08.915

So it should say that it is mod it's significant still.

771

00:40:08.945 --> 00:40:12.575

Yeah, yeah. Even given the carbon management plan,

772

00:40:15.165 --> 00:40:20.015

Given that we haven't, I think,

773

00:40:20.065 --> 00:40:23.695

again, I, I've, it's an interpretation of the guidance is

774

00:40:23.695 --> 00:40:26.255

that without all of those off, I think the,

775

00:40:26.635 --> 00:40:28.735

the carbon management plan would get it to a point

776

00:40:28.735 --> 00:40:29.935

of it not being significant,

777

00:40:30.475 --> 00:40:33.295

but the chapter is assessed where it is in terms

778

00:40:33.295 --> 00:40:35.135

of a design at the moment.

779

00:40:36.035 --> 00:40:39.975

And I would've thought in again, is that if we had

780

00:40:40.575 --> 00:40:43.575

assessed it on the base basis of a plan

781

00:40:43.575 --> 00:40:46.095

that hasn't been fully developed to its detailed stage,

782

00:40:46.435 --> 00:40:48.175

that's where we think it will get to exactly

783

00:40:48.175 --> 00:40:50.415

what you're saying in terms of not being significant.

784

00:40:50.435 --> 00:40:55.015

But at this point in time, the net the, the residual impacts

785

00:40:55.015 --> 00:40:58.485

of are, are only partially mitigated.

786

00:40:58.705 --> 00:41:01.565

So I agree with you that the outline carbon management plan

787

00:41:01.595 --> 00:41:04.165

does set it out to being not significant.

788

00:41:04.275 --> 00:41:05.275

Yeah.

789

00:41:05.945 --> 00:41:08.045

The draft DCO does require

790

00:41:09.155 --> 00:41:11.085

that the development is operationally net zero.

791

00:41:11.185 --> 00:41:14.925

So is that ca are you then forecasting doubt that the,

792

00:41:15.145 --> 00:41:17.045

the carbon management plan won't be able to do that?

793

00:41:17.785 --> 00:41:19.485

Not at all. Sorry. It's just saying that

794

00:41:19.515 --> 00:41:22.285

what the chapter has assessed is what we're saying.

795

00:41:22.425 --> 00:41:24.485

So, and I think you're right

796

00:41:24.505 --> 00:41:27.245

and I'm gonna take that away as a, the, the,

797

00:41:27.345 --> 00:41:30.965

the post carbon management plan is correct that I'll,

798

00:41:31.275 --> 00:41:35.605

that it will be either beneficial or negligible.

799

00:41:35.605 --> 00:41:36.525

Yeah. In terms of, yeah.

800

00:41:41.865 --> 00:41:42.085

So

801

00:41:42.615 --> 00:41:44.485

Madam, would it be helpful to clarify

802

00:41:44.675 --> 00:41:46.245

that further within the chapter?

803

00:41:47.345 --> 00:41:49.525

Yes. Yeah, absolutely. Thank you.

804

00:41:50.645 --> 00:41:52.745

Uh, in regards to the whole life carbon assessment,

805

00:41:52.835 --> 00:41:54.985

table four dash nine vs.

806

00:41:54.985 --> 00:41:57.625

Chapter 10 confirms the significance of effects.

807

00:41:58.735 --> 00:42:02.825

Paragraph 4.6 18 confirms that the residual effects remain

808

00:42:02.825 --> 00:42:05.625

as set out within table four dash nine with the impact

809

00:42:05.645 --> 00:42:08.865

of the CHP option net carbon emissions over the whole

810

00:42:09.105 --> 00:42:12.185

lifetime assessment being a significant moderate adverse,

811

00:42:12.695 --> 00:42:14.545

however, the residual effects shown

812

00:42:14.625 --> 00:42:16.025

for the whole life carbon emissions

813

00:42:16.025 --> 00:42:19.025

of the proposed development under summary table five dash

814

00:42:19.165 --> 00:42:21.585

one states that the significant of effects

815

00:42:21.925 --> 00:42:23.705

for the CHP option would reduce

816

00:42:23.725 --> 00:42:26.425

to neutral non-significant effect through the use

817

00:42:26.425 --> 00:42:27.665

of the carbon management plan.

818

00:42:28.695 --> 00:42:29.725

Based on the discussions,

819

00:42:29.725 --> 00:42:33.365

however, we've had earlier that the construction

820

00:42:33.925 --> 00:42:37.605

emissions are not being offset, at least in totality.

821

00:42:39.815 --> 00:42:41.435

Can the applicant explain that position,

822

00:42:41.755 --> 00:42:43.635

particularly the stance in the summary?

823

00:42:46.415 --> 00:42:50.265

Yeah, so follow, so if I can just quote

824

00:42:51.615 --> 00:42:54.585

some of the guidance that we've used to make

825

00:42:54.585 --> 00:42:56.025

that judgment, if that's alright.

826

00:42:56.125 --> 00:43:00.825

So, um, from the 2022 IEA guidance, um, major adverse,

827

00:43:00.845 --> 00:43:02.865

the projects greenhouse gas are not mitigated

828

00:43:03.405 --> 00:43:07.145

or are only compliant with a due minimum, um, standard set

829

00:43:07.145 --> 00:43:09.025

through regulation, uh, retail thing.

830

00:43:09.245 --> 00:43:12.825

Um, moderate adverse is the projects greenhouse gas emission

831

00:43:12.895 --> 00:43:14.465

impacts are partially mitigated

832

00:43:14.845 --> 00:43:17.105

and may partially meet the applicable and existing

833

00:43:17.405 --> 00:43:18.985

and emerging policy requirements.

834

00:43:19.365 --> 00:43:20.865

And then minor adverses

835

00:43:20.865 --> 00:43:23.705

to projects greenhouse gas impacts be fully consistent

836

00:43:24.055 --> 00:43:26.545

with applicable existing and emerging policy requirements

837

00:43:26.885 --> 00:43:29.945

or negligible as the projects greenhouse gas emissions would

838

00:43:29.945 --> 00:43:31.585

be reduced from measures that go well beyond

839

00:43:32.585 --> 00:43:35.225

existing emerging, emerging policies and design standards.

840

00:43:35.525 --> 00:43:37.705

Um, that's the reason that our,

841

00:43:37.715 --> 00:43:41.105

after we have the carbon management place

842

00:43:41.165 --> 00:43:43.585

and apply all of those elements, we think we go well

843

00:43:43.585 --> 00:43:45.065

beyond emerging policy.

844

00:43:49.425 --> 00:43:52.205

And again, I appreciate that is an interpretation of

845

00:43:53.065 --> 00:43:54.365

the guidance.

846

00:43:56.095 --> 00:43:59.895

I think on the basis that the construction emissions are

847

00:43:59.915 --> 00:44:03.415

not being at present monitored

848

00:44:03.915 --> 00:44:06.215

or reported on based on what we've got in,

849

00:44:06.275 --> 00:44:07.295

in front of us at the moment.

850

00:44:07.925 --> 00:44:12.535

There's, is it 50,000 tons of, um, carbo dioxide,

851

00:44:12.995 --> 00:44:16.415

um, equivalent that's quite a significant amount of carbon

852

00:44:16.645 --> 00:44:21.615

that at presence not mitigated through the draft ECO.

853

00:44:23.155 --> 00:44:26.985

Is that, in your view still not a significant effect?

854

00:44:29.695 --> 00:44:31.005

Again, it's how you judge what,

855

00:44:31.070 --> 00:44:32.610

what a significant effect is again,

856

00:44:32.610 --> 00:44:35.685

and that's the interpretation is there is a potential

857

00:44:35.685 --> 00:44:39.315

for those omissions to be, we have tried, I I would say

858

00:44:39.315 --> 00:44:42.995

that the mitigation measures go well beyond what is required

859

00:44:43.575 --> 00:44:46.355

in any emerging policy element in terms of

860

00:44:46.895 --> 00:44:50.395

the mitigations already identified within the document in

861

00:44:50.395 --> 00:44:54.115

terms of 45% that's in there, acknowledging

862

00:44:54.115 --> 00:44:56.755

that there's further that was, we've already identified

863

00:44:56.815 --> 00:45:00.275

and carrying on identifying, um, the design code,

864

00:45:00.285 --> 00:45:01.995

which again, will provide a part of it.

865

00:45:02.445 --> 00:45:05.435

Hence that interpretation is that the fact that it goes

866

00:45:05.455 --> 00:45:08.915

beyond and the guidance, the updated guidance,

867

00:45:09.275 --> 00:45:12.675

I would say in times of 2022 has changed the way

868

00:45:12.675 --> 00:45:14.355

that we would, we have assessed

869

00:45:14.355 --> 00:45:16.275

that following the mitigation

870

00:45:16.275 --> 00:45:17.435

measures that would be put in place.

871

00:45:17.855 --> 00:45:19.635

Um, but like I say, the main chapter

872

00:45:19.635 --> 00:45:23.195

of the body does acknowledge the 53,000 tons of significant

873

00:45:23.995 --> 00:45:26.755

moderate adverse because they're only partially

874

00:45:27.225 --> 00:45:28.315

mitigated at this point.

875

00:45:31.025 --> 00:45:32.325

I'm just confused as to why

876

00:45:32.865 --> 00:45:34.085

the whole life carbon assessment

877

00:45:34.085 --> 00:45:37.205

therefore doesn't consider it to be significant adverse.

