

WEBVTT – This file was automatically generated by event.video

0

00:00:00.755 --> 00:00:02.085

Welcome back everybody.

1

00:00:02.275 --> 00:00:05.125

It's 15 35, 3 35,

2

00:00:05.785 --> 00:00:07.365

and the hearing is resumed.

3

00:00:08.295 --> 00:00:11.365

We've now completed the traffic

4

00:00:11.505 --> 00:00:13.885

and transport related questions for today.

5

00:00:14.665 --> 00:00:17.405

Um, and if there's anybody in the room who doesn't need

6

00:00:17.405 --> 00:00:20.245

to stay for any of the subsequent topics,

7

00:00:20.385 --> 00:00:21.405

the next one is carbon.

8

00:00:22.185 --> 00:00:25.165

Uh, please feel free to leave, and

9

00:00:25.165 --> 00:00:28.445

likewise, if people on online would like to leave,

10

00:00:28.465 --> 00:00:30.005

please feel free to do so.

11

00:00:31.475 --> 00:00:33.205

I'll now hand over to, I'm

12

00:00:33.205 --> 00:00:35.165

Sorry, sir, just I picked up half of that.

13

00:00:35.385 --> 00:00:37.565

The, the, I think we, I have an officer who needs

14

00:00:37.885 --> 00:00:39.005

to leave at five 15.

15

00:00:39.245 --> 00:00:41.165

I think she's dealing with carbon,

16

00:00:41.465 --> 00:00:42.605

so I think she better stay.

17

00:00:42.785 --> 00:00:45.805

Yes, that's fine. But the, the, the problem is if, if it's

18

00:00:45.805 --> 00:00:48.085

beyond five 15, we have a difficulty.

19

00:00:48.185 --> 00:00:50.405

So, but I, I know it's only half past three now, so

20

00:00:50.405 --> 00:00:53.125

that's just, um, that's just, that's just me

21

00:00:53.125 --> 00:00:54.605

with thank you. That of caution.

22

00:00:54.955 --> 00:00:56.685

That should be fine. And of course, if,

23

00:00:56.745 --> 00:00:58.765

if questions do arise, um, Mr.

24

00:00:58.945 --> 00:01:02.205

Bre, sorry, Mr. Brem is handling carbon.

25

00:01:02.785 --> 00:01:05.085

She, she'll work out a way forward on that. Okay.

26

00:01:05.085 --> 00:01:06.205

Thank you very much. Thank you.

27

00:01:06.665 --> 00:01:08.845

So at that point, if anybody would like to leave,

28

00:01:08.845 --> 00:01:11.165

please feel free to do so and thank

29

00:01:11.165 --> 00:01:12.165

Thank you, sir. Um,

30

00:01:12.165 --> 00:01:13.085

thank you to the panel.

31

00:01:13.285 --> 00:01:15.205

I think Natural Highways as we're a highway authority,

32

00:01:15.705 --> 00:01:17.805

we will quietly, um, slide out.

33

00:01:18.055 --> 00:01:20.725

Thank you. And, um, thank you for your attendance.

34

00:01:20.875 --> 00:01:23.605

Anybody else who's attended and contributed today?

35

00:01:23.605 --> 00:01:27.085

Thank you. I'll now hand over to Mr. Reky. Thank you.

36

00:01:28.935 --> 00:01:30.085

Thank you. We'll now turn

37

00:01:30.085 --> 00:01:31.685

to item four on the agenda carbon.

38

00:01:32.865 --> 00:01:36.365

So firstly, starting with the South CRE local plan policy

39

00:01:36.945 --> 00:01:38.125

CC three compliance

40

00:01:38.385 --> 00:01:41.765
and BRI policy CC three

41

00:01:41.865 --> 00:01:45.285
of the adopted south CRE local plan requires proposals

42

00:01:45.285 --> 00:01:47.845
for non-residential buildings of 1000 square meters

43

00:01:47.845 --> 00:01:50.645
or more to reduce carbon emissions by minimum of 10%.

44

00:01:51.385 --> 00:01:53.125
The use of onsite renewable energy

45

00:01:53.125 --> 00:01:54.245
and low carbon technologies.

46

00:01:54.835 --> 00:01:57.525
This is to be calculated by reference to a baseline

47

00:01:57.545 --> 00:02:00.125
for the anticipated carbon emissions for the property

48

00:02:00.225 --> 00:02:01.965
as defined by building regulations.

49

00:02:03.105 --> 00:02:05.205
Can South Cape District Councils confirm?

50

00:02:05.675 --> 00:02:09.085
Does the 10% carbon reduction requirement under policy CC

51

00:02:09.085 --> 00:02:12.245
three relate to the construction and

52

00:02:12.345 --> 00:02:14.165
or the operational phase of development?

53

00:02:14.225 --> 00:02:16.725

And do they consider that the proposed development meets

54

00:02:16.725 --> 00:02:18.125

with the requirements of this policy?

55

00:02:20.375 --> 00:02:22.405

Thank you, madam. Um, Ms. Martin,

56

00:02:22.565 --> 00:02:23.765

I think will be able to deal with that.

57

00:02:32.425 --> 00:02:35.005

Hi, uh, Tracy Martin, south C District Council.

58

00:02:35.505 --> 00:02:38.165

Um, I can confirm that based on the information

59

00:02:38.525 --> 00:02:42.405

provided, um, the, um, operational

60

00:02:42.405 --> 00:02:44.765

and construction phases should ensure, um,

61

00:02:44.765 --> 00:02:47.285

quite significant carbon reduction, um,

62

00:02:47.785 --> 00:02:51.405

and the desire to achieve debt zero, um, along

63

00:02:51.405 --> 00:02:53.885

with the proposed installation of a rather large,

64

00:02:53.945 --> 00:02:56.005

so PV system, I think sort

65

00:02:56.005 --> 00:02:58.525

of quoted at five week six megawatts.

66

00:02:58.825 --> 00:03:01.405

Um, it should ensure that the 10% is there

67

00:03:01.405 --> 00:03:03.605

and her compliance is achieved for CC three.

68

00:03:07.195 --> 00:03:10.765

Okay, thank you. I think at the moment the,

69

00:03:10.765 --> 00:03:13.645

there's no minimum for the solar panel provision.

70

00:03:13.945 --> 00:03:16.445

Um, so is, does that change your response at all?

71

00:03:20.905 --> 00:03:24.925

Um, the size of the solar PV system will have

72

00:03:24.925 --> 00:03:27.525

to be in relation to the other measures proposed for site.

73

00:03:27.945 --> 00:03:31.005

Um, so although we talk about the policy being related

74

00:03:31.005 --> 00:03:32.645

to renewables, um,

75

00:03:32.645 --> 00:03:35.925

other low zero carbon technologies will also be included in

76

00:03:36.005 --> 00:03:37.005

that 10% reduction.

77

00:03:37.305 --> 00:03:39.325

Um, and I think there's a number of these to be included,

78

00:03:39.865 --> 00:03:42.525

um, in, in, in, in the, the, the proposals.

79

00:03:45.315 --> 00:03:46.005

Okay, thank you.

80

00:03:53.275 --> 00:03:53.565

Okay.

81

00:03:58.205 --> 00:03:59.225

You just bear with me a moment.

82

00:03:59.225 --> 00:04:02.345

Sorry, my, um, computer's decided to crash. Just one moment.

83

00:04:24.585 --> 00:04:27.135

Thank you. Oh, sorry. Just bear with me one moment.

84

00:04:35.595 --> 00:04:38.305

Comes or actually deal with the planning application.

85

00:04:40.565 --> 00:04:45.545

If they grant the DC0 would do the planning application. I

86

00:04:45.595 --> 00:04:49.505

Dunno, I dunno, Apologies.

87

00:04:49.515 --> 00:04:51.145

We're just having some technical difficulties

88

00:04:52.165 --> 00:04:53.585

at the moment because

89

00:04:53.785 --> 00:04:57.225

That is, they're doing one

90

00:04:57.225 --> 00:04:58.985

for the pump station at Water Beach.

91

00:05:01.845 --> 00:05:03.785

We don't want it to even come to that, do we?

92

00:05:05.715 --> 00:05:07.545

Don't No.

93

00:05:09.605 --> 00:05:10.985

You to bring torch.

94

00:05:26.755 --> 00:05:27.755

Probably wonder why

95

00:05:46.625 --> 00:05:47.625

I do apologize. Sorry.

96

00:05:47.625 --> 00:05:50.305

These things do happen. Um, okay.

97

00:05:50.645 --> 00:05:55.545

In the applicant's response to ex Q1, 21 point 19 rep, uh,

98

00:05:55.655 --> 00:05:59.005

zero rep 1 0 7 9, it confirms

99

00:05:59.005 --> 00:06:00.725

that all buildings on the site would be designed

100

00:06:00.725 --> 00:06:02.805

to achieve bamp excellence performance.

101

00:06:02.895 --> 00:06:05.605

Presumably this should be bamp excellent performance,

102

00:06:07.885 --> 00:06:08.965

excellent rather than excellence.

103

00:06:08.965 --> 00:06:11.245

Okay, thank you. Um, can the applicant confirm

104

00:06:11.245 --> 00:06:13.045

where this is secured through the draft DC0?

105

00:06:17.185 --> 00:06:19.565

My text for the, for applicant, um, a deadline

106

00:06:19.665 --> 00:06:21.485

for will be submitting a design code

107

00:06:21.485 --> 00:06:24.085

that will secure the pre-amp Excellent, uh,

108

00:06:24.085 --> 00:06:25.525
requirement for the buildings.

109

00:06:34.415 --> 00:06:35.125
Thank you.

110

00:06:41.385 --> 00:06:43.685
Moving on to the carbon assessment

111

00:06:43.865 --> 00:06:45.925
and the examining authority will mainly refer

112

00:06:45.925 --> 00:06:50.845
to ES chapter 10 on carbon, um, with reference rep 3 0 1 9

113

00:06:50.945 --> 00:06:53.885
and the greenhouse gas greenhouse gas calculations

114

00:06:53.965 --> 00:06:57.525
with reference rep 3 0 3 2 For this section,

115

00:06:59.145 --> 00:07:01.525
can Coba County Council confirm if the updates

116

00:07:01.525 --> 00:07:04.885
to the greenhouse gas calculations at deadline three answer

117

00:07:04.885 --> 00:07:07.045
their queries Rega raised at deadline one ra

118

00:07:07.045 --> 00:07:08.925
regarding this document from the applicant,

119

00:07:09.345 --> 00:07:11.645
the council raised four bullet points with request

120

00:07:11.645 --> 00:07:13.765
for clarification of details and information

121

00:07:18.515 --> 00:07:20.965

Chemistry county council, uh, David Ufford.

122

00:07:21.105 --> 00:07:25.045

Um, yes, I got my colleague online, Sarah, um, Wilkinson,

123

00:07:25.045 --> 00:07:26.805

who'll be able to, uh, help with that.

124

00:07:31.165 --> 00:07:34.415

Good afternoon. Yes, it's Mrs. Sarah Wilkinson, carbon

125

00:07:34.475 --> 00:07:36.815

and Energy Manager for Cambridge County Council.

126

00:07:37.635 --> 00:07:42.255

Um, yes, I can confirm that the, um, particular,

127

00:07:42.465 --> 00:07:44.135

those four bullet points

128

00:07:44.135 --> 00:07:47.975

around the calculations in Appendix 10.1

129

00:07:48.405 --> 00:07:49.655

have been answered.

130

00:07:50.195 --> 00:07:54.095

Uh, in terms of those, uh, clarification queries,

131

00:07:54.185 --> 00:07:58.335

there are another, uh, a number of points, uh, wider points

132

00:07:58.335 --> 00:08:02.015

around the carbon assessment that as yet remain unresolved,

133

00:08:02.195 --> 00:08:04.655

but I'll, uh, wait till we sort of come, come

134

00:08:04.655 --> 00:08:05.695

to those in, in the conversation.

135

00:08:05.785 --> 00:08:06.785

Thank you.

136

00:08:08.015 --> 00:08:10.905

Okay, thank you. Um, did you, did you want

137

00:08:10.905 --> 00:08:11.945

to raise them now at this point?

138

00:08:11.945 --> 00:08:13.505

It seems an opportune moment to do so.

139

00:08:14.405 --> 00:08:15.865

Uh, I can do, yes.

140

00:08:16.085 --> 00:08:20.785

Um, so I think the main, one of my main concerns is

141

00:08:20.785 --> 00:08:22.225

around the, the baseline,

142

00:08:22.325 --> 00:08:25.305

and that applies to both construction phase emissions

143

00:08:25.305 --> 00:08:26.425

and operational.

144

00:08:26.805 --> 00:08:29.425

But I think that the biggest point of difference

145

00:08:29.425 --> 00:08:30.985

between our view and the applicant's

146

00:08:32.145 --> 00:08:33.825

probably does fall within the construction

147

00:08:33.825 --> 00:08:35.145

phase emissions calculations.

148

00:08:36.005 --> 00:08:38.865

So the counter council's view is that the, the baseline

149

00:08:38.885 --> 00:08:40.905

for construction ought properly to be zero

150

00:08:41.555 --> 00:08:42.905

since without the development

151

00:08:42.905 --> 00:08:44.265

no construction would take place.

152

00:08:44.855 --> 00:08:48.025

Therefore, the net change in emissions from the construction

153

00:08:48.025 --> 00:08:51.105

phase is an increase of, um, the, the figure given

154

00:08:51.165 --> 00:08:52.225

by the applicant of

155

00:08:52.365 --> 00:08:55.525

around 50,000 tons carbon dioxide equivalent.

156

00:08:56.505 --> 00:08:58.645

So your choice of baseline, um,

157

00:08:59.545 --> 00:09:03.005

in the applicant's environmental statement was looking at a,

158

00:09:03.125 --> 00:09:06.845

a theoretical, um, what how we,

159

00:09:06.985 --> 00:09:09.045

how you could build a project like this and then,

160

00:09:09.105 --> 00:09:10.765

and then what's that's reduced from.

161

00:09:10.765 --> 00:09:14.885

And whilst that is very admirable, it doesn't tell you

162

00:09:15.155 --> 00:09:17.725

what the net impact of the project would be.

163

00:09:18.545 --> 00:09:20.765

Um, if I could make an analogy,

164

00:09:20.995 --> 00:09:23.325

it's like when you buy something in the sale

165

00:09:23.385 --> 00:09:25.925

and say you're that much better off, you've still spent

166

00:09:25.925 --> 00:09:27.685

that much, if you see what I mean.

167

00:09:29.945 --> 00:09:33.725

Um, so that's the main, um, one

168

00:09:33.725 --> 00:09:35.725

of my main concerns is about the baseline.

169

00:09:35.725 --> 00:09:39.945

There is also some reference in, uh, rep one

170

00:09:40.455 --> 00:09:45.065

dash 0 7 9 to, in the re the applicant's response

171

00:09:45.205 --> 00:09:50.065

to the examine questions, um, about the

172

00:09:50.665 --> 00:09:53.425

IEA guidance for calculating greenhouse gas emissions

173

00:09:53.425 --> 00:09:54.665

that was referred to.

174

00:09:55.025 --> 00:09:57.505

I think there is a, a slight misquote

175

00:09:57.565 --> 00:09:59.345
of the guidance in, in that.

176

00:09:59.685 --> 00:10:04.485
Um, and that the, the core sort of point

177

00:10:04.585 --> 00:10:06.885
of this is that the ultimate goal,

178

00:10:07.225 --> 00:10:09.805
and I quote from a different page in the, in the guidance,

179

00:10:10.305 --> 00:10:11.765
uh, the ultimate goal

180

00:10:11.765 --> 00:10:14.245
of establishing a baseline is being able to assess

181

00:10:14.265 --> 00:10:17.925
and report the net greenhouse gas impact

182

00:10:17.945 --> 00:10:19.045
of the proposed project.

183

00:10:20.305 --> 00:10:22.525
And that can only be assessed by comparing it to

184

00:10:22.525 --> 00:10:23.725
what would happen without development.

185

00:10:25.625 --> 00:10:28.965
Um, for operational emissions, it's a bit more complicated.

186

00:10:29.505 --> 00:10:33.395
Uh, there are, um, it, it,

187

00:10:34.595 --> 00:10:36.275
I have not found it clear.

188

00:10:37.835 --> 00:10:39.425

There is some comparison to,

189

00:10:39.525 --> 00:10:41.185
to current operational emissions,

190

00:10:41.185 --> 00:10:43.105
but it doesn't seem to be, uh,

191

00:10:43.105 --> 00:10:45.505
from the documents I've seen comparing directly

192

00:10:45.525 --> 00:10:48.785
to the existing, uh, plant at Cambridge,

193

00:10:48.795 --> 00:10:51.985
which since this proposed project would be a replacement for

194

00:10:51.985 --> 00:10:56.465
that I feel would be the most, um, appropriate baseline.

195

00:10:58.755 --> 00:11:02.775
Um, so I think, yeah, that's what I wanted

196

00:11:02.775 --> 00:11:05.615
to say about, uh, the baseline

197

00:11:05.795 --> 00:11:08.815
and this some other things about uncertainty

198

00:11:08.815 --> 00:11:10.535
of future emissions, which are perhaps, uh,

199

00:11:10.535 --> 00:11:12.175
later on the agenda.

200

00:11:13.675 --> 00:11:15.375
Yes. Thank you. Thank you. Um,

201

00:11:15.655 --> 00:11:16.895
I will give the op the applicant

202

00:11:16.895 --> 00:11:17.975

the opportunity to respond.

203

00:11:18.055 --> 00:11:20.455

I do have some questions though, so perhaps if I can do some

204

00:11:20.455 --> 00:11:22.215

of the questions first and we can come back to those points.

205

00:11:23.155 --> 00:11:26.695

So regarding the baseline of the carbon assessment, could I,

206

00:11:26.755 --> 00:11:29.615

um, ask the applicant to share tables three dash one

207

00:11:29.915 --> 00:11:31.855

and three dash three on pages 24

208

00:11:31.855 --> 00:11:35.655

and 26 of the track change version of the, of ES chapter 10,

209

00:11:35.655 --> 00:11:37.215

which is rep three 20.

210

00:11:37.825 --> 00:11:39.855

Sorry, madam, could you just take those

211

00:11:40.035 --> 00:11:41.035

Slower again? Tables,

212

00:11:41.035 --> 00:11:42.295

tables three dash one.

213

00:11:43.065 --> 00:11:46.255

Three dash three and they're on pages 24

214

00:11:46.555 --> 00:11:50.255

and 26 of BS chapter chapter 10.

215

00:11:50.355 --> 00:11:52.735

And I would like to see the track change version, if

216

00:11:52.735 --> 00:11:55.205
that's okay, which is REP three 20.

217

00:11:56.225 --> 00:11:59.245
Yes. Would you like us to upload on screen, please?

218

00:11:59.245 --> 00:12:00.445
That would be helpful. Yes, because you are

219

00:12:00.445 --> 00:12:02.285
multitasking, I can at the moment.

220

00:12:02.945 --> 00:12:05.645
Can, can we manage that please, Tim? Thank you.

221

00:12:26.865 --> 00:12:29.485
So these tables show estimated carbon emissions

222

00:12:29.485 --> 00:12:31.845
for baseline construction and baseline operating.

223

00:12:32.265 --> 00:12:34.205
Can the applicant explain why there's been a number

224

00:12:34.205 --> 00:12:36.205
of changes to the tables at deadline three, please

225

00:12:40.125 --> 00:12:41.265
Parler for the applicant?

226

00:12:41.885 --> 00:12:43.745
Yes. So there have been some changes.

227

00:12:43.755 --> 00:12:46.625
Table, there is an error, an error in the way

228

00:12:46.625 --> 00:12:48.265
that the numbers were transposed.

229

00:12:48.485 --> 00:12:50.945

So the totals are largely the same,

230

00:12:50.945 --> 00:12:52.305

they've just been in different rows.

231

00:12:52.685 --> 00:12:54.065

Um, and we noticed

232

00:12:54.065 --> 00:12:57.065

that whilst making other changes in response to the Q.

233

00:12:57.735 --> 00:13:01.755

Okay. And

234

00:13:02.065 --> 00:13:04.035

regarding the baseline for decommissioning

235

00:13:04.035 --> 00:13:07.585

and construction, please can the applicant explain why they

236

00:13:07.585 --> 00:13:10.625

took differing approaches within ES chapter 10, um,

237

00:13:10.625 --> 00:13:13.465

which is rep 3 0 19 towards the carbon emissions

238

00:13:13.465 --> 00:13:14.825

for baseline for decommissioning

239

00:13:14.825 --> 00:13:17.425

and construction for decommissioning a baseline

240

00:13:17.425 --> 00:13:19.825

of zero carbon emissions was assumed, whereas

241

00:13:19.925 --> 00:13:22.145

for construction, the delivery milestone zero

242

00:13:22.325 --> 00:13:25.065

or DMM zero option was adopted as a baseline,

243

00:13:25.275 --> 00:13:26.705

which represents a rebuild

244

00:13:26.705 --> 00:13:28.945

of the wastewater treatment plant in the same location

245

00:13:29.045 --> 00:13:32.065

as a proposed development using conventional processes.

246

00:13:32.485 --> 00:13:34.065

In answering this question, um,

247

00:13:34.185 --> 00:13:35.705

I would also ask the applicant to explain

248

00:13:35.705 --> 00:13:37.225

where they took a difference to answer

249

00:13:37.225 --> 00:13:39.145

that set up within their scoping report

250

00:13:39.785 --> 00:13:43.145

reference A PPM 0 8 0, which stated

251

00:13:43.145 --> 00:13:45.105

that baseline conditions associated

252

00:13:45.255 --> 00:13:46.665

with construction are zero

253

00:13:46.855 --> 00:13:49.185

because there is no current construction on the site.