878

00:45:39.135 --> 00:45:41.235

The whole life carbon takes the benefit

879

00:45:41.575 --> 00:45:45.265

of the bio methane, the gas in terms

880

00:45:45.265 --> 00:45:47.265

of the net emissions or are you talking Sorry.

881

00:45:47.655 --> 00:45:50.585

Yeah, but it's the sign,

882

00:45:50.645 --> 00:45:52.985

the significant effect is not mitigated.

883

00:45:54.965 --> 00:45:56.425

That's operational emissions.

884

00:45:57.595 --> 00:45:59.655

And we're also looking at the CHP option

885

00:45:59.655 --> 00:46:02.495

as a worst case scenario, which doesn't have the same,

886

00:46:02.755 --> 00:46:05.335

But the operational management plan does significantly

887

00:46:05.815 --> 00:46:08.855

mitigate the CHP option in terms of, well,

888

00:46:08.855 --> 00:46:10.255

it being operationally net

889

00:46:10.255 --> 00:46:11.255

Zero, it's to net zero. Yeah,

890

00:46:11.255 --> 00:46:13.695

to net, Yeah. So that's a balanced neutral

891

00:46:14.765 --> 00:46:17.175

that doesn't mitigate construction emissions,

892

00:46:19.485 --> 00:46:21.425

But the construction emissions have also been

893

00:46:21.425 --> 00:46:25.185

significantly mitigated beyond what's been asked from,

894

00:46:25.515 --> 00:46:29.705

again, from the interpretation of current policy in the time

895

00:46:29.705 --> 00:46:32.185

that it's being constructed, the the percent, the,

896

00:46:32.185 --> 00:46:34.105

the reduction that's being achieved already

897

00:46:34.125 --> 00:46:37.345

and being aimed to achieve is, again,

898

00:46:37.415 --> 00:46:39.665

it's becomes difficult, but between what is,

899

00:46:39.665 --> 00:46:43.425

there's no guidance there around whether 45%

900

00:46:43.525 --> 00:46:47.095

or 50% would be seen as above

901

00:46:47.095 --> 00:46:49.695

and beyond any national local policy requirement

902

00:46:49.695 --> 00:46:51.455

because there aren't those quantified standards.

903

00:46:51.455 --> 00:46:56.095

So it does come back to interpretation of what is being seen

904

00:46:56.095 --> 00:46:58.695

as going well beyond is what say

905

00:46:58.695 --> 00:47:00.335

That does, does the guidance also state

906

00:47:00.335 --> 00:47:02.415

that any greenhouse gas emissions should

907

00:47:02.415 --> 00:47:04.095

be considered as significant? It did,

908

00:47:04.675 --> 00:47:07.815

And then they've provided this updated table of how,

909

00:47:08.315 --> 00:47:09.855

and it doesn't change that position,

910

00:47:09.985 --> 00:47:11.095

hence why in the main body

911

00:47:11.095 --> 00:47:13.575

of the report everything has been moderately adverse,

912

00:47:13.835 --> 00:47:17.835

but it does also provide the additional element

913

00:47:17.935 --> 00:47:21.795

of mitigation efforts should be considered in terms of

914

00:47:22.335 --> 00:47:23.755

the change in significance of effects.

915

00:47:31.455 --> 00:47:34.755

Um, so just moving on to, uh, design refinement

916

00:47:34.775 --> 00:47:36.315

and greenhouse gas emissions.

917

00:47:37.155 --> 00:47:39.235

A South Coture District Council have noted within their

918

00:47:39.475 --> 00:47:41.675

relevant representation and local impact report

919

00:47:41.745 --> 00:47:44.835

that it's essential to ensure that the draft DCO allows

920

00:47:44.835 --> 00:47:46.435

for continual process of refinement

921

00:47:46.435 --> 00:47:49.435

and information regarding carbon, which reflects UpToDate

922

00:47:49.515 --> 00:47:53.675

and accurate information In response, the applicant suggests

923

00:47:53.675 --> 00:47:54.675

that requirement seven

924

00:47:54.675 --> 00:47:58.715

of the draft ECO secure sufficient information I go on,

925

00:47:59.185 --> 00:48:00.355

I've written down, um,

926

00:48:00.465 --> 00:48:02.195

that the design code will come forward.

927

00:48:02.195 --> 00:48:03.315

We've not seen that as yet.

928

00:48:04.015 --> 00:48:08.915

Um, to date I've not seen

929

00:48:09.535 --> 00:48:13.155

how the detailed design would link to carbon efficiency, um,

930

00:48:13.155 --> 00:48:16.075

through requirement seven of the draft ECO

931

00:48:16.175 --> 00:48:17.875
or the design objectives, which you said

932

00:48:17.875 --> 00:48:19.595
that the design code would be based on.

933

00:48:19.695 --> 00:48:22.515
So will the design code have more information

934

00:48:22.515 --> 00:48:25.715
around carbon efficiency and how that's secured?

935

00:48:29.455 --> 00:48:30.875
Yes, so it will try

936

00:48:30.875 --> 00:48:35.365
and set some minimum standards of material specifications,

937

00:48:35.625 --> 00:48:39.365
et cetera, or minimum standards probably a bit strong,

938

00:48:39.425 --> 00:48:41.205
but, um, it will

939

00:48:41.745 --> 00:48:45.165
set best practice requirements within the code to continue

940

00:48:45.825 --> 00:48:49.485
to prevent rollback of what's been identified already

941

00:48:49.585 --> 00:48:52.925
and pushed towards additional me mitigation

942

00:48:52.925 --> 00:48:54.045
measures in terms of,

943

00:49:03.625 --> 00:49:06.765
And will those best practice measure measures secure the

944

00:49:06.765 --> 00:49:08.645

45% of carbon savings?

945

00:49:11.525 --> 00:49:13.945

Yes, because they, so the 45% has already gone

946

00:49:13.945 --> 00:49:15.025

through viability assessment

947

00:49:15.085 --> 00:49:18.425

and is known to be technically feasible

948

00:49:18.605 --> 00:49:20.305

and achievable in the design.

949

00:49:20.305 --> 00:49:22.545

There's other measures that we've identified in the chapter

950

00:49:22.935 --> 00:49:26.345

that need to go through that, that assessment

951

00:49:26.885 --> 00:49:29.145

and there's things that continually

952

00:49:29.145 --> 00:49:30.545

to be identified in terms of,

953

00:49:30.965 --> 00:49:33.505

and that's just the nature of the design process in terms of

954

00:49:34.135 --> 00:49:36.385

Will it set it as a, as a minimum, for example?

955

00:49:36.935 --> 00:49:38.105

Yeah. Yeah.

956

00:49:38.205 --> 00:49:40.425

So the applicant is actually willing to commit

957

00:49:40.425 --> 00:49:43.425

to 55% within the design code in terms of achieving

958

00:49:44.085 --> 00:49:45.385

an additional 10%

959

00:49:45.385 --> 00:49:49.305

to what's already been identified in ES chapter 10. Okay,

960

00:49:49.305 --> 00:49:50.305

Thank you.

961

00:49:56.295 --> 00:50:00.195

Um, Cambridge county council's, uh, local impact report, um,

962

00:50:00.895 --> 00:50:03.475

states that the design, the detailed design required

963

00:50:03.495 --> 00:50:05.955

by requirement seven should demonstrate the final design

964

00:50:05.955 --> 00:50:09.275

either matches or improves on the bill of materials you used

965

00:50:09.335 --> 00:50:12.395

for estimating emissions, um, from construction.

966

00:50:13.535 --> 00:50:15.075

Is that something which will be controlled

967

00:50:15.075 --> 00:50:16.115

through the design code?

968

00:50:24.965 --> 00:50:29.575

Um, yeah, so I just wanna be careful on the bill

969

00:50:29.575 --> 00:50:30.895

of materials point.

970

00:50:31.235 --> 00:50:34.095

I'd need to understand exactly what

971

00:50:34.095 --> 00:50:35.935

that would look like in terms it would follow the

972

00:50:35.935 --> 00:50:37.575

measurement approach, which would be looking at

973

00:50:38.675 --> 00:50:40.575

the assumptions within the modeling at the moment,

974

00:50:40.625 --> 00:50:42.015

might assume certain materials.

975

00:50:42.015 --> 00:50:44.895

We would then test that what is the alternatives available

976

00:50:46.185 --> 00:50:47.605

in terms it might be the same material

977

00:50:47.625 --> 00:50:48.925

or a lower carbon spec

978

00:50:48.925 --> 00:50:53.525

or it might be a com, so concrete, uh, it might be, um,

979

00:50:54.165 --> 00:50:55.845

a concrete or a steel tank kind of thing.

980

00:50:55.845 --> 00:50:57.325

And those, those would be identified

981

00:50:57.325 --> 00:50:58.445

and clearly identified

982

00:50:58.755 --> 00:51:00.365

what alternatives have been identified

983

00:51:00.365 --> 00:51:01.725

and what the impact has been.

984

00:51:01.945 --> 00:51:02.945

Yep.

985

00:51:08.915 --> 00:51:11.175

Mom, can I just add a a further point,

986

00:51:11.175 --> 00:51:12.695

John Bowles for the applicant?

987

00:51:13.435 --> 00:51:18.335

Um, the, uh, commitment to achieve the, um, target is,

988

00:51:18.595 --> 00:51:23.135

um, uh, intended to be a, an overall commitment.