254

00:13:51.805 --> 00:13:54.585

Can I just get a clarification on how we've approached

255

00:13:55.245 --> 00:13:59.105

the decommissioning between the DMM zero baseline

256

00:13:59.445 --> 00:14:00.785
and the proposed development?

257

00:14:01.015 --> 00:14:05.225
Yeah, yep. Um, they would largely be the same in terms of,

258

00:14:05.575 --> 00:14:09.385
because they're both proposed redevelopment at a new site,

259

00:14:09.385 --> 00:14:11.905
the decommissioning of the existing site would be dealt

260

00:14:11.905 --> 00:14:14.555
with the same way despite either one.

261

00:14:15.185 --> 00:14:18.795
Yeah. So for decommissioning the baseline is zero.

262

00:14:19.825 --> 00:14:22.555
Yeah. Um, but for construction, um,

263

00:14:22.695 --> 00:14:24.875
the delivery milestone zero was adopted rather

264

00:14:24.875 --> 00:14:25.915
than a baseline of zero.

265

00:14:28.155 --> 00:14:31.025
Sorry, I have to ask you to, so for construction,

266

00:14:31.755 --> 00:14:35.585
we've allowed for a delivery milestone of the DMM zero Yeah.

267

00:14:35.775 --> 00:14:37.355
For the construction, but,

268

00:14:37.535 --> 00:14:39.995
and I think this is a point to make generally,

269

00:14:39.995 --> 00:14:42.595

which is whilst that baseline has been chose,

270

00:14:42.735 --> 00:14:45.275

the residual impacts have been compared

271

00:14:45.275 --> 00:14:46.475

against a zero position.

272

00:14:46.535 --> 00:14:48.915

So the 53,000 tons that have been made,

273

00:14:48.915 --> 00:14:50.475

the significance of effects mm-Hmm.

274

00:14:50.555 --> 00:14:54.595

Have been assessed against the absolute impact

275

00:14:54.695 --> 00:14:56.155

of the redevelopment.

276

00:14:56.215 --> 00:14:58.475

So we haven't compared that to the reason

277

00:14:59.575 --> 00:15:01.915

the baseline was chosen was that there was an acceptance

278

00:15:01.915 --> 00:15:05.435

that the redevelopment was gonna have emissions and

279

00:15:05.435 --> 00:15:07.755

therefore the focus of efforts in line

280

00:15:07.755 --> 00:15:11.075

with the applicant's past 2080 process was what can we do

281

00:15:11.075 --> 00:15:14.075

to mitigate, um, we had a really constructive conversation

282

00:15:14.075 --> 00:15:15.275

with the council before Christmas.

283

00:15:15.655 --> 00:15:16.955

We are exploring approaches

284

00:15:16.955 --> 00:15:19.915

and how we address the clarity of narrative that comes out

285

00:15:20.055 --> 00:15:22.955

of the chapter in terms of an alternative baseline.

286

00:15:23.215 --> 00:15:25.115

But the conclusions don't change

287

00:15:25.115 --> 00:15:27.595

because of the way that we've assessed significance

288

00:15:27.615 --> 00:15:31.435

of impacts against the residual emissions of 53,000 tons

289

00:15:31.945 --> 00:15:34.635

from the construction, if that makes sense. So

290

00:15:35.155 --> 00:15:37.075

I think, I'm just trying to understand what you said.

291

00:15:37.295 --> 00:15:39.075

So you're saying that the

292

00:15:40.485 --> 00:15:42.445

delivery milestone zero is, is a baseline?

293

00:15:42.605 --> 00:15:43.685

I I think this, and this is

294

00:15:43.685 --> 00:15:46.085

what the county council was talking about, was in terms

295

00:15:46.085 --> 00:15:48.325

of construction emissions and that not being zero,

296

00:15:48.785 --> 00:15:52.965

and as I mentioned as well, baseline conditions associated

297

00:15:52.965 --> 00:15:56.475

with construction were proposed to be zero,

298

00:15:56.735 --> 00:15:58.915

and that was set out within the scoping report that the,

299

00:15:58.945 --> 00:16:00.075

that the applicants provided.

300

00:16:00.095 --> 00:16:02.075

So I'm just looking to understand why there's been a change

301

00:16:02.075 --> 00:16:04.115

between the scoping report

302

00:16:04.495 --> 00:16:06.955

and the, the submission in the es,

303

00:16:09.215 --> 00:16:10.595

but you are also saying that

304

00:16:11.115 --> 00:16:14.275

although the DMM zero baseline is adopted

305

00:16:15.015 --> 00:16:16.355

and that's assessor at the es,

306

00:16:16.655 --> 00:16:19.235

the residual impacts are then assessed against zero.

307

00:16:20.655 --> 00:16:23.745

That is right. And I think we had a favorable conversation

308

00:16:23.745 --> 00:16:27.225

with council that that does create a narrative issue in

309

00:16:27.225 --> 00:16:28.585

terms of how to document flows

310

00:16:29.285 --> 00:16:32.025

and the conclusions are still based on the same zero

311

00:16:32.385 --> 00:16:34.825

construction baseline as the scoping report.

312

00:16:35.045 --> 00:16:37.145

And we are looking to address

313

00:16:37.175 --> 00:16:40.345

that issue at deadline four in terms of the clarity

314

00:16:40.365 --> 00:16:42.425

of the narrative, what the significance

315

00:16:42.425 --> 00:16:43.905

of effects are addressed against.

316

00:16:44.135 --> 00:16:47.665

Okay. So I think if we, yeah, if we can have an update,

317

00:16:47.705 --> 00:16:49.785

a deadline for which sets out the, the narrative

318

00:16:49.785 --> 00:16:50.785

as you've suggested that,

319

00:16:50.785 --> 00:16:52.625

that would be, that would be really helpful.

320

00:16:52.875 --> 00:16:53.305

Thank you.

321

00:16:57.865 --> 00:16:59.925

And can I, can I just clarify as well the,

322

00:17:00.585 --> 00:17:03.325

the DMM zero baseline within the es, does this

323

00:17:03.845 --> 00:17:06.005

represent the wastewater treatment plant being rebuilt

324

00:17:06.025 --> 00:17:07.725

as per its capacity as it is now

325

00:17:08.265 --> 00:17:10.445

or with the same capacity as proposed development?

326

00:17:10.625 --> 00:17:12.645

And would that be to phase one or phase two?

327

00:17:15.565 --> 00:17:17.665

So it is phase one and phase two

328

00:17:17.965 --> 00:17:20.625

and for the proposed development capacity as well.

329

00:17:20.625 --> 00:17:21.945

So it's, uh, a like for like,

330

00:17:21.945 --> 00:17:23.985

but at the proposed development capacity

331

00:17:24.085 --> 00:17:25.265

for phase one and phase two,

332

00:17:25.565 --> 00:17:26.625

So it's up to phase two.

333

00:17:26.695 --> 00:17:27.585

Yeah. Okay. Yeah.

334

00:17:41.355 --> 00:17:45.055

And does the DMM zero baseline include the same extent

335

00:17:45.055 --> 00:17:47.615

of development as the proposed development, so such

336

00:17:47.615 --> 00:17:50.005

as the access rows, the gateway building, the workshop,

337

00:17:50.005 --> 00:17:53.245

does it include that as a whole, as a like for like

338

00:17:54.265 --> 00:17:56.355

It's a like for like scope of what would be needed

339

00:17:56.455 --> 00:17:58.315

to operate the works in the same way

340

00:17:58.315 --> 00:17:59.595

as the proposed development?

341

00:18:00.965 --> 00:18:04.355

Thank you. Just moving on

342

00:18:04.355 --> 00:18:05.915

to the baseline for construction.

343

00:18:06.675 --> 00:18:08.595

I will come back to you Mr. Gilder. I have seen your hand.

344

00:18:08.595 --> 00:18:12.075

Thank you. Um, in terms of the DMM zero baseline,

345

00:18:12.555 --> 00:18:14.355

ES chapter 10 confirms, um,

346

00:18:14.355 --> 00:18:16.435

that this is based on 2010

347

00:18:16.715 --> 00:18:18.195

construction practices and baseline models.

348

00:18:19.015 --> 00:18:20.715

Um, it was confirmed in the, uh,

349

00:18:20.775 --> 00:18:22.795

by the applicant in response to EQ one

350

00:18:22.795 --> 00:18:24.715

that this approach was taken as it is designed

351

00:18:24.715 --> 00:18:27.235

with the applicant's reporting approach on carbon capital,

352

00:18:27.235 --> 00:18:28.595

carbon emission reductions,

353

00:18:29.415 --> 00:18:31.155

and the examining authority note the use

354

00:18:31.155 --> 00:18:33.515

of the 2010 construction methods from a

355

00:18:33.515 --> 00:18:34.835

corporate reporting perspective.

356

00:18:35.225 --> 00:18:37.315

However, the purposes of the ES

357

00:18:37.315 --> 00:18:41.315

and in line with the relevant guidance, a baseline, a ba,

358

00:18:41.555 --> 00:18:43.595

a baseline is necessary in order to assess

359

00:18:43.615 --> 00:18:46.555

and report on the net greenhouse gas impact

360

00:18:46.555 --> 00:18:47.675

of the proposed development.

361

00:18:48.295 --> 00:18:51.555

In this regard, the use of 2010 construction practices

362

00:18:51.555 --> 00:18:53.275

and baseline models could be considered

363

00:18:53.275 --> 00:18:55.875

as somewhat arbitrary as it provides a baseline,

364

00:18:55.875 --> 00:18:57.435

which would not realistically come forward.

365

00:18:58.175 --> 00:19:00.755

The current wastewater treatment plant would not be rebuilt

366

00:19:00.755 --> 00:19:04.355

using 2010 construction methods, which out date,

367

00:19:04.495 --> 00:19:06.595

nor would it be reconstructed at the proposed site.

368

00:19:06.735 --> 00:19:10.295

If this application were to be refused in this regard,

369

00:19:10.295 --> 00:19:13.055

please can the applicant provide further justification on

370

00:19:13.055 --> 00:19:16.375

the use of the DMM zero, um, baseline for construction?

371

00:19:17.775 --> 00:19:19.475

Yes, pri for the applicant?

372

00:19:19.535 --> 00:19:22.355

So this is a well established process in terms of

373

00:19:24.015 --> 00:19:25.995

the applicant have a long established,

374

00:19:26.015 --> 00:19:29.915

and I can't say quite, um, well-regarded approach

375

00:19:29.915 --> 00:19:32.395

to carbon management and have had, you know,

376

00:19:32.715 --> 00:19:34.635

external verification for that process for a number

377

00:19:34.635 --> 00:19:37.275

of years against the past 20 18, 20 16

378

00:19:37.495 --> 00:19:39.515
and more recently, the 2023 update.

379

00:19:40.495 --> 00:19:43.235
The, the, the practice behind that standard in terms

380

00:19:43.235 --> 00:19:47.995
of past 2018 is around the baseline is used as a focus for

381

00:19:47.995 --> 00:19:50.395
where your residual emissions are likely to be.

382

00:19:50.615 --> 00:19:53.475
The use of the 2010 baseline has allowed them

383

00:19:53.495 --> 00:19:56.035
to continually push the boundaries and not settle.

384

00:19:56.455 --> 00:19:58.395
So over time, they've gone from,

385

00:19:58.775 --> 00:20:01.475
the applicant has gone from a 50% to a 60

386

00:20:01.655 --> 00:20:03.715
to a 70% year on year.

387

00:20:03.715 --> 00:20:07.675
So the target shifts against a consistent baseline, um,

388

00:20:07.855 --> 00:20:10.755
to allow the pushing of more ambition to be driven

389

00:20:11.175 --> 00:20:12.395
to its corporate targets.

390

00:20:12.695 --> 00:20:16.755
The reason the 2010 baseline rather than a zero

391

00:20:17.355 --> 00:20:20.715

approach has been chosen in this consideration, that is one

392

00:20:20.715 --> 00:20:22.035

to align with the corporate targets,

393

00:20:22.175 --> 00:20:23.875

but it's also allowed us to communicate

394

00:20:24.465 --> 00:20:27.675

what would be the big residual emissions, the hotspot areas

395

00:20:27.735 --> 00:20:29.235

as we call them in the carbon, and

396

00:20:29.235 --> 00:20:30.915

therefore to have the engagement around what

397

00:20:30.915 --> 00:20:32.035

to do about them and

398

00:20:32.035 --> 00:20:35.275

where there the material efforts can be made to reduce them

399

00:20:36.265 --> 00:20:38.635

accepting that there are gonna be residual emissions from

400

00:20:38.635 --> 00:20:41.315

the construction, but to be able to demonstrate that

401

00:20:41.945 --> 00:20:44.395

best endeavors and efforts have been made to reduce them

402

00:20:44.395 --> 00:20:47.260

as much as possible towards a client's aspirational target.

403

00:20:49.695 --> 00:20:51.295

I think I'm just struggling to understand

404

00:20:51.955 --> 00:20:55.855

how the comparison to 2010 is, is relevant

405

00:20:56.915 --> 00:20:59.455
to today in the sense of that's

406

00:20:59.455 --> 00:21:01.335
that couldn't realistically envisage be built.

407

00:21:02.695 --> 00:21:05.345
Yeah. Um, I, I appreciate the challenge

408

00:21:05.365 --> 00:21:09.695
and I think that that is often like a kind of, I guess, um,

409

00:21:09.855 --> 00:21:12.815
a perception kind of issue in terms of how do I know

410

00:21:12.815 --> 00:21:14.055
what 2010 would've been.

411

00:21:14.475 --> 00:21:17.615
The applicant's process has a very, it's one of a,

412

00:21:18.195 --> 00:21:20.455
an established approach to which models are used

413

00:21:20.455 --> 00:21:23.055
and design standards at 2010 appreciating

414

00:21:23.055 --> 00:21:25.055
that can't be used, but that changing of

415

00:21:25.595 --> 00:21:29.815
the percentage challenge of 50, 60, 70% is

416

00:21:29.815 --> 00:21:31.855
what guards against it not being ambitious.

417

00:21:32.035 --> 00:21:34.895
If that might, I I understand it,

418

00:21:35.975 --> 00:21:37.235

the same concrete mixes,

419

00:21:37.255 --> 00:21:39.435

the same design standards would never be rebuilt,

420

00:21:39.615 --> 00:21:43.355

but the idea of pushing the percentage reduction from

421

00:21:43.355 --> 00:21:46.395

that point is what tries to track construction practices.

422

00:21:46.655 --> 00:21:48.075

And over the last decade

423

00:21:48.215 --> 00:21:50.915

and a little bit longer, the applicant has understood

424

00:21:51.855 --> 00:21:54.355

how it can push forward those construction practice

425

00:21:54.355 --> 00:21:55.395

and supply chain engagement

426

00:21:56.055 --> 00:21:58.275

and keep on making sure that its target is difficult

427

00:21:58.275 --> 00:22:00.075

to meet across that 2010 baseline.

428

00:22:00.075 --> 00:22:03.755

It's that it's a matter of keeping on, shifting the baseline

429

00:22:04.325 --> 00:22:06.715

makes it difficult for the applicant to know whether it's

430

00:22:07.815 --> 00:22:09.075

is pushing the boundary

431

00:22:09.075 --> 00:22:11.435

or whether it's measuring from a different point in time.

432

00:22:25.205 --> 00:22:29.055

Yeah, I'll just add to that again, um, a baseline needs

433

00:22:29.055 --> 00:22:30.575

to be at a fixed measure in time.

434

00:22:30.875 --> 00:22:33.095

It could be changed every time you do a new project

435

00:22:33.285 --> 00:22:35.775

that makes it much more of a, obviously a corporate burden

436

00:22:35.875 --> 00:22:38.255

to understand a 5% reduction

437

00:22:38.255 --> 00:22:40.775

for this bespoke product project could be seen

438

00:22:40.775 --> 00:22:44.375

as very ambitious if it's taken from a very optimized state.

439

00:22:44.845 --> 00:22:48.985

This allows, I guess, everyone else in every stakeholder

440

00:22:49.005 --> 00:22:52.265

to show that this project is being the same credence as all

441

00:22:52.265 --> 00:22:53.465

of its other corporate commitments

442

00:22:53.465 --> 00:22:55.025

that are regulated at the moment as well,

443

00:22:55.045 --> 00:22:58.105

or that it has in its its other capital delivery program

444

00:23:01.375 --> 00:23:03.605

Other than from a corporate perspective.

445

00:23:03.705 --> 00:23:06.445

If we took that, that sort of corporate element aside,

446

00:23:08.655 --> 00:23:11.875

is there any other sort of evidence that you would have

447

00:23:12.055 --> 00:23:15.595

to suggest that the two, that 2010 is, is a particular year

448

00:23:15.655 --> 00:23:19.435

or particular construction baseline, which has relevance

449

00:23:19.435 --> 00:23:20.435

to today's standards?

450

00:23:24.105 --> 00:23:26.065

I would say no, it it, to be completely honest,

451

00:23:26.095 --> 00:23:28.425

it's not about being relevant to today's standard.

452

00:23:28.465 --> 00:23:30.145

I think it's the 70% reduction

453

00:23:30.565 --> 00:23:33.225

and the 50 60% reduction that brings the relevance

454

00:23:33.605 --> 00:23:35.785

to today's standard and whether that's ambitious

455

00:23:36.245 --> 00:23:37.945

or not in terms of what it's trying to achieve.

456

00:23:46.235 --> 00:23:48.575

Uh, Cambridge County Council within their, um,

457

00:23:48.905 --> 00:23:52.335

local impact report have also, um, noted

458

00:23:52.365 --> 00:23:55.535

that waste disposal has not been included within

459

00:23:55.595 --> 00:23:56.775

the construction emissions.

460

00:23:57.635 --> 00:24:00.615

Um, can the applicant confirm whether waste disposal carbon

461

00:24:00.895 --> 00:24:01.855

emissions are included within

462

00:24:01.855 --> 00:24:03.055

the assessment for construction?

463

00:24:03.055 --> 00:24:04.855

And if so, could they identify where

464

00:24:05.075 --> 00:24:07.855

and if not, could they confirm why not, please?

465

00:24:09.285 --> 00:24:11.545

Yep. So prh de parler for the applicant, um,

466

00:24:11.635 --> 00:24:13.265

waste disposal is included.

467

00:24:13.415 --> 00:24:15.625

It's baked into the carbon models.

468

00:24:15.885 --> 00:24:19.065

If I can do a very brief explanation of how the models work,

469

00:24:19.655 --> 00:24:21.825

they cover a scope boundary, um,

470

00:24:22.035 --> 00:24:24.305

based on a build asset boundary.

471

00:24:24.645 --> 00:24:27.345

So that includes everything from making assumption,

472

00:24:27.405 --> 00:24:29.185
making design assumptions on

473

00:24:29.185 --> 00:24:31.745
how much surplus excavator material you might have,

474

00:24:32.165 --> 00:24:34.385
how much waste mat, how much waste material you might over

475

00:24:34.385 --> 00:24:35.705
procure or not use on site.

476

00:24:35.875 --> 00:24:38.145
Those are baked into all of the tables

477

00:24:38.145 --> 00:24:40.145
that are published into the module.

478

00:24:47.745 --> 00:24:50.315
Regarding construction impacts, the highest level

479

00:24:50.315 --> 00:24:53.115
of carbon savings are identified from the tunnel

480

00:24:53.135 --> 00:24:54.515
and final effluent designs

481

00:24:54.515 --> 00:24:56.475
between the baseline DMM zero design

482

00:24:56.735 --> 00:25:00.235
and the proposed ECO design Save Honey Hill suggests in

483

00:25:00.235 --> 00:25:03.035
their written representation rep one, uh, 1 7 1

484

00:25:03.225 --> 00:25:05.635
that the tunnels have been oversight could have been

485

00:25:05.635 --> 00:25:07.315

oversized in the DMM zero design

486

00:25:07.315 --> 00:25:09.235

to achieve overall enhanced carbon savings.

487

00:25:10.175 --> 00:25:12.075

How does the applicant respond to this suggestion?

488

00:25:12.175 --> 00:25:13.635

And please can the applicant outline

489

00:25:13.695 --> 00:25:15.875

how these savings are achieved through the, the tunnel

490

00:25:16.175 --> 00:25:17.995

and finer effluent effluent designs?

491

00:25:18.175 --> 00:25:20.595

So what, why are the largest carbon savings found here?

492

00:25:22.375 --> 00:25:26.185

Yeah, um, so they weren't oversized, they were, so the,

493

00:25:26.185 --> 00:25:28.505

the baseline design was sized on what was required

494

00:25:29.005 --> 00:25:30.585

for health and safety access

495

00:25:30.605 --> 00:25:33.225

and what was expected to be required at the time.

496

00:25:33.365 --> 00:25:35.785

So the change in diameter is about designing it in a way

497

00:25:35.785 --> 00:25:37.705

that doesn't require manned access

498

00:25:37.925 --> 00:25:39.105

at the time for maintenance.

499

00:25:39.325 --> 00:25:41.185

So that's been a big substantial change.

500

00:25:41.805 --> 00:25:43.825

The change in the pipelines has been

501

00:25:44.395 --> 00:25:47.345

quite significant engagement with pipeline suppliers

502

00:25:47.345 --> 00:25:50.425

to understand and be able to use composite pipe materials.