989

00:51:23.705 --> 00:51:27.615

There is a concern just around, um, the initial phase

990

00:51:27.615 --> 00:51:29.295

of works, which will be the enabling works

991

00:51:29.915 --> 00:51:34.405

and the need for those to be implemented as soon

992

00:51:34.405 --> 00:51:38.205

as possible in the event that the DC0 is granted to enable

993

00:51:39.155 --> 00:51:42.165

achievement of the delivery program that we are working to.

994

00:51:42.825 --> 00:51:46.805

So I just, it it's just important to make that qualification

995

00:51:46.955 --> 00:51:49.485

that the target is still intended

996

00:51:49.505 --> 00:51:54.365

to apply across the whole development, but that, um, and

997

00:51:54.365 --> 00:51:58.715

therefore that information would be reported and

998

00:51:59.115 --> 00:52:01.875

provided at each phase of development except for

999

00:52:01.875 --> 00:52:02.995

that enabling phase.

1000

00:52:10.495 --> 00:52:14.055

Why, why can't it be, um, monitored

1001

00:52:14.055 --> 00:52:15.655

and reported during the enabling phase?

1002

00:52:21.805 --> 00:52:24.905

Uh, my, for the applicant, um, we're wanting to give, um,

1003

00:52:25.255 --> 00:52:29.785

ourselves, uh, an amount sufficient time to, um, deliver,

1004

00:52:29.855 --> 00:52:33.905

deliver a review, um, for that page and through that phase,

1005

00:52:34.365 --> 00:52:37.545

but to not preclude the ability to start at the times that

1006

00:52:37.545 --> 00:52:40.105

where the applicant's intended to start in the enabling

1007

00:52:40.105 --> 00:52:43.425

phase construction, um, with a strong commitment that we,

1008

00:52:43.685 --> 00:52:48.065

um, uh, are committing to 55% reduction from the DMM zero

1009

00:52:48.335 --> 00:52:49.865

with the ambition to get to 70.

1010

00:52:50.645 --> 00:52:53.385

And we just wanna make sure we've got enough time, um,

1011

00:52:53.485 --> 00:52:56.505

to coordinate with, um, the controlling councils.

1012
00:52:58.205 --> 00:52:59.705
Sounds like it could be done,

1013
00:53:01.225 --> 00:53:02.565
you're saying it's a timing issue,

1014
00:53:02.565 --> 00:53:05.085
but it it can, it could be done, it could be monitored.

1015
00:53:07.105 --> 00:53:10.485
We will be, we will, we will be reporting the, the carbon,

1016
00:53:11.185 --> 00:53:15.285
um, proposals through, through the design development.

1017
00:53:15.785 --> 00:53:18.245
Um, we would wanna make sure that we give it sufficient time

1018
00:53:18.265 --> 00:53:19.565
to, to have a review.

1019
00:53:20.145 --> 00:53:22.925
Um, we believe that that may preclude the start

1020
00:53:22.925 --> 00:53:25.845
of the enabling it if, uh, if, if that's done beforehand,

1021
00:53:26.465 --> 00:53:29.245
um, with most of the enabling phase, um, pertaining

1022
00:53:29.245 --> 00:53:34.085
to ecological environmental mitigation, um, and, um, road

1023
00:53:34.225 --> 00:53:36.645
and infrastructure delivery, which, um,

1024
00:53:36.825 --> 00:53:38.325
are not necessarily based on any

1025
00:53:38.325 --> 00:53:39.805

of the process developments, which are gonna give,

1026

00:53:39.805 --> 00:53:43.565

give our main, um, carbon winds if you like.

1027

00:53:44.185 --> 00:53:46.805

Um, so the enabling phase, um, there's,

1028

00:53:46.805 --> 00:53:50.085

there's not a great deal that, that we can do to achieve a,

1029

00:53:50.405 --> 00:53:51.725

a significant carbon saving.

1030

00:53:51.905 --> 00:53:55.925

So we don't believe that that is gonna prejudice our, uh,

1031

00:53:56.265 --> 00:53:59.285

um, our carbon targets through the design code.

1032

00:54:05.155 --> 00:54:06.695

Uh, being able

1033

00:54:06.695 --> 00:54:09.375

to achieve carbon saving versus the actual carbon emissions,

1034

00:54:09.415 --> 00:54:11.135

I think are two are two different things.

1035

00:54:11.555 --> 00:54:16.445

Um, I'm, I'm just still a little unclear as why that

1036

00:54:17.785 --> 00:54:20.405

why, you know, for example, the, the,

1037

00:54:20.705 --> 00:54:21.805

the ecological mitigation.

1038

00:54:21.845 --> 00:54:24.885

I mean that, that to me seems fairly straightforward,

1039

00:54:24.985 --> 00:54:29.205

but the, the highway access type works, I mean that,

1040

00:54:29.225 --> 00:54:32.045

that's a larger part of the, the wire scheme.

1041

00:54:32.545 --> 00:54:36.125

So the same sort of processes in terms of monitoring,

1042

00:54:36.735 --> 00:54:38.865

measuring, I would've thought would apply to that

1043

00:54:38.865 --> 00:54:40.585

as they would for the rest of the scheme,

1044

00:54:41.655 --> 00:54:43.825

Very, very comfortable that we monitor and,

1045

00:54:44.125 --> 00:54:45.505

and record and account for.

1046

00:54:45.885 --> 00:54:49.425

Um, I think, um, the point I was poorly making was

1047

00:54:49.965 --> 00:54:51.065

our ability to try

1048

00:54:51.065 --> 00:54:53.865

and affect a significant change on that element of works

1049

00:54:54.605 --> 00:54:56.905

is not as as great as, as the,

1050

00:54:57.045 --> 00:54:58.505

the larger body of the proposed works.

1051

00:55:00.705 --> 00:55:04.845

If I Yep. Um, I think just, I,

1052

00:55:04.965 --> 00:55:06.205

I might not clarify this any further,

1053

00:55:06.205 --> 00:55:09.165

but I'll try, is that the idea being that the 55%

1054

00:55:09.755 --> 00:55:13.085

that is being committed to here is some

1055

00:55:13.085 --> 00:55:17.715

of those decisions might happen that are kind of committed

1056

00:55:17.715 --> 00:55:18.995

with the review with the councils and whatnot

1057

00:55:18.995 --> 00:55:20.995

after the enabling phase starts.

1058

00:55:21.255 --> 00:55:24.075

So whilst we're committing to it, there might need to be all

1059

00:55:24.075 --> 00:55:25.275

of those design decisions

1060

00:55:25.295 --> 00:55:27.835

and securing the right materials, et cetera,

1061

00:55:27.835 --> 00:55:31.195

might not happen before the design, the,

1062

00:55:31.255 --> 00:55:32.675

the enabling phases start.

1063

00:55:33.015 --> 00:55:35.755

So that, that, that's, I think is the issue

1064

00:55:35.755 --> 00:55:38.595

that's being raised, is that not every single phase is gonna

1065

00:55:38.595 --> 00:55:40.235

be 55% lower.

1066

00:55:40.305 --> 00:55:41.595

It's across the whole scheme.

1067

00:55:41.755 --> 00:55:43.395

Some of those decisions might be made

1068

00:55:43.605 --> 00:55:45.515

after the enabling works need to start.

1069

00:55:46.415 --> 00:55:47.955

Um, and that's just a, a,

1070

00:55:48.155 --> 00:55:49.435

I guess a concern that's been raised.

1071

00:55:49.505 --> 00:55:50.505

Yeah, that,

1072

00:55:55.055 --> 00:55:56.055

Okay. I, I,

1073

00:55:56.055 --> 00:55:57.585

I think I understand the point that you're making.

1074

00:55:57.945 --> 00:56:00.265

I mean, I think, I think the justification needs to be

1075

00:56:00.625 --> 00:56:04.545

provided perhaps a deadline for as to why you can't achieve

1076

00:56:04.545 --> 00:56:07.265

that, because obviously there are similar sort

1077

00:56:07.265 --> 00:56:09.955

of elements going on within the proposed, the rest

1078

00:56:09.955 --> 00:56:10.995

of the proposed development.

1079

00:56:11.375 --> 00:56:13.535

And, you know, there, there are,

1080

00:56:13.705 --> 00:56:14.855
there should be savings there.

1081

00:56:15.015 --> 00:56:17.735
I I think I'm just struggling to understand why, why

1082

00:56:17.735 --> 00:56:19.615
that element's achieved, but perhaps if some sort

1083

00:56:19.615 --> 00:56:20.735
of technical information could be

1084

00:56:20.895 --> 00:56:23.445
provided that deadline for, just for the justification as

1085

00:56:23.445 --> 00:56:26.565
to why that's excluded, that would be quite useful for us,

1086

00:56:28.505 --> 00:56:29.505
Madam. Um,

1087

00:56:29.505 --> 00:56:31.015
we can certainly do that

1088

00:56:31.515 --> 00:56:34.375
and, uh, within the design code

1089

00:56:34.595 --> 00:56:36.775
and the supporting materials to explain it

1090

00:56:38.465 --> 00:56:43.035
Perhaps perhaps a, um, an understanding of the,

1091

00:56:43.975 --> 00:56:47.635
um, the emissions from that state specifically

1092

00:56:47.695 --> 00:56:49.515
and that, you know, with reference to that.