503

00:25:50.725 --> 00:25:53.425

So they've been two quite significant design changes.

504

00:26:05.305 --> 00:26:08.125

The assessment of construction impacts in, um,

505

00:26:08.605 --> 00:26:09.965

ES chapter 10 also appears

506

00:26:10.025 --> 00:26:13.365

to exclude the carbon emissions associated with construction

507

00:26:13.365 --> 00:26:16.085

and, uh, pumping operation for the water beach pipeline.

508

00:26:16.745 --> 00:26:18.365

Whilst the examining authority notes

509

00:26:18.365 --> 00:26:20.605

that these impacts may be considered outside

510

00:26:20.605 --> 00:26:22.045

of the DC0 application,

511

00:26:22.545 --> 00:26:24.725

the carbon impacts are not assessed within the punitive

512

00:26:24.725 --> 00:26:26.205

impacts section of the es.

513

00:26:26.305 --> 00:26:29.045

So the examining authority, um, queries,

514

00:26:29.105 --> 00:26:31.765

how can the examining authority have confidence in these

515

00:26:31.835 --> 00:26:33.885

that these impacts would not cumulatively,

516

00:26:34.045 --> 00:26:36.285

cumulatively result in a significant effect.

517

00:26:44.015 --> 00:26:46.015

I think that's the one that we might have to come back

518

00:26:46.015 --> 00:26:47.215

to what saying that.

519

00:26:47.275 --> 00:26:49.335

So yeah, we can come back to that in terms

520

00:26:49.335 --> 00:26:51.255

of whether there would or wouldn't be a cumulative impact.

521

00:26:51.815 --> 00:26:53.495

I think pumping in terms

522

00:26:53.495 --> 00:26:55.935

of emissions over time is obviously something

523

00:26:55.935 --> 00:26:58.375

that's gonna decarbonize and I think decarbonization comes

524

00:26:58.375 --> 00:27:01.335

up later in terms of level of significance as well.

525

00:27:06.075 --> 00:27:07.245

Okay. Um, uh, Mr.

526

00:27:07.335 --> 00:27:09.645

Gilda, did you have any comments that you wanted to raise?

527

00:27:12.195 --> 00:27:14.455

Yes, thank you madam. Um, perhaps I,

528

00:27:14.935 --> 00:27:17.055

I can be impolite in one sense

529

00:27:17.055 --> 00:27:19.655

and ask that we don't go through all these topics

530

00:27:19.755 --> 00:27:21.575

and then you ask me to respond

531

00:27:21.635 --> 00:27:23.375

to all the topics as far as we can.

532

00:27:23.555 --> 00:27:25.495

Can we, can we take each topic

533

00:27:25.595 --> 00:27:27.655

and then if, if there's something

534

00:27:27.655 --> 00:27:30.055

that SHH could usefully add to the conversation,

535

00:27:30.085 --> 00:27:33.975

it's better taken with, with the topic under, in,

536

00:27:33.975 --> 00:27:35.295

under assessment.

537

00:27:35.385 --> 00:27:40.235

Sorry about that. Um, as you know, madam,

538

00:27:40.235 --> 00:27:43.515

um, we put in a very full response in

539

00:27:44.175 --> 00:27:49.155

rep 1 1 7 1 on the questions of the carbon assessment, um,

540

00:27:50.935 --> 00:27:52.795

and the strategic carbon assessment.

541

00:27:53.745 --> 00:27:56.035

When the applicant came to respond, um,

542

00:27:56.935 --> 00:27:59.755

to our written representations, we did have a full response

543

00:27:59.775 --> 00:28:01.675

to the strategic carbon assessment

544

00:28:02.215 --> 00:28:06.195

and we've seen no response to the, um, substantive

545

00:28:07.285 --> 00:28:09.165

critique that we presented at chapter 10

546

00:28:09.505 --> 00:28:10.565

as it stood at that time.

547

00:28:11.185 --> 00:28:13.165

Um, and obviously we're now aware

548

00:28:13.165 --> 00:28:16.005

that some minor amendments have been made to chapter 10,

549

00:28:16.025 --> 00:28:20.205

but many of the substantive criticisms I think still remain.

550

00:28:21.025 --> 00:28:25.955

Um, so that, I mean, what I'm trying to avoid here, madam,

551

00:28:25.955 --> 00:28:29.275

is, is going through all those substantive criticisms

552

00:28:29.275 --> 00:28:32.235

and I take it obviously that you've, you've read, um,

553

00:28:32.705 --> 00:28:34.515

read 1 1 7 1,

554

00:28:37.555 --> 00:28:40.095

The, the applicant has, has made

555

00:28:41.875 --> 00:28:44.855

two substantive points, I think one of which is

556

00:28:44.855 --> 00:28:47.735

around this whole question, what is the appropriate baseline

557

00:28:48.995 --> 00:28:50.815

for construction assessment

558

00:28:51.775 --> 00:28:54.635

and is very much wedded, as you've heard in your,

559

00:28:54.735 --> 00:28:57.715

in the answers to this, this corporate approach,

560

00:28:57.725 --> 00:29:02.155

which is based on 70% reduction over a 2010 baseline.

561

00:29:02.695 --> 00:29:07.035

Um, I think we would still take the views, madam, that

562

00:29:07.655 --> 00:29:11.315

if, if they were to use a 2010 baseline,

563

00:29:12.995 --> 00:29:17.325

we, we are still in a situation where they, they considered

564

00:29:17.325 --> 00:29:19.325

what was effectively a very baggy design.

565

00:29:19.595 --> 00:29:22.885

They hadn't sought to optimize that, that design

566

00:29:22.905 --> 00:29:25.955

before they calculated the carbon emissions.

567

00:29:26.335 --> 00:29:28.235

And in consequence, as we pointed out,

568

00:29:28.675 --> 00:29:30.395

a very large proportion of that

569

00:29:30.925 --> 00:29:33.755

40 odd thousand ton reduction is achieved

570

00:29:33.895 --> 00:29:37.955

by massively reducing the tunnel diameters effectively

571

00:29:38.175 --> 00:29:39.915

and by the use of composite materials.

572

00:29:39.945 --> 00:29:41.685

I've now here, here, um,

573

00:29:42.385 --> 00:29:45.645

and to that extent it's not, it's not a legitimate approach

574

00:29:46.115 --> 00:29:49.925

that we should be looking at what is in effect a zero, um,

575

00:29:50.485 --> 00:29:52.115

construction baseline.

576

00:29:54.185 --> 00:29:58.835

At the same time, the applicants are nowhere near achieving

577

00:29:58.835 --> 00:30:00.875

their 70% reduction at this stage,

578

00:30:01.225 --> 00:30:02.995

even on their own calculations.

579

00:30:03.105 --> 00:30:06.835

They are, um, well, well short of those.

580

00:30:07.655 --> 00:30:12.445

Um, and clearly there's no clear path to if we,

581

00:30:12.465 --> 00:30:13.765

if we exclude from,

582

00:30:14.745 --> 00:30:17.005

if we exclude from their original estimates,

583

00:30:17.355 --> 00:30:20.525

this big tunnel reduction, which is clearly not something

584

00:30:20.525 --> 00:30:22.845

that can be repeated, I can't believe there are any other

585

00:30:23.155 --> 00:30:28.125

very large reductions available within the, the, the scope

586

00:30:28.145 --> 00:30:30.245

of the construction exercise.

587

00:30:30.635 --> 00:30:32.965

They are themselves going to fall well short

588

00:30:32.985 --> 00:30:34.885

of their own carbon corporate target.

589

00:30:35.625 --> 00:30:39.485

So not only are they contributing 50 odd thousand tons

590

00:30:39.545 --> 00:30:43.235

of construction carbon as, as a net emission,

591

00:30:43.975 --> 00:30:46.795

but they're nowhere near meeting their own corporate target

592

00:30:46.975 --> 00:30:50.035

on a single high quality new build.

593

00:30:50.615 --> 00:30:52.395

Um, and if one compares it

594

00:30:52.395 --> 00:30:54.675

with all the other capital investments that, uh,

595

00:30:56.145 --> 00:30:58.905

angling water will be making, um, many of those are going

596

00:30:58.905 --> 00:31:01.585

to be complex restructurings of existing works

597

00:31:01.645 --> 00:31:02.665

and so on and so forth.

598

00:31:03.125 --> 00:31:07.505

Um, so it, it seems, seems on the face of it to be

599

00:31:07.505 --> 00:31:09.825

that they're way short of being able

600

00:31:09.825 --> 00:31:11.865

to deliver their own corporate target on

601

00:31:11.865 --> 00:31:15.855

what is probably their, their highlight

602

00:31:15.855 --> 00:31:17.455

scheme essentially.

603

00:31:17.875 --> 00:31:20.695

Um, and that that's something that I don't think

604

00:31:20.695 --> 00:31:23.455

that the applicant has fully addressed in, in terms of

605

00:31:23.455 --> 00:31:27.455

where it, where it intends to go, um, in order to get down

606

00:31:28.725 --> 00:31:31.025

to the minimum possible carbon emissions

607

00:31:31.025 --> 00:31:32.105
from, from construction.

608

00:31:33.215 --> 00:31:35.415
So I think those are the, that's,

609

00:31:35.415 --> 00:31:37.735
that's the particularly substantive point that we've got

610

00:31:37.735 --> 00:31:38.855
to so far.

611

00:31:39.075 --> 00:31:42.055
Um, madam and I'll come back to other points as we go on.

612

00:31:43.305 --> 00:31:46.985
Thank you Ms. Cotton. I, I,

613

00:31:47.205 --> 00:31:49.785
Is this a, this cotton resident, um,

614

00:31:49.925 --> 00:31:51.225
is this an appropriate time

615

00:31:51.225 --> 00:31:52.625
to make a comment about the strategic

616

00:31:52.625 --> 00:31:53.825
carbon assessment or not?

617

00:31:53.825 --> 00:31:55.305
At not at all at this moment,

618

00:31:55.375 --> 00:31:57.705
it's just concentrating on this chapter 10.

619

00:31:57.835 --> 00:31:59.865
We're just looking at the baseline at the moment for the,

620

00:31:59.925 --> 00:32:01.265

for the ES chapter 10.

621

00:32:01.325 --> 00:32:02.825

So yeah, if I could ask that,

622

00:32:02.825 --> 00:32:04.745

we could hold off on that for now, please. Fine.

623

00:32:04.875 --> 00:32:09.725

Thank you. So just moving on

624

00:32:09.725 --> 00:32:12.725

to the baseline for operational emissions, um,

625

00:32:14.825 --> 00:32:17.885

as, as far as I can see for no operation for operation,

626

00:32:18.145 --> 00:32:21.485

no baseline for carbon emissions has been presented, uh,

627

00:32:21.485 --> 00:32:24.005

please can the applicant confirm why this is the case when

628

00:32:24.005 --> 00:32:27.005

it's necessary to determine the net, uh, carbon emissions

629

00:32:27.005 --> 00:32:28.645

as a result of the proposed development?