1093

00:56:49.515 --> 00:56:51.755

So it's, it's contextual in that regard.

1094

00:56:52.555 --> 00:56:55.345

Madam, just a, just a, just as a point of clarification.

1095

00:56:55.525 --> 00:56:58.905

So John, John balls for the applicant, um, the intention is

1096

00:56:58.905 --> 00:57:02.265

to report, but it would be reported at the first phase of,

1097

00:57:02.485 --> 00:57:04.785

of construction, so there would be a catch up.

1098

00:57:04.785 --> 00:57:06.785

Effectively, it's just in relation to

1099

00:57:06.785 --> 00:57:08.785

that first enabling phase.

1100

00:57:09.245 --> 00:57:14.135

So if as, as, as you've, uh, um, pointed out

1101

00:57:15.405 --> 00:57:17.815

thereof, if you like, um, if

1102

00:57:19.785 --> 00:57:22.865

those targets are not achieved effectively in

1103

00:57:22.865 --> 00:57:25.665

that first enabling phase, there's a catch up requirement

1104

00:57:25.735 --> 00:57:28.225

that will come become evident through the,

1105

00:57:28.225 --> 00:57:31.225

through phase one construction and then subsequent phases.

1106

00:57:31.765 --> 00:57:33.825

And, uh, that will be reported at those,

1107

00:57:34.165 --> 00:57:35.345
at each of those phases.

1108

00:57:37.645 --> 00:57:38.075
Thank you.

1109

00:57:42.915 --> 00:57:45.615
Uh, Cambridge County Council also suggests that emissions,

1110

00:57:45.795 --> 00:57:48.455
um, from construction transport, uh,

1111

00:57:48.455 --> 00:57:50.455
could be updated when supplier locations

1112

00:57:50.455 --> 00:57:52.975
and transport distances of materials are known.

1113

00:57:53.475 --> 00:57:55.815
Um, can the applicant confirm whether this is intended

1114

00:57:55.815 --> 00:57:57.695
to be controlled through the draft DC0

1115

00:57:58.505 --> 00:57:59.565
or supporting documents?

1116

00:58:03.265 --> 00:58:06.525
It will be part of the updated detailed design carbon

1117

00:58:06.535 --> 00:58:10.485
model that has been provided in the mitigation element.

1118

00:58:10.625 --> 00:58:12.445
So one of, like we said,

1119

00:58:12.785 --> 00:58:15.845
the supply chain engagement be having more certainty will be

1120
00:58:15.845 --> 00:58:18.405
one of the levers we'd be using to reduce emissions.

1121
00:58:18.665 --> 00:58:21.205
So it will be updated in,

1122
00:58:21.265 --> 00:58:24.325
in the carbon model produced at detailed design,

1123
00:58:24.505 --> 00:58:27.565
and yeah, that's when those decisions would be made.

1124
00:58:28.305 --> 00:58:29.685
And that's through the design code?

1125
00:58:44.215 --> 00:58:47.915
Yep. I think design code is, is, is what is where

1126
00:58:47.915 --> 00:58:50.235
that would be secured, because at the moment it is in

1127
00:58:51.415 --> 00:58:54.525
table five to of chapter 10 in terms of the mitigations

1128
00:58:54.525 --> 00:58:56.125
of providing an updated design.

1129
00:58:56.125 --> 00:58:57.605
But that is why the design code is

1130
00:58:57.605 --> 00:59:00.245
therefore to kind of capture those elements secure. Okay.

1131
00:59:00.645 --> 00:59:01.845
I think obviously that needs

1132
00:59:01.845 --> 00:59:03.965
to be quite explicit in terms of what it's securing.

1133
00:59:04.105 --> 00:59:06.245

I'm a little bit, uh, well, I'm aware

1134

00:59:06.465 --> 00:59:08.805

or conscious that obviously the councils have, are yet

1135

00:59:08.805 --> 00:59:10.245

to see that and there's quite a few elements

1136

00:59:10.245 --> 00:59:11.645

that will need to be agreed.

1137

00:59:11.705 --> 00:59:15.285

So obviously welcome that information as soon as as possible

1138

00:59:15.285 --> 00:59:17.885

and, and promote dialogue between the councils

1139

00:59:17.885 --> 00:59:19.165

and the applicant in that regard.

1140

00:59:19.635 --> 00:59:21.725

Does the councils have any update or,

1141

00:59:21.865 --> 00:59:26.005

or any sort of comments on any matters regarding, uh, carbon

1142

00:59:26.225 --> 00:59:27.365

and offset in particularly

1143

00:59:31.975 --> 00:59:33.305

Looking pointed at Mr.

1144

00:59:33.305 --> 00:59:38.065

Harford? But I I, I don't,

1145

00:59:39.185 --> 00:59:41.695

let's have a see if Ms. Wilkinson is there.

1146

00:59:42.675 --> 00:59:43.675

Yep,

1147

00:59:44.745 --> 00:59:45.745

I'm here. Uh, I've

1148

00:59:45.745 --> 00:59:47.165

got no further comments. Thank you.

1149

00:59:51.495 --> 00:59:53.625

Nothing from, um, my right.

1150

00:59:53.645 --> 00:59:56.065

The city council or South Cambridge. Cambridge.

1151

00:59:57.725 --> 01:00:02.645

Thank you. Um, gas

1152

01:00:02.665 --> 01:00:03.845

to grid capabilities

1153

01:00:03.945 --> 01:00:07.485

and alternatives save Honey Hills written representation

1154

01:00:07.725 --> 01:00:10.365

suggests that the applicant's preferred option of gas

1155

01:00:10.365 --> 01:00:11.925

to grid connection could not be realized.

1156

01:00:12.625 --> 01:00:15.725

Um, we touched on this earlier to some extent, um,

1157

01:00:15.725 --> 01:00:18.245

because the draft ECO does not incorporate provisions

1158

01:00:18.245 --> 01:00:21.365

to enable it to be built, um, they've referenced a lack

1159

01:00:21.365 --> 01:00:23.685

of provision of pipe connections to the national, uh,

1160

01:00:23.745 --> 01:00:26.565

gas grid or, um, uh,

1161

01:00:26.985 --> 01:00:28.565

nor does the draft DCA make reference

1162

01:00:28.565 --> 01:00:31.085

to the regulatory requirements the, the applicant would need

1163

01:00:31.085 --> 01:00:33.445

to make this, um, to become a supplier.

1164

01:00:34.025 --> 01:00:36.685

Um, obviously we touched on the physical capabilities

1165

01:00:36.825 --> 01:00:39.485

and the, um, fact that this has done has

1166

01:00:39.485 --> 01:00:41.445

or has been done elsewhere, but in terms of the

1167

01:00:41.965 --> 01:00:44.685

specific comments, which Safe Honey Hill made in there, um,

1168

01:00:44.765 --> 01:00:46.925

written representation, can the applicant

1169

01:00:46.925 --> 01:00:48.205

provide a response to that please,

1170

01:00:53.325 --> 01:00:54.705

Uh, mind extra for the applicant?

1171

01:00:55.485 --> 01:00:58.105

Um, the intention is to, uh,

1172

01:01:00.085 --> 01:01:01.315

coordinate with Caden

1173

01:01:01.375 --> 01:01:03.875

who are the local median pressure gas operator.

1174

01:01:04.615 --> 01:01:06.035

Um, within the scheme order limits,

1175

01:01:06.085 --> 01:01:08.715

there is a median pressure gas main that, uh,

1176

01:01:08.985 --> 01:01:11.555

transacts these inside of the proposed development.

1177

01:01:12.175 --> 01:01:15.075

Um, Caden will, uh, deliver their own infrastructure

1178

01:01:15.415 --> 01:01:18.475

and connect, uh, via a grid entry unit, um,

1179

01:01:18.495 --> 01:01:21.475

and the proposed, um, development, uh, adjacent

1180

01:01:21.615 --> 01:01:22.955

to our gas enhancement

1181

01:01:22.955 --> 01:01:25.675

and gas grid, gas to grid, um, proposal.

1182

01:01:27.125 --> 01:01:29.705

Um, so what we've liaised with Cadent, um,

1183

01:01:30.915 --> 01:01:33.705

quite a few times the last few years, uh, they're,

1184

01:01:33.705 --> 01:01:35.825

they're confident that we can connect him with

1185

01:01:36.505 --> 01:01:37.825

capacity within their, into the network.

1186

01:01:38.765 --> 01:01:41.705

Um, and they, they will, they will be the provider likely

1187

01:01:41.725 --> 01:01:43.385

to provider of the, the grid entry unit.

1188

01:01:43.925 --> 01:01:48.905

So I'm unsure of, um, the doubt of

1189

01:01:48.905 --> 01:01:51.145

how we could deliver gas to grid on site,

1190

01:01:52.255 --> 01:01:53.785

both from a technology's perspective

1191

01:01:53.805 --> 01:01:55.025

and an infrastructure perspective.

1192

01:01:55.445 --> 01:01:57.865

Ca Caden, as a DNO will do there,

1193

01:01:58.365 --> 01:02:00.065

Is this something that could be included

1194

01:02:00.065 --> 01:02:01.265

within the statement of common ground?

1195

01:02:05.685 --> 01:02:05.905

Yes.