630

00:32:29.345 --> 00:32:31.445

How, how can we assess the net difference

631

00:32:31.445 --> 00:32:33.685

between the existing operational carbon emissions and,

632

00:32:34.105 --> 00:32:36.685

and the proposed development carbon emissions

633

00:32:38.585 --> 00:32:40.915

Carbon, Um, BRI Parla for the applicant?

634

00:32:41.495 --> 00:32:43.875

Um, again, from the conversations with council, we,

635

00:32:43.935 --> 00:32:46.635

we understood that there was a challenge raised there.

636

00:32:46.735 --> 00:32:49.955

We actually think that what's been presented against the

637

00:32:50.465 --> 00:32:53.795

judging the absolute emissions from the baseline alone from

638

00:32:54.215 --> 00:32:57.595

the works where again, whilst the comparison has been

639

00:32:57.595 --> 00:32:59.995

between the M zero of the proposed development,

640

00:33:00.335 --> 00:33:02.355

the actual impacts have been assessed against

641

00:33:03.605 --> 00:33:05.365

a nothing being on site on the operational,

642

00:33:05.365 --> 00:33:06.525

which is actually more onerous.

643

00:33:06.905 --> 00:33:08.725

So again, from the narrative point of view,

644

00:33:08.985 --> 00:33:12.605

we are working on comparing against the existing operation

645

00:33:13.345 --> 00:33:15.365

and the indications of that as that they would actually

646

00:33:16.155 --> 00:33:19.365

present emissions against currently no emissions.

647

00:33:19.365 --> 00:33:20.965

What we're assessing impacts against.

648

00:33:21.065 --> 00:33:24.285

So whilst we understand what confusion

649

00:33:24.285 --> 00:33:25.765

that might cause from a narrative point of view,

650

00:33:25.765 --> 00:33:27.005

from a conclusion's point of view,

651

00:33:27.585 --> 00:33:31.205

the current works has emissions, comparing them to something

652

00:33:31.205 --> 00:33:34.365

that else that has reduced emissions is gonna come out

653

00:33:34.985 --> 00:33:36.125

in a favorable light,

654

00:33:36.225 --> 00:33:37.405

but we want to acknowledge

655

00:33:37.405 --> 00:33:39.805

that there are residual gross emissions that need

656

00:33:39.805 --> 00:33:42.845

to be mitigated alongside any proposed development anyway.

657

00:33:42.945 --> 00:33:44.005

So I think that's a deadline

658

00:33:44.065 --> 00:33:46.805

for clearing up the narrative of what we've yeah.

659

00:33:47.065 --> 00:33:48.285

Um, presented.

660

00:33:49.395 --> 00:33:50.845

Okay, thank you. That, that would be helpful.

661

00:33:57.195 --> 00:33:58.335

Th this may be something

662

00:33:58.335 --> 00:34:00.335

that you are looking at addressing a deadline

663

00:34:00.335 --> 00:34:02.015

for in any event, but the question

664

00:34:02.015 --> 00:34:05.575

that I had was can the applicant tell us why the CHP option

665

00:34:05.595 --> 00:34:07.615

for the proposed development, um,

666

00:34:07.725 --> 00:34:10.175

assumed the DMM zero operating emissions?

667

00:34:10.515 --> 00:34:13.255

Um, but like I said, perhaps that is something

668

00:34:13.255 --> 00:34:14.735

that you're looking to tie up in

669

00:34:14.995 --> 00:34:16.135

the deadline for submissions.

670

00:34:16.135 --> 00:34:18.295

I I just wanted to understand why

671

00:34:18.295 --> 00:34:20.975

that's assumed The DMM zero operating emissions,

672

00:34:21.555 --> 00:34:26.455

That's basically the existing site running A CHP at

673

00:34:26.455 --> 00:34:31.095

the moment and therefore it being a similar system

674

00:34:31.315 --> 00:34:33.535

and likely to have the same emissions in terms of

675

00:34:35.425 --> 00:34:38.835

what the current site is operating at with the resizing of

676

00:34:38.835 --> 00:34:39.915

for the current development.

677

00:34:40.175 --> 00:34:42.715

So the change in population that it's covering.

678

00:34:43.135 --> 00:34:45.995

So the DMM zero option for operation

679

00:34:46.875 --> 00:34:48.675

represents the same emissions as our operation

680

00:34:48.675 --> 00:34:50.675

as the existing plan, is that what you're saying? That's

681

00:34:50.675 --> 00:34:53.595

Not what it represents the same technology,

682

00:34:54.095 --> 00:34:57.155

but not at the same population equivalent in sizing

683

00:34:57.185 --> 00:34:59.275

that would be required for stage two.

684

00:35:00.625 --> 00:35:03.195

Okay. Yeah, I think, I think we need some clarification

685

00:35:03.195 --> 00:35:05.755

around that, a deadline for, if that's okay.

686

00:35:14.525 --> 00:35:16.865

Can I just raise what, what was that?

687

00:35:17.485 --> 00:35:20.705

The difficulty a little bit here is that there is no

688

00:35:23.215 --> 00:35:24.455

quantitative policy

689

00:35:25.075 --> 00:35:29.095

or standard that the applicant is quantified required

690

00:35:29.095 --> 00:35:30.415

to be in this sense.

691

00:35:30.515 --> 00:35:34.175

And the assessment has always tried to identify

692

00:35:34.285 --> 00:35:35.855

what is ambitious

693

00:35:36.355 --> 00:35:41.085

and driven, what is achievable, feasible,

694

00:35:41.225 --> 00:35:43.245

and, and there's still viability assessment

695

00:35:43.945 --> 00:35:46.405

to be undertaken on further mitigation options.

696

00:35:46.745 --> 00:35:49.845

And just in the nature of not being achieving the target at

697

00:35:49.845 --> 00:35:52.725

the moment, it is an aspirational corporate target

698

00:35:52.725 --> 00:35:55.685

that is trying to go beyond any existing policy

699

00:35:55.685 --> 00:35:59.645

because whilst there are economy level budgets

700

00:35:59.645 --> 00:36:01.965

and targets, they're not translated into requirements

701

00:36:01.985 --> 00:36:03.045

for individual schemes.

702

00:36:03.465 --> 00:36:06.405

The applicant has a strong track record in doing a,

703

00:36:06.925 --> 00:36:09.845

a large amount of carbon reductions on its additional,

704

00:36:10.425 --> 00:36:12.845

but, um, its other capital delivery programs.

705

00:36:13.105 --> 00:36:16.725

But it should be noted that there is no other standard

706

00:36:16.745 --> 00:36:20.205

to be held to in terms of quantitative what is good enough

707

00:36:20.265 --> 00:36:22.725

and ambitious, and it would be, just wanted to make

708

00:36:22.725 --> 00:36:27.375

that noted point on what we're proposing is very much, um,

709

00:36:27.625 --> 00:36:29.615

based on track record and voluntary, but,

710

00:36:29.615 --> 00:36:32.215

and trying to look at what standards are asking us to do.

711

00:36:32.675 --> 00:36:34.855

But there is interpretation to be made there to kind

712

00:36:34.855 --> 00:36:36.615

of say what's ambitious, um,

713

00:36:36.635 --> 00:36:38.735

and there's always gonna be a subjective element to that,

714

00:36:38.955 --> 00:36:40.575

but there has been lots of assessment done.

715

00:36:41.375 --> 00:36:42.615

I I think that's a very fair point.

716

00:36:42.615 --> 00:36:44.415

It it's, it's a very difficult subject.

717

00:36:44.795 --> 00:36:48.575

Um, I think my thoughts around that is yes,

718

00:36:48.575 --> 00:36:50.055

that there's not no sort of set standards,

719

00:36:50.055 --> 00:36:51.375

but there are methodologies

720

00:36:51.635 --> 00:36:54.135

and ways of assessing the impacts of greenhouse gases

721

00:36:54.135 --> 00:36:56.095

and that's where we refer to the I eima guidance

722

00:36:56.795 --> 00:36:59.175

and I think the, the sort of take home message from

723

00:36:59.175 --> 00:37:02.335

that is assessing the net difference in emissions, um,

724

00:37:02.435 --> 00:37:05.575

and it's then sort of applying what your considerations

725

00:37:05.575 --> 00:37:07.855

of the baseline to that, um, and,

726

00:37:07.875 --> 00:37:11.435

and fitting in the corporate accounting

727

00:37:11.435 --> 00:37:12.595

and capabilities there.

728

00:37:12.735 --> 00:37:14.595

But I think it's making sure that you've justified

729

00:37:15.625 --> 00:37:18.645

your approach based on, on the corporate perspective

730

00:37:19.365 --> 00:37:21.005

sufficiently within the environmental statement

731

00:37:21.005 --> 00:37:22.325

or any supporting documents.

732

00:37:22.945 --> 00:37:27.685

Um, okay, so within schedule

733

00:37:27.685 --> 00:37:30.605

of amendments, the draft of, uh, development consent,

734

00:37:31.145 --> 00:37:33.965

I'm sorry, the DCO application reference,

735

00:37:34.125 --> 00:37:37.565

a PP 0 0 8 under 0.47,

736

00:37:37.825 --> 00:37:39.845

the acceptance inspector stated that

737

00:37:40.415 --> 00:37:43.605

given the focus in the application documents on providing a

738

00:37:43.605 --> 00:37:45.445

carbon efficient wastewater treatment plan,

739

00:37:46.325 --> 00:37:48.285

consideration should be given to the inclusion

740

00:37:48.345 --> 00:37:51.485

of a comparative assessment for reasonable alternatives,

741

00:37:51.485 --> 00:37:53.885

including the do nothing option

742

00:37:54.505 --> 00:37:56.565

or the provision of upgrades at the existing

743

00:37:56.565 --> 00:37:57.765

wastewater treatment plan.

744

00:37:58.415 --> 00:38:00.705

Without these, the environmental benefits of the

745

00:38:01.225 --> 00:38:02.745

proposed development are unclear.

746

00:38:04.675 --> 00:38:07.175

The inspector also questioned without this information

747

00:38:07.175 --> 00:38:10.975

whether the ES complies with the EIA regulations 2017,

748

00:38:12.505 --> 00:38:14.665

schedule four of the EIA regulation sets out

749

00:38:14.665 --> 00:38:16.865

what is required for inclusion within the environment.

750

00:38:16.865 --> 00:38:19.265

Environmental statement number three

751

00:38:19.265 --> 00:38:21.665

of this is a description of the relevant aspects

752

00:38:21.725 --> 00:38:23.545

of the current state of the environment,

753

00:38:23.805 --> 00:38:24.985

the baseline scenario

754

00:38:25.685 --> 00:38:29.065

and an outline of the likely evolution thereof without

755

00:38:29.065 --> 00:38:31.345

implementation of the development as far

756

00:38:31.345 --> 00:38:33.505

as natural changes from the baseline scenario

757

00:38:34.125 --> 00:38:37.005

can be assessed within reasonable effort on the basis

758

00:38:37.065 --> 00:38:39.765

of the availability of environmental information

759

00:38:39.825 --> 00:38:41.085

and scientific knowledge.