1196

01:02:20.885 --> 01:02:24.585

In the applicant's response to ex Q1, six point, uh,

1197

01:02:24.615 --> 01:02:28.785

four five re 1 0 79 options for alternatives, uh,

1198

01:02:28.785 --> 01:02:31.465

to exporting gas de grid offered, um,

1199

01:02:31.535 --> 01:02:32.665

does the applicant consider

1200

01:02:32.665 --> 01:02:34.865

that the draft DCO allows sufficient flexibility

1201

01:02:34.885 --> 01:02:36.065
to incorporate these options

1202

01:02:36.565 --> 01:02:38.105
and have they been considered as part

1203

01:02:38.105 --> 01:02:40.185
of the environmental environmental statement?

1204

01:02:44.165 --> 01:02:46.335
Apologies, can you repeat the question? Yes.

1205

01:02:46.475 --> 01:02:48.095
The, the number, sorry, not the question

1206

01:02:48.095 --> 01:02:50.885
itself, the XQ that you

1207

01:02:51.225 --> 01:02:52.225
Yes. Uh, 6.45

1208

01:02:52.225 --> 01:02:54.285
xq one

1209

01:02:59.275 --> 01:03:01.885
it's options that I think we again touched upon earlier.

1210

01:03:02.265 --> 01:03:05.325
Um, in terms of alternatives to gas to grid

1211

01:03:20.635 --> 01:03:22.405
Grid, yes, we're, we're confident

1212

01:03:22.405 --> 01:03:24.605
that the options available to us are covered within

1213

01:03:24.625 --> 01:03:25.725
the DC00.

1214

01:03:25.725 --> 01:03:27.285

Other options included.

1215

01:03:27.485 --> 01:03:31.325

A a no build of just flaring the gas is unacceptable.

1216

01:03:31.545 --> 01:03:35.125

Uh, compressing inter uh, compress natural gas would be

1217

01:03:35.785 --> 01:03:38.525

the feasibility of that is, is yet to be determined.

1218

01:03:38.825 --> 01:03:42.605

Um, so utilizing it from a, an energy perspective is, is,

1219

01:03:42.665 --> 01:03:44.925

is the most appropriate use of ethin at the moment.

1220

01:03:45.725 --> 01:03:47.145

So just just to clarify, sorry,

1221

01:03:47.375 --> 01:03:50.945

just from my understanding, I think you've, you've stated

1222

01:03:50.975 --> 01:03:52.505

that they, they are potential options.

1223

01:03:52.685 --> 01:03:55.225

Um, but in terms of from a technical legal point

1224

01:03:55.225 --> 01:03:58.505

and the draft, the wording of the draft DC0, does that allow

1225

01:03:58.805 --> 01:04:01.625

for changes to the gasta grid option, for example?

1226

01:04:08.215 --> 01:04:11.135

I think the position is that there wouldn't need

1227

01:04:11.135 --> 01:04:13.975

to be any changes to it for

1228

01:04:14.895 --> 01:04:18.295

a long time in terms of, we know that those options are

1229

01:04:19.535 --> 01:04:21.895

utilized in some case in terms of compressing and liquefy.

1230

01:04:22.395 --> 01:04:25.295

Um, but the conversations with Caden, et cetera,

1231

01:04:25.565 --> 01:04:28.335

make us confident that the gastric grid injection point

1232

01:04:28.425 --> 01:04:31.055

would be therefore an, an option for a,

1233

01:04:31.375 --> 01:04:32.615

a significant amount of time.

1234

01:04:33.155 --> 01:04:36.735

Um, but we have also considered what, what would need

1235

01:04:36.735 --> 01:04:39.015

to be in place to do this other work,

1236

01:04:39.075 --> 01:04:41.975

but the full viability assessment has not been done

1237

01:04:41.975 --> 01:04:43.415

because it's not been considered

1238

01:04:44.155 --> 01:04:46.335

as a serious option at this stage.

1239

01:04:47.695 --> 01:04:50.135

I hate to sound repetitive, but does the draft DC0

1240

01:04:50.195 --> 01:04:52.895

and the wording of the DC0 allow for flexibility?

1241

01:05:00.435 --> 01:05:02.835

I think the question ram is, is essentially do, uh,

1242

01:05:03.095 --> 01:05:05.595

do those other options fall within the, uh, description

1243

01:05:05.595 --> 01:05:09.075

of work number nine, um, which is that,

1244

01:05:09.075 --> 01:05:12.435

that infrastructure option, I will take that away

1245

01:05:12.895 --> 01:05:14.595

and we'll provide clarification on that

1246

01:05:14.595 --> 01:05:16.235

because obviously I need to know what those kit will,

1247

01:05:16.235 --> 01:05:17.725

the kit for those other, other options is.

1248

01:05:18.395 --> 01:05:20.525

Yeah, I I think it's just a, a technical point

1249

01:05:20.525 --> 01:05:24.045

that I wanted to be sure is, is covered by the draft DC0

1250

01:05:24.905 --> 01:05:27.925

and I suppose, does, does that potential change

1251

01:05:28.225 --> 01:05:30.605

or use of alternative equipment, um,

1252

01:05:31.235 --> 01:05:33.205

have any effects on the findings of the es?

1253

01:05:40.645 --> 01:05:41.815

It's really difficult

1254

01:05:41.875 --> 01:05:44.215

to judge based on what it's offsetting.

1255

01:05:44.555 --> 01:05:48.375

The idea being that bio the biome methane injected into the

1256

01:05:48.375 --> 01:05:51.615

grid is displacing natural gas in the grid network.

1257

01:05:52.395 --> 01:05:57.015

The compression of, um, gas to be used

1258

01:05:57.015 --> 01:06:00.455

for transport fuel on indu industrial applications would be

1259

01:06:00.455 --> 01:06:01.775

replacing diesel, but also

1260

01:06:01.775 --> 01:06:03.095

that's gonna be changing over time

1261

01:06:03.235 --> 01:06:05.375

or industrial uses, et cetera.

1262

01:06:05.375 --> 01:06:06.815

The hydrogen element depends on

1263

01:06:06.815 --> 01:06:08.215

how the hydrogen economy goes

1264

01:06:08.275 --> 01:06:10.335

and what you're displacing at that point in time.

1265

01:06:10.595 --> 01:06:13.495

So it's a really difficult thing to assess in terms of,

1266

01:06:13.555 --> 01:06:17.495

but the idea being it will be part of a future valuable

1267

01:06:18.205 --> 01:06:21.335

fuel source for whatever way the economy goes.

1268

01:06:21.755 --> 01:06:25.815

Um, and it will be a green fuel source for the future.

1269

01:06:31.445 --> 01:06:33.845

I suppose a, a general question is, is it likely

1270

01:06:33.905 --> 01:06:37.285

to lead to any, any increased impacts outside of

1271

01:06:37.285 --> 01:06:39.405

that which has been assessed within the es?

1272

01:06:39.405 --> 01:06:41.205

And I know and appreciate, it's a difficult question

1273

01:06:41.205 --> 01:06:43.085

to answer, but, and if you want to take that away,

1274

01:06:43.085 --> 01:06:44.125

that's absolutely fine,

1275

01:06:44.625 --> 01:06:47.685

but it's our obviously job as the examining authority to

1276

01:06:47.945 --> 01:06:49.045

to, to make that point.

1277

01:06:50.715 --> 01:06:53.495

Um, we'll take it away,

1278

01:06:53.595 --> 01:06:55.295

but again, I don't need interviewers.

1279

01:06:55.295 --> 01:06:57.775

No, there isn't any a significant change

1280

01:06:57.875 --> 01:06:59.055

and how things would operate,

1281

01:06:59.115 --> 01:07:00.655

et cetera, on the basis of those.

1282
01:07:00.715 --> 01:07:02.535
But yeah, we'll take that away.

1283
01:07:06.895 --> 01:07:08.605
Those are all the questions that I had.

1284
01:07:09.225 --> 01:07:12.085
Can I ask if any, firstly,

1285
01:07:12.085 --> 01:07:13.885
do the councils have any comments to make?

1286
01:07:17.435 --> 01:07:20.085
Just Check with Ms. Wilkinson again. No, thank you.

1287
01:07:24.555 --> 01:07:26.785
Thank you. Um, Mr. Gilda,

1288
01:07:30.155 --> 01:07:31.155
Thank you, ma'am. I

1289
01:07:31.155 --> 01:07:32.425
hope you've noted

1290
01:07:32.425 --> 01:07:35.305
that I've kept very quiet in the period since

1291
01:07:35.325 --> 01:07:36.345
the, the tea break.

1292
01:07:47.345 --> 01:07:51.385
Sorry, ma'am. I've temporarily lost chapter,

1293
01:07:51.655 --> 01:07:52.665
chapter 19.

1294
01:07:52.965 --> 01:07:56.465
No problem. Chapter 10 of the es. I I now have it back.

1295
01:07:59.275 --> 01:08:01.145

Can I, I don't want

1296

01:08:01.145 --> 01:08:03.105

to prolong the evening session any longer than we have to.

1297

01:08:03.605 --> 01:08:08.025

Um, can I take you to table 5.1, um,

1298

01:08:08.885 --> 01:08:12.155

in the chapter, which is page 70

1299

01:08:13.735 --> 01:08:17.705

and, and just refer to

1300

01:08:19.005 --> 01:08:20.265

the conclusions that we seem

1301

01:08:20.325 --> 01:08:22.505

or the applicant seem to be presenting?

1302

01:08:23.245 --> 01:08:26.375

Um, I think your question, ma'am, was

1303

01:08:26.885 --> 01:08:29.935

when you look at the whole life carbon impact to the scheme

1304

01:08:30.565 --> 01:08:34.315

under the CHP option in table 5.1, bottom of page 70,

1305

01:08:35.015 --> 01:08:39.395

it says very clearly moderate adverse net effect reduces

1306

01:08:39.395 --> 01:08:42.075

to neutral negligible effect with the application.

1307

01:08:42.135 --> 01:08:46.995

The CMP. Since the CMP is not

1308

01:08:47.615 --> 01:08:51.705

in any way affecting the capital carbon part of the budget,

1309
01:08:51.735 --> 01:08:54.105
it's entirely designed to affect the,

1310
01:08:54.785 --> 01:08:55.785
I just ask Mr. Gilda,

1311
01:08:55.785 --> 01:08:59.225
oh, sorry ma'am, to sit closer to the microphone.

1312
01:08:59.435 --> 01:09:04.395
Sorry. The, I I think we can take this point

1313
01:09:04.395 --> 01:09:06.075
fairly quickly, madam,

1314
01:09:06.075 --> 01:09:08.755
but I'm hoping that this will, um, strike home

1315
01:09:08.755 --> 01:09:13.155
with the applicant in the first line of table 5.1 operation

1316
01:09:13.335 --> 01:09:16.715
of the, um, sorry, the first line

1317
01:09:16.715 --> 01:09:19.115
of table 5.1 capital carbon budget.

1318
01:09:19.895 --> 01:09:21.435
The residual effect is recorded

1319
01:09:21.575 --> 01:09:23.195
as significant, moderate adverse.

1320
01:09:23.255 --> 01:09:25.635
And I don't think I'm disagreeing with that.

1321
01:09:26.405 --> 01:09:28.495
When we get down to the whole life carbon, which

1322
01:09:28.515 --> 01:09:31.855

by definition is construction plus operation.

1323

01:09:32.835 --> 01:09:36.335

We have the statement in brackets beneath

1324

01:09:37.035 --> 01:09:41.705

the CHP option in, in, in the relevant line,

1325

01:09:42.465 --> 01:09:44.865

CHP option, moderate adverse net effect,

1326

01:09:45.885 --> 01:09:47.155

which I wouldn't disagree with.

1327

01:09:47.735 --> 01:09:49.635

But then it says, reduce to neutral

1328

01:09:49.635 --> 01:09:51.835

or negligible effect non-significant

1329

01:09:51.915 --> 01:09:53.435

through the use of the CMP.

1330

01:09:54.395 --> 01:09:58.045

Well, the CMP doesn't apply to the construction carbon

1331

01:09:58.585 --> 01:10:01.445

and the whole life carbon includes the construction carbon.

1332

01:10:01.585 --> 01:10:03.125

So that's logically nonsense.

1333

01:10:03.625 --> 01:10:06.205

Um, it needs to be addressed in, in the revisions

1334

01:10:06.205 --> 01:10:08.165

that are going to be brought forward, I

1335

01:10:11.495 --> 01:10:12.495

Think. Yeah, that was the point that we,

1336

01:10:12.495 --> 01:10:14.335

we spoke about earlier.

1337

01:10:14.755 --> 01:10:16.655

Um, and the applicant provided a response to that.

1338

01:10:18.755 --> 01:10:21.095

Yes, ma'am. I, the, the only other point I'm going

1339

01:10:21.095 --> 01:10:22.135

to make at this stage,

1340

01:10:22.415 --> 01:10:25.015

'cause I think we, we touched on it at an earlier stage,

1341

01:10:25.755 --> 01:10:28.415

is in securing either through requirements three

1342

01:10:28.515 --> 01:10:31.905

or elsewhere in the DCOA commitment

1343

01:10:32.005 --> 01:10:36.225

to a given level of carbon reduction, um,

1344

01:10:36.725 --> 01:10:40.865

during construction, we now hear, um, that subsequently that

1345

01:10:41.435 --> 01:10:45.465

there is a figure being profit if this 55% reduction from

1346

01:10:45.485 --> 01:10:48.265

the, the mysterious DMM zero baseline.

1347

01:10:48.765 --> 01:10:52.005

Um, if that's, that's to be their commitment,

1348

01:10:52.585 --> 01:10:54.885

um, that is fair enough.

1349

01:10:54.885 --> 01:10:58.445

But the requirement has to be clear that they are committing

1350

01:10:58.505 --> 01:11:03.125

to a minimum level of construction carbon, um, reduction.

1351

01:11:03.685 --> 01:11:06.645

I recognize, 'cause I've been involved in delivering major

1352

01:11:06.645 --> 01:11:09.125

infrastructure projects that obviously

1353

01:11:09.555 --> 01:11:12.725

that is an ongoing process through design and delivery.

1354

01:11:13.385 --> 01:11:16.725

Um, but it doesn't take, take away the point that

1355

01:11:17.295 --> 01:11:18.805

there needs to be that commitment

1356

01:11:18.865 --> 01:11:19.965

and 55%,

1357

01:11:20.095 --> 01:11:23.685

since it's rather less than the company's corporate

1358

01:11:23.685 --> 01:11:26.685

commitment, seems to be an unusual figure to be adopting.

1359

01:11:27.145 --> 01:11:28.885

And it ought to be a much higher figure.

1360

01:11:28.945 --> 01:11:31.285

It has to, ought to be at least 70%

1361

01:11:31.405 --> 01:11:33.645

because that's the, the corporate average

1362

01:11:33.755 --> 01:11:35.085

that they're looking to achieve.

1363

01:11:35.585 --> 01:11:39.495

Um, so I leave that with, leave you with that madam.

1364

01:11:39.795 --> 01:11:41.335

And, and one last point, which I,

1365

01:11:43.365 --> 01:11:45.965

I don't think we've made clearly in written representation,

1366

01:11:46.145 --> 01:11:50.065

so I am making it a new, is about the acceptability

1367

01:11:50.285 --> 01:11:51.905

of the use of carbon credits

1368

01:11:51.925 --> 01:11:55.825

and other such measures as a means of carbon offsetting.

1369

01:11:56.185 --> 01:11:57.345

I mean, from a logical

1370

01:11:57.445 --> 01:11:58.585

and practical perspective,

1371

01:11:59.585 --> 01:12:01.065

I think we've seen two slightly

1372

01:12:01.065 --> 01:12:02.465

different positions presented.

1373

01:12:02.485 --> 01:12:06.145

One is that it's something we might do from a corporate

1374

01:12:06.145 --> 01:12:07.425

perspective 'cause it's cheaper

1375

01:12:07.565 --> 01:12:11.225

and off what we'll find it more acceptable than us doing it

1376

01:12:11.725 --> 01:12:14.185

by some capital investment or by some other means.

1377

01:12:14.805 --> 01:12:19.245

Um, it, it's not a, it's not an appropriate approach

1378

01:12:19.425 --> 01:12:23.845

for a large, um, corporate quasi-public sector body

1379

01:12:23.845 --> 01:12:27.525

to be taking, to be buying carbon credits in the market

1380

01:12:27.745 --> 01:12:29.805

or buying Hill Farms in Wales

1381

01:12:29.905 --> 01:12:31.445

to plant trees on or something.

1382

01:12:31.825 --> 01:12:35.885

Um, any net zero commitment should be tied

1383

01:12:35.905 --> 01:12:38.405

to this DCO and this DCO site.

1384

01:12:38.985 --> 01:12:40.965

Um, and that would be our position.

1385

01:12:43.245 --> 01:12:44.995

Thank you Mr. Gilda. Ms. Coten.

1386

01:12:47.015 --> 01:12:48.715

Oh, I don't think I've got anything to say.

1387

01:12:50.305 --> 01:12:54.585

Thank you. And was there anybody, any other ips

1388

01:12:54.585 --> 01:12:56.545

that wanted to make any comments either

1389

01:12:56.845 --> 01:12:57.945

in the room or virtually?

1390

01:13:08.855 --> 01:13:09.675

I'd like to, oh,

1391

01:13:09.805 --> 01:13:10.805

Sorry. Yes.

1392

01:13:10.805 --> 01:13:11.635

Unless I am allowed

1393

01:13:11.635 --> 01:13:15.715

to talk about the carbon strategy assessment. Um, is

1394

01:13:15.715 --> 01:13:16.715

It brief? No.

1395

01:13:16.715 --> 01:13:19.515

Should I save it till tomorrow?

1396

01:13:21.575 --> 01:13:22.825

Something to look forward to.

1397

01:13:23.475 --> 01:13:25.025

We're gonna finish on carbon this evening.

1398

01:13:25.565 --> 01:13:27.785

Um, I think in terms of strategic carbon

1399

01:13:27.785 --> 01:13:29.585

assessment, I don't have any questions

1400

01:13:29.585 --> 01:13:30.625

at this point in time.

1401

01:13:30.975 --> 01:13:33.555

Okay. As I said, you are both in the

1402

01:13:33.555 --> 01:13:34.675

room today, so if you'd like to,

1403

01:13:35.175 --> 01:13:36.175

Oh, no. Anything I would say

1404

01:13:36.175 --> 01:13:37.715
would really like to be obviously

1405

01:13:38.065 --> 01:13:40.555
through your ears or perhaps I just put it in writing.