760

00:38:41.965 --> 00:38:45.335

With this in mind, can the applicant explain how both

761

00:38:45.335 --> 00:38:48.335

of the construction baseline both the construction baseline

762

00:38:48.355 --> 00:38:51.655

and lack of operational baseline data accord

763

00:38:51.655 --> 00:38:53.615

with this requirement of the EIA regs?

764

00:38:54.965 --> 00:38:58.015

Yeah, I think that does slightly revisit the narrative

765

00:38:58.015 --> 00:39:00.215

kind of point, and the fact that residual emissions have

766

00:39:00.215 --> 00:39:04.455

been based on 53,000 tons, which is against a zero

767

00:39:05.335 --> 00:39:07.815

baseline, if we were to compare that to an upgrade

768

00:39:07.815 --> 00:39:10.255

to the existing site, which the strategic carbon assessment

769

00:39:10.685 --> 00:39:13.455

does provide a high level view of that reduces

770

00:39:13.455 --> 00:39:14.495

that residual emissions.

771

00:39:14.755 --> 00:39:17.415

So the environment statement chapter 10 has

772

00:39:17.735 --> 00:39:21.095

provided in terms of the signi impact, sorry, the, um,

773

00:39:21.095 --> 00:39:22.575

assessment of impact, significance

774

00:39:22.595 --> 00:39:23.975

of impact against the zero.

775

00:39:24.675 --> 00:39:27.495

And again, appreciate that the narrative clarity of that,

776

00:39:27.495 --> 00:39:29.495

that is what the baseline is in the DMM zero

777

00:39:30.145 --> 00:39:32.535

might be referred to as an alternative scenario

778

00:39:32.635 --> 00:39:34.815

to demonstrate re mitigation efforts have been put in place.

779

00:39:34.815 --> 00:39:38.195

So I think that is a clearing that narrative up

780

00:39:38.195 --> 00:39:41.035

that the baseline, the significance of effect is being

781

00:39:41.635 --> 00:39:44.875

compared against a do nothing do minimum standard.

782

00:39:47.375 --> 00:39:48.375

Mr.

783

00:39:50.705 --> 00:39:54.655

Gilda, Um, um,

784

00:39:55.115 --> 00:39:56.935

the answer you've just had is, is, is,

785

00:39:56.955 --> 00:39:58.215

is is somewhat curious.

786

00:39:58.495 --> 00:40:01.255

I think, um, in the,

787

00:40:01.255 --> 00:40:04.295

the strategic carbon assessment the applicant has always,

788

00:40:04.555 --> 00:40:08.215

um, claimed is out with the environmental statement.

789

00:40:08.245 --> 00:40:09.535

It's a planning assessment.

790

00:40:10.075 --> 00:40:14.775

Um, and indeed to find the, the carbon, um,

791

00:40:16.275 --> 00:40:18.335

to find the carbon budget that's in there

792

00:40:18.435 --> 00:40:21.975

for upgrading existing works, you have to do a number of

793

00:40:23.565 --> 00:40:25.095

back of the envelope calculations

794

00:40:25.235 --> 00:40:26.375

to get to find that number.

795

00:40:26.845 --> 00:40:28.535

It's not clear on the face even

796

00:40:28.535 --> 00:40:30.015
of the strategic carbon assessment,

797

00:40:30.235 --> 00:40:32.175
and it's certainly not part

798

00:40:32.275 --> 00:40:34.335
of the environmental statement chapter 10.

799

00:40:34.915 --> 00:40:38.955
Um, and if in in light of the advice

800

00:40:38.955 --> 00:40:40.515
that was given at the time of the scoping

801

00:40:40.945 --> 00:40:42.835
that hasn't been met in the es

802

00:40:46.345 --> 00:40:47.345
The applicant like to respond?

803

00:40:48.245 --> 00:40:50.045
I think what we're saying there is that we've,

804

00:40:50.625 --> 00:40:53.805
in the es the significance of effects have been

805

00:40:54.685 --> 00:40:57.245
compared against a zero construction baseline, which is,

806

00:40:58.305 --> 00:41:00.125
and again, the residual impacts have been,

807

00:41:00.245 --> 00:41:02.325
I think we're acknowledging that there are significant

808

00:41:02.965 --> 00:41:05.365
residual impacts that are moderately moderate adverse

809

00:41:06.265 --> 00:41:08.205

and actually comparing them against

810

00:41:08.265 --> 00:41:10.525
to an upgrade scenario would reduce

811

00:41:10.875 --> 00:41:14.565
that difference against the baseline, not increase those

812

00:41:14.835 --> 00:41:18.885
because we would have additional upgrade emissions

813

00:41:18.955 --> 00:41:22.485
that would add to our baseline compared to the 53,000 times

814

00:41:22.485 --> 00:41:25.485
that a net difference in residual impacts would be reduced.

815

00:41:25.625 --> 00:41:28.325
So we're trying to place a reasonable worst case

816

00:41:29.025 --> 00:41:30.925
by comparing to a zero position.

817

00:41:31.265 --> 00:41:34.445
So actually the assessment is in its worst case

818

00:41:34.725 --> 00:41:36.005
position as it is now.

819

00:41:37.305 --> 00:41:39.385
I think at the moment that's not clear within the ES

820

00:41:39.445 --> 00:41:41.305
and as you said, you, you need to update that

821

00:41:41.405 --> 00:41:42.745
to be able to make that point clear.

822

00:41:43.045 --> 00:41:44.825
Um, but yeah, I think at the moment that's,

823

00:41:44.825 --> 00:41:45.985
that's not really demonstrated

824

00:41:45.985 --> 00:41:47.225
within the environmental statement.

825

00:41:48.885 --> 00:41:51.985
We can take that away, but yeah, I think the, the

826

00:41:52.705 --> 00:41:55.145
residual impacts and the significance of effects

827

00:41:55.815 --> 00:41:57.505
talk about the 53,000 tons,

828

00:41:57.595 --> 00:42:00.025
which is purely not the difference

829

00:42:00.025 --> 00:42:02.105
between the DMM zero baseline

830

00:42:02.125 --> 00:42:04.465
and where it's got to, it is just

831

00:42:05.435 --> 00:42:06.895
the proposed development emissions,

832

00:42:06.995 --> 00:42:08.535
but like to say from a clarity

833

00:42:08.535 --> 00:42:10.055
point of view, it needs to be made. Yeah,

834

00:42:10.795 --> 00:42:12.335
But I hear what you're saying regarding that.

835

00:42:12.415 --> 00:42:16.895
I know I'm not disputing the significance effects in terms

836

00:42:16.895 --> 00:42:19.815

of what you've pre presented in the es, I think, um,

837

00:42:19.835 --> 00:42:21.735

and I've got some questions on that later on.

838

00:42:21.955 --> 00:42:24.655

Um, but I think, yeah, I think we need to have this update

839

00:42:24.655 --> 00:42:26.055

to be able to sort of, um, dig into

840

00:42:26.055 --> 00:42:27.335

that any deeper Ms. Cotton,

841

00:42:28.475 --> 00:42:31.735

Uh, the, the new, um, um, updated version

842

00:42:31.755 --> 00:42:34.495

of the strategic carbon assessment won't talk about it

843

00:42:34.495 --> 00:42:38.815

for very long, uh, mentions, uh, an increase of 294%, um,

844

00:42:39.005 --> 00:42:43.215

comparing the, uh, proposed, um, carbon emissions with

845

00:42:43.325 --> 00:42:45.055

what will be attached to, um,

846

00:42:45.285 --> 00:42:47.655

upgrading the current sewage plant.

847

00:42:48.895 --> 00:42:52.985

So they are looking at the two in that document.

848

00:42:54.785 --> 00:42:55.215

Thank you.

849

00:43:08.265 --> 00:43:09.805

Within ES chapter 10,

850

00:43:11.095 --> 00:43:14.445

table four dash five presents the potential operational

851

00:43:14.725 --> 00:43:16.405

emissions of the proposed development compared

852

00:43:16.405 --> 00:43:18.485

to the existing wastewater treatment plan,

853

00:43:18.585 --> 00:43:21.045

annual average emissions reported by the applicant.

854

00:43:22.065 --> 00:43:24.805

Um, can I, uh, ask the applicant to clarify

855

00:43:25.385 --> 00:43:27.045

why there would be a net production of

856

00:43:27.065 --> 00:43:28.485

nor point N one eight tens

857

00:43:28.485 --> 00:43:30.565

of carbon dioxide equivalent per megaliter

858

00:43:31.025 --> 00:43:33.645

for the CHP option when the applicant intends the proposed

859

00:43:33.645 --> 00:43:35.805

development to be operationally carbon neutral?

860

00:43:41.375 --> 00:43:44.905

Yeah, so this doesn't take into account any offsetting of

861

00:43:44.905 --> 00:43:48.425

that there purely gross emissions, oh, sorry, net emissions,

862

00:43:48.565 --> 00:43:53.445

but not before any offset plans as have been, I

863

00:43:54.005 --> 00:43:56.045

identified any outlined carbon management plan in terms of

864

00:43:56.045 --> 00:43:58.445

that need to be established are in place.

865

00:43:58.665 --> 00:44:02.765

The applicant's net zero commitment by 2030, um, allows

866

00:44:02.825 --> 00:44:05.045

for offsetting of any residual emissions.

867

00:44:07.805 --> 00:44:10.245

I suppose. Why, why doesn't it take account of that if

868

00:44:10.245 --> 00:44:12.085

that's the residual overall EFF effect?

869

00:44:13.475 --> 00:44:16.045

Yeah, because offset, the offsetting strategy is still

870

00:44:16.045 --> 00:44:17.285

to be defined

871

00:44:17.285 --> 00:44:21.685

and agreed in terms of what the best value regional

872

00:44:22.295 --> 00:44:25.125

offsetting strategy would be to make sure that they're not

873

00:44:26.235 --> 00:44:28.245

then perversely incentivized to

874

00:44:29.045 --> 00:44:31.685

identify the cheapest offsets globally and

875

00:44:31.755 --> 00:44:32.885

therefore the outline,

876

00:44:33.185 --> 00:44:35.565

as the outline carbon management plan tries to dictate,

877

00:44:35.565 --> 00:44:37.285

there needs to be engagement to understand

878

00:44:37.285 --> 00:44:41.045

what the best value investment in offsets would be

879

00:44:41.045 --> 00:44:43.485

that would benefit more regionally and locally.

880

00:44:44.185 --> 00:44:46.405

Um, and that takes a bit of engagement. Yes.