1406

01:13:40.755 --> 01:13:41.915
I know everyone wants to go home.

1407

01:13:42.545 --> 01:13:44.275
Yeah. I think as it stands,

1408

01:13:44.455 --> 01:13:45.995
the strategic carbon assessment is on the,

1409

01:13:45.995 --> 01:13:47.075
isn't on the agenda for today.

1410

01:13:47.655 --> 01:13:49.035
I'd be more than happy to,

1411

01:13:49.135 --> 01:13:50.555
to review the comments in writing.

1412

01:13:51.175 --> 01:13:53.435
Um, but I think we'll leave it at that for today.

1413

01:13:53.625 --> 01:13:57.865
Okay. Thank you. If, if there is a brief summary

1414

01:13:58.005 --> 01:13:59.705
or overview, we, we have got time for that.

1415

01:13:59.705 --> 01:14:02.065
If that, if that's at all helpful to you, Ms. Ms. Cotton.

1416

01:14:02.575 --> 01:14:04.345
Okay. I'll try and make it really, really brief

1417

01:14:04.525 --> 01:14:06.105

and, uh, super interesting.

1418

01:14:06.725 --> 01:14:11.250

Um, uh, so, uh, sorry, just, uh, forgive me when I just,

1419

01:14:11.250 --> 01:14:12.405

uh, find my points.

1420

01:14:13.265 --> 01:14:17.765

Um, uh, um, so it was just

1421

01:14:17.765 --> 01:14:19.485

regarding, um, uh,

1422

01:14:20.085 --> 01:14:22.725

'cause I put in some questions about the, uh, uh, um,

1423

01:14:22.755 --> 01:14:24.885

following on from the, the last hearing about the, uh,

1424

01:14:25.125 --> 01:14:26.605

strategic carbon, um, management

1425

01:14:26.705 --> 01:14:31.245

and, um, um, my point about the housing was responded to

1426

01:14:31.745 --> 01:14:33.645

and I was very unhappy with that response.

1427

01:14:33.645 --> 01:14:34.965

Obviously I need to put that in writing

1428

01:14:34.965 --> 01:14:38.485

because it was about the number of houses that would be, um,

1429

01:14:39.145 --> 01:14:43.005

in the counterfactual scenario that you are, um,

1430

01:14:43.005 --> 01:14:46.965

talking about, um, uh, uh, building an alternate

1431

01:14:47.875 --> 01:14:49.685

village of, um,

1432

01:14:49.945 --> 01:14:53.245

the 8,000 plus houses rather than also taking into account

1433

01:14:53.245 --> 01:14:55.125

the number that would still be there on site.

1434

01:14:55.185 --> 01:14:56.805

You wouldn't have to move all of them

1435

01:14:56.805 --> 01:14:58.605

because they'd still be able to build some houses.

1436

01:14:59.305 --> 01:15:01.285

So, uh, I didn't feel that that was, uh,

1437

01:15:01.565 --> 01:15:02.645

satisfactorily addressed.

1438

01:15:02.685 --> 01:15:03.685

I will be responding to that.

1439

01:15:04.065 --> 01:15:07.485

Uh, my, my question number seven wasn't about the, uh,

1440

01:15:07.485 --> 01:15:09.525

tunnel carbon wasn't answered at all.

1441

01:15:10.345 --> 01:15:13.965

Um, um, but, um, the most important point that I wanted

1442

01:15:13.965 --> 01:15:17.285

to mention was that, um, in regards to some reports, uh,

1443

01:15:17.285 --> 01:15:21.965

that were, uh, um, uh, uh, constructed, um, written by, um,

1444
01:15:21.985 --> 01:15:25.125
one of them being, uh, by a regional, um,

1445
01:15:25.625 --> 01:15:26.925
and there were two reports and,

1446
01:15:27.025 --> 01:15:31.485
and the, uh, the, uh, UMIs

1447
01:15:31.905 --> 01:15:33.405
of South Cambridge District

1448
01:15:33.405 --> 01:15:35.245
Council referred to these two reports.

1449
01:15:35.345 --> 01:15:39.045
One produced by Bioregional, another one by, um, uh,

1450
01:15:39.195 --> 01:15:41.405
land use about sustainability.

1451
01:15:42.185 --> 01:15:46.485
And the, um, the Bioregional report in that just said

1452
01:15:46.485 --> 01:15:48.365
that the main, it's all about sustainability.

1453
01:15:48.435 --> 01:15:49.605
It's always about sustainability.

1454
01:15:49.625 --> 01:15:50.805
And I think this is very important

1455
01:15:50.805 --> 01:15:52.605
because the whole justification of all

1456
01:15:52.605 --> 01:15:53.685
of this is about saying

1457
01:15:53.685 --> 01:15:55.325

that this is the most sustainable location

1458

01:15:55.345 --> 01:15:56.725

and that's why we have to put houses there.

1459

01:15:56.725 --> 01:15:57.965

That's why I keep coming back to it.

1460

01:15:58.465 --> 01:16:02.525

Um, that, um, they said in their report, um,

1461

01:16:02.915 --> 01:16:05.485

that South Cambridge District Council, uh, referred to

1462

01:16:05.595 --> 01:16:08.325

that transport is the main indicator about, uh, carbon.

1463

01:16:08.665 --> 01:16:12.565

And they said that actually that the housing costs were, uh,

1464

01:16:12.945 --> 01:16:14.125

not very different at all.

1465

01:16:14.475 --> 01:16:16.765

This isn't the, um, that, uh, that first report

1466

01:16:16.835 --> 01:16:20.285

because when you build in a counterfactual scenario

1467

01:16:20.305 --> 01:16:22.365

of the village, you can put solar panels on them.

1468

01:16:22.985 --> 01:16:26.525

So in that report done by Bioregional, who also

1469

01:16:27.185 --> 01:16:29.525

did the report, um, for the, um,

1470

01:16:30.525 --> 01:16:33.325

strategic carbon assessment, so in one report they say

1471

01:16:33.325 --> 01:16:35.965
that housing, in fact, uh, uh, um,

1472

01:16:37.505 --> 01:16:39.125
is not a consider, is cannot,

1473

01:16:39.125 --> 01:16:40.565
not really a consideration at all.

1474

01:16:40.565 --> 01:16:41.845
It's all about transport. However,

1475

01:16:41.865 --> 01:16:44.805
in the strategic carbon assessment, they say that, uh,

1476

01:16:44.805 --> 01:16:47.805
the housing cost is considerable, uh,

1477

01:16:48.055 --> 01:16:49.925
equal in fact to the transport.

1478

01:16:49.925 --> 01:16:52.885
So I just wanted to, uh, um, uh, draw your attention to

1479

01:16:52.885 --> 01:16:57.485
that, um, uh, inconsistency in those two, uh, reports.

1480

01:16:57.545 --> 01:16:59.325
And also finally, to say that the report

1481

01:16:59.325 --> 01:17:02.365
that the South C District Council was referring to in their,

1482

01:17:02.465 --> 01:17:05.445
uh, LIR, um, also from the other consult,

1483

01:17:05.445 --> 01:17:07.605
there are other climate consultants land use.

1484

01:17:07.905 --> 01:17:11.655

Um, in its original report, it mentions the relocation

1485

01:17:11.715 --> 01:17:13.975

of the sewage plant as an issue, but there,

1486

01:17:14.155 --> 01:17:16.695

and also the air quality of it as an issue of

1487

01:17:16.695 --> 01:17:20.095

that number one option, uh, um, densification,

1488

01:17:20.925 --> 01:17:24.715

which is option number one building at Northeast Cambridge.

1489

01:17:25.215 --> 01:17:27.595

Um, and then that, then that reference

1490

01:17:27.675 --> 01:17:29.195

to the relocation being an issue,

1491

01:17:29.635 --> 01:17:32.795

a sustainability issue is just dropped as a, as a headline.

1492

01:17:32.815 --> 01:17:34.155

It doesn't appear anywhere else.

1493

01:17:34.655 --> 01:17:36.915

So I just thought it was important to mention that.

1494

01:17:36.915 --> 01:17:37.915

That's it. Thank you.

1495

01:17:38.885 --> 01:17:41.155

Thank you. Again, if you can also put the comments in

1496

01:17:41.155 --> 01:17:42.235

writing, I think that would be really helpful.

1497

01:17:42.525 --> 01:17:45.275

Great. Thank you. Did the applicant want to respond to that?

1498
01:17:45.655 --> 01:17:47.835
Um, very briefly, Madam, I'll ask Mr.

1499
01:17:48.095 --> 01:17:50.115
Bowles and he may need to bring Mr.

1500
01:17:50.405 --> 01:17:53.395
Hiram in, who's been waiting all day online,

1501
01:17:59.675 --> 01:18:01.295
Excuse me, John Bowles for the applicant.

1502
01:18:02.195 --> 01:18:06.815
Um, I, I'm obviously not the author of the report

1503
01:18:06.875 --> 01:18:11.015
and, um, uh, as, um, Ms. Ellis has uh, mentioned, uh,

1504
01:18:11.165 --> 01:18:13.775
Toby Hiram, who's one of the co-authors is, is online.