881

00:44:50.935 --> 00:44:54.355

Um, do you have, or can you confirm, um, what year

882

00:44:54.375 --> 00:44:56.795

or period the applicant's average emissions, um,

883

00:44:56.795 --> 00:44:59.315

for the current wastewater treatment plant is taken from?

884

00:45:06.555 --> 00:45:08.205

I'll have to come back to you on the exact

885

00:45:08.205 --> 00:45:09.525

year on that, but I can yeah.

886

00:45:09.525 --> 00:45:10.525

Provide that. Yeah,

887

00:45:16.115 --> 00:45:18.255

You may need to come back to me on, on this one,

888

00:45:18.395 --> 00:45:20.215

but, um, would you, could you confirm

889

00:45:20.215 --> 00:45:22.375

what are the net carbon emissions per megaliter

890

00:45:22.475 --> 00:45:24.415

for the existing wastewater treatment plant

891

00:45:24.635 --> 00:45:26.815

as they're excluded from table four dash five?

892

00:45:28.805 --> 00:45:30.505

Yep, I can, I, I can do that.

893

00:45:30.565 --> 00:45:33.425

Um, one of the reasons for this is just

894

00:45:33.425 --> 00:45:38.305

that they are reported across the asset base as part of the,

895

00:45:38.445 --> 00:45:40.585

the, the applicant's regulatory requirements,

896

00:45:40.675 --> 00:45:42.305

hence they haven't been disaggregated,

897

00:45:42.365 --> 00:45:44.665

but the information's available and can be provided.

898

00:45:45.015 --> 00:45:49.775

Yeah. Thank you. Um,

899

00:45:49.885 --> 00:45:52.935

I'll be moving on to, um, consideration

900

00:45:52.935 --> 00:45:54.135

of sludge deliveries next.

901

00:45:55.795 --> 00:45:58.975

Um, please, can the applicant direct the examining authority

902

00:45:59.195 --> 00:46:00.815

to where within the carbon assessment

903

00:46:01.475 --> 00:46:04.175

or assessments the sludge deliveries to the site, uh,

904

00:46:04.475 --> 00:46:06.415
during operation are considered?

905

00:46:08.785 --> 00:46:11.635
Yeah, so I think the clear answer there is then not,

906

00:46:11.935 --> 00:46:14.315
and the main reason for that is probably coming back to

907

00:46:14.315 --> 00:46:15.435
what we're comparing against,

908

00:46:15.575 --> 00:46:19.755
and again, narrative issue would be there is no

909

00:46:20.475 --> 00:46:21.675
expected net change

910

00:46:21.675 --> 00:46:24.435
between sludge deliveries at the existing site

911

00:46:25.175 --> 00:46:27.475
and the new proposed development, whether that be

912

00:46:27.475 --> 00:46:30.595
for DMM zero or the proposed development.

913

00:46:31.055 --> 00:46:33.555
Um, as you'll see, there are digest state

914

00:46:34.265 --> 00:46:35.675
tanking emissions in there.

915

00:46:35.735 --> 00:46:38.675
The reason those have been included is that there was

916

00:46:39.305 --> 00:46:42.515
options to choose sludge treatment technologies that would,

917

00:46:43.015 --> 00:46:45.555

um, potentially reduce volumes further or less.

918

00:46:45.895 --> 00:46:48.755

And as that was part of the auctioneering around

919

00:46:49.385 --> 00:46:52.875

what option be better, those emissions have been included

920

00:46:52.895 --> 00:46:55.075

to show that there was a decision made

921

00:46:55.295 --> 00:46:58.955

to choose a lower energy intensity, um,

922

00:46:59.705 --> 00:47:01.755

treatment process for this lunch at the moment

923

00:47:01.905 --> 00:47:03.555

that reduces overall emissions,

924

00:47:03.555 --> 00:47:06.235

but does increase some transport emissions now as well.

925

00:47:06.905 --> 00:47:09.795

Okay. I, I think again, that any deadline

926

00:47:09.795 --> 00:47:10.795

for submission needs to make

927

00:47:10.795 --> 00:47:13.075

that clear why sort deliveries aren't included,

928

00:47:13.075 --> 00:47:15.555

because I don't think that that's clear at the moment.

929

00:47:25.545 --> 00:47:28.205

Uh, moving on to uncertainty of future mission

930

00:47:28.305 --> 00:47:31.705

and scenarios, um, in, um,

931

00:47:32.205 --> 00:47:34.985

the local impact report from Cambridge County Council at

932

00:47:34.985 --> 00:47:37.825

paragraph 6.23, it is stated

933

00:47:37.825 --> 00:47:40.625

that gross operational carbon emissions should be given more

934

00:47:40.625 --> 00:47:43.185

weight in the decision making process than avoided emissions

935

00:47:43.245 --> 00:47:44.865

due to their higher level of certainty.

936

00:47:45.685 --> 00:47:48.625

Can the council confirm if this comment was just in relation

937

00:47:48.625 --> 00:47:50.625

to the applicant's preferred DC0 option

938

00:47:50.645 --> 00:47:52.305

or the CHP option as well,

939

00:47:59.005 --> 00:48:03.245

Madam, I'm hoping, ah, there was, thank you.

940

00:48:05.975 --> 00:48:09.475

Uh, yes, Sarah Wilkinson for Cambridge County Council.

941

00:48:10.135 --> 00:48:14.075

Um, my comment, uh, our comment related to either option.

942

00:48:14.125 --> 00:48:15.125

Thank you.

943

00:48:19.655 --> 00:48:22.075

Uh, thank you. So based on the use of gross

944

00:48:22.175 --> 00:48:25.115

or the consideration of gross operational emissions, um,

945

00:48:25.175 --> 00:48:27.195

as the council suggest, does, does the council consider

946

00:48:27.195 --> 00:48:29.075

that the impacts on operation to be significant?

947

00:48:34.805 --> 00:48:38.365

Um, the council considers that the,

948

00:48:39.655 --> 00:48:44.355

the gross emissions from operational would be significant in

949

00:48:44.385 --> 00:48:45.435

with either option

950

00:48:46.175 --> 00:48:50.515

and that at this point it's difficult

951

00:48:50.515 --> 00:48:53.235

to tell the significance of the net emissions

952

00:48:53.545 --> 00:48:56.435

because of the uncertainty of,

953

00:48:56.655 --> 00:48:59.275

um, avoided emissions.

954

00:49:04.475 --> 00:49:06.655

And to what extent does the council consider

955

00:49:06.655 --> 00:49:09.295

that the carbon management plan would offset the emissions?

956

00:49:09.795 --> 00:49:12.055

Um, and would this reduce the residual impact?

957

00:49:16.845 --> 00:49:21.595

Um, I'm not sure if that, that's,

958

00:49:21.735 --> 00:49:23.755

um, one I can answer.

959

00:49:24.235 --> 00:49:29.155

I think it, it does seem, um, likely that it will, it just,

960

00:49:29.465 --> 00:49:32.235

just, um, not something that we can be certain about.

961

00:49:36.305 --> 00:49:38.055

Where does the lack of certainty come from?

962

00:49:38.055 --> 00:49:40.135

What, what exactly are your concerns with the,

963

00:49:40.135 --> 00:49:41.215

the carbon management plan?

964

00:49:41.955 --> 00:49:45.205

So there's, um, it's not with the carbon management

965

00:49:45.835 --> 00:49:50.645

plan specifically, it's about the concept of caning, uh,

966

00:49:50.795 --> 00:49:51.805

avoided emissions.

967

00:49:52.385 --> 00:49:55.685

Um, so if you take the applicant's preferred option

968

00:49:55.745 --> 00:50:00.515

of bio methane production, um, the reason

969

00:50:00.615 --> 00:50:04.835

for claiming a reduction in emissions is due to,

970

00:50:05.415 --> 00:50:10.235

um, the theory that bio methane production prevents fossil

971

00:50:11.335 --> 00:50:13.155

gas being being used instead.

972

00:50:14.305 --> 00:50:18.875

So that relies on, um, both,

973

00:50:20.895 --> 00:50:24.955

you have to know that it will definitely be a,

974

00:50:25.155 --> 00:50:27.965

a corresponding reduction in the amount of fossil gas used

975

00:50:28.305 --> 00:50:31.725

as opposed to just increasing the overall amount of gas,

976

00:50:31.725 --> 00:50:34.805

whether fossil or bio that that's used.

977

00:50:36.615 --> 00:50:39.115

And then you also, um,

978

00:50:40.525 --> 00:50:42.695

it's also uncertain whether export

979

00:50:42.695 --> 00:50:44.015

to the gas grid would be required

980

00:50:44.015 --> 00:50:46.575

for the entire lifetime of the plant.

981

00:50:46.595 --> 00:50:48.775

So there's a, a, a timing uncertainty

982

00:50:48.775 --> 00:50:52.655

as well due considering the trend to electrification

983

00:50:53.155 --> 00:50:57.055

of heating, meaning that, uh, gas use, uh, you know,

984

00:50:57.465 --> 00:50:59.855

might not be around so much in future.

985

00:51:00.155 --> 00:51:03.695

And as the government, uh, the applicant has said, uh,

986

00:51:03.695 --> 00:51:07.255

in their, uh, application is the government have not

987

00:51:08.255 --> 00:51:12.935

produced any, uh, forecasts for the timescale or the timing

988

00:51:13.075 --> 00:51:17.695

or the, or the extent of decarbonization of, of, of gas,

989

00:51:18.195 --> 00:51:20.445

it is, um, quite hard.

990

00:51:21.345 --> 00:51:23.445

It will be hard for the applicant to predict that.

991

00:51:23.665 --> 00:51:27.805

So, um, that's why there is some uncertainty remaining.

992

00:51:33.685 --> 00:51:37.095

Okay, thank you. So it seems that you've got, um,

993

00:51:38.135 --> 00:51:41.215

stronger concerns, if I can put it like that, regarding the,

994

00:51:41.215 --> 00:51:42.255

the gas grid option.

995

00:51:42.255 --> 00:51:43.815

So the, the applicant's preferred option,

996

00:51:43.815 --> 00:51:47.455

but, um, if we were looking at the CHP option

997

00:51:47.475 --> 00:51:49.775

and the, the offsetting measures, um,

998

00:51:50.175 --> 00:51:52.495

proposed within the carbon management plan, do,

999

00:51:52.555 --> 00:51:54.815

do you have any particular concerns regarding that?

1000

00:51:57.855 --> 00:52:01.895

Um, not any, uh, uh,

1001

00:52:02.335 --> 00:52:04.495

concerns that particular to, to that option?

1002

00:52:05.035 --> 00:52:07.375

No. Okay, thank you.

1003

00:52:07.615 --> 00:52:10.175

I think the, the same things would apply some, some of them

1004

00:52:10.435 --> 00:52:11.735

to, to any option, but,

1005

00:52:12.605 --> 00:52:13.605

Okay.

1006

00:52