1505
01:18:14.155 --> 01:18:15.495
If we need to go to the detail,

1506
01:18:15.615 --> 01:18:19.135
I do think we can actually respond to the any written, um,

1507
01:18:19.595 --> 01:18:23.335
uh, statement that, um, Mrs. Cotton wishes to make, uh,

1508
01:18:23.385 --> 01:18:25.375
fully through that, which we've sought to do

1509
01:18:25.475 --> 01:18:27.335
so far in the questions that have been raised.

1510
01:18:27.755 --> 01:18:29.815
But if I can just pick up on a couple of the points.

1511
01:18:30.595 --> 01:18:35.385

Um, I don't, I don't believe I need

1512

01:18:35.385 --> 01:18:36.905
to explain the purpose of the,

1513

01:18:37.125 --> 01:18:38.665
um, strategic carbon assessment.

1514

01:18:38.765 --> 01:18:40.345
It was done as a planning exercise

1515

01:18:40.405 --> 01:18:42.825
to give some more definition, if you like, as to

1516

01:18:43.655 --> 01:18:44.745
what it means

1517

01:18:44.975 --> 01:18:47.985
that the planning authority should identify in, uh,

1518

01:18:47.985 --> 01:18:50.945
Northeast Cambridge is the most sustainable location

1519

01:18:51.005 --> 01:18:52.625
for strategic scale development.

1520

01:18:53.045 --> 01:18:55.825
And you know, that's a very, that's a very sort of

1521

01:18:56.365 --> 01:18:58.025
all encompassing kind of statement.

1522

01:18:58.045 --> 01:18:59.945
And we wanted therefore to try

1523

01:18:59.945 --> 01:19:03.785
and assist the Secretary of State in understanding better

1524

01:19:04.405 --> 01:19:07.865
why one would go through this type of a proposed development

1525

01:19:08.845 --> 01:19:12.305

and the implications of it as opposed to

1526

01:19:13.465 --> 01:19:15.785

directly seek alternative sites,

1527

01:19:15.795 --> 01:19:17.905

which we know are not easy to find.

1528

01:19:18.125 --> 01:19:20.705

So that was the fundamental purpose in which

1529

01:19:20.705 --> 01:19:21.785

we did the report.

1530

01:19:22.495 --> 01:19:24.265

When we were looking at that, we needed

1531

01:19:24.325 --> 01:19:27.105

to provide a counterfactual to that.

1532

01:19:28.665 --> 01:19:29.765

And the counterfactual

1533

01:19:29.765 --> 01:19:33.925

therefore was based on the strategy options

1534

01:19:33.925 --> 01:19:35.685

that were being considered in the

1535

01:19:35.685 --> 01:19:37.005

greater Cambridge local plan.

1536

01:19:37.665 --> 01:19:40.965

And so we went to the next available option.

1537

01:19:41.705 --> 01:19:45.765

And uh, that then, then is why the assumptions were made

1538

01:19:46.025 --> 01:19:48.605

around things like density of development, et cetera,

1539

01:19:48.605 --> 01:19:51.445

because the next available option was urban

1540

01:19:51.535 --> 01:19:53.605

extensions and new settlements.

1541

01:19:54.025 --> 01:19:58.805

And, um, we therefore needed to peg, um, effectively, um,

1542

01:19:59.355 --> 01:20:00.965

impacts in relation to that.

1543

01:20:01.025 --> 01:20:02.885

And that is the basis on which then the

1544

01:20:02.885 --> 01:20:04.245

study was undertaken.

1545

01:20:04.945 --> 01:20:09.055

The reason that we, um, assess,

1546

01:20:10.245 --> 01:20:13.985

um, the number of houses as the same is

1547

01:20:13.985 --> 01:20:18.505

because in our opinion, we do not believe that the retention

1548

01:20:18.565 --> 01:20:21.385

of the wastewater treatment plant in exists in its existing

1549

01:20:21.665 --> 01:20:24.105

location would allow for the delivery

1550

01:20:24.885 --> 01:20:29.225

of any significant number of houses in northeast Cambridge.

1551

01:20:29.515 --> 01:20:32.425

There have, uh, madam main questions of course on

1552

01:20:32.425 --> 01:20:33.665
that point, and,

1553

01:20:33.805 --> 01:20:38.025
and I know that the panel have different perspectives on

1554

01:20:38.025 --> 01:20:40.025
that as part of that consideration,

1555

01:20:40.365 --> 01:20:43.505
but certainly that is our position that, um,

1556

01:20:44.325 --> 01:20:46.585
if one could not relocate

1557

01:20:47.725 --> 01:20:49.505
the existing wastewater treatment plant,

1558

01:20:50.385 --> 01:20:52.625
a very substantial proportion, if not all

1559

01:20:52.625 --> 01:20:55.945
of the 8,350 houses that would

1560

01:20:56.135 --> 01:20:58.665
otherwise be, have been identified

1561

01:20:58.665 --> 01:21:00.465
for delivery in northeast Cambridge

1562

01:21:00.465 --> 01:21:01.625
would have to go somewhere else.

1563

01:21:02.405 --> 01:21:05.785
Uh, so, so, so that essentially is that element of it.

1564

01:21:06.285 --> 01:21:10.065
The study itself is not a broad sustainability assessment.

1565

01:21:10.725 --> 01:21:13.745

It is looking at, um, carbon impacts.

1566

01:21:14.365 --> 01:21:17.345

And so therefore, uh, the, the, the comments, uh,

1567

01:21:17.485 --> 01:21:22.145

Mrs. Cotton makes about, um, not taking into account,

1568

01:21:22.485 --> 01:21:27.345

um, air quality and other sustainability, um, factors.

1569

01:21:27.705 --> 01:21:30.265

I acknowledge, and that is correct. It doesn't do that.

1570

01:21:30.885 --> 01:21:32.905

We were looking, uh, uh, at, at,

1571

01:21:33.365 --> 01:21:35.945

and the reason it doesn't do that is really the same basis

1572

01:21:35.965 --> 01:21:37.705

of the reason why, um,

1573

01:21:40.045 --> 01:21:44.865

the potential future for housing on the vacated site

1574

01:21:45.475 --> 01:21:47.665

isn't included as part of the, um,

1575

01:21:47.695 --> 01:21:50.945

environmental assessment work, which is that it's not part

1576

01:21:50.945 --> 01:21:54.465

of the project and we cannot, at this point in time provide

1577

01:21:54.465 --> 01:21:56.825

that level of assessment to it.

1578

01:21:57.525 --> 01:22:00.065

We can do that on the basis of carbon

1579

01:22:00.065 --> 01:22:02.625
because we can use benchmarks and data,

1580

01:22:02.685 --> 01:22:04.785
and that was the whole purpose in which that

1581

01:22:04.785 --> 01:22:08.145
therefore we were able to scope that piece of work.

1582

01:22:09.025 --> 01:22:12.185
A final point, uh, to make is that the, um,

1583

01:22:14.095 --> 01:22:16.155
the methodology that was adopted for that piece

1584

01:22:16.155 --> 01:22:20.955
of work was discussed, um, with council officers,

1585

01:22:21.735 --> 01:22:25.435
um, with, uh, by regional who have been acting

1586

01:22:25.575 --> 01:22:27.715
for the council on the preparation

1587

01:22:27.715 --> 01:22:30.755
of the local plan in terms of looking at sustainability

1588

01:22:31.735 --> 01:22:34.475
and um, with useful projects.

1589

01:22:34.475 --> 01:22:38.435
Who are the sustainability advisors to, uh, Lance Sec, you

1590

01:22:38.435 --> 01:22:42.635
and I, who are the, um, main, uh, appointed, uh,

1591

01:22:42.635 --> 01:22:47.355
master developer for, um, uh, the Northeast Cambridge, um,

1592

01:22:47.405 --> 01:22:50.235

sorry, the, the vacated site, uh, as an if

1593

01:22:50.235 --> 01:22:54.795

and when it comes forward and, um, we have sought

1594

01:22:54.795 --> 01:22:57.475

to use whatever available data

1595

01:22:58.175 --> 01:23:02.075

and benchmarking is, uh, we can use to get a rational,

1596

01:23:02.075 --> 01:23:03.155

reasonable assessment.

1597

01:23:03.295 --> 01:23:04.715

And so that's the basis on which

1598

01:23:04.735 --> 01:23:06.045

The study has been done.

1599

01:23:08.885 --> 01:23:11.605

Thank you. I'd just like

1600

01:23:11.605 --> 01:23:13.165

to thank everybody for their time today.

1601

01:23:13.275 --> 01:23:14.965

It's been a really long day and I thank

1602

01:23:14.965 --> 01:23:16.245

everybody for their contributions.

1603

01:23:16.245 --> 01:23:17.405

It's very much appreciated.

1604

01:23:17.895 --> 01:23:19.565

We'll adjourn the hearing now

1605

01:23:20.585 --> 01:23:23.925

and, uh, obviously reconvene tomorrow at nine 30 here.

1606

01:23:24.265 --> 01:23:26.525

Uh, and we'll be starting with item five on the agenda,

1607

01:23:26.525 --> 01:23:29.605

which is ecology, um, noting that, um,

1608

01:23:29.705 --> 01:23:33.125

the applicant's ecologist obviously is unwell at the moment.

1609

01:23:33.585 --> 01:23:37.445

Um, time is, uh, 1838

1610

01:23:37.465 --> 01:23:38.805

and this hearing is adjourned.

1611

01:23:39.575 --> 01:23:41.285

Thank you very much, madam. Thank you everyone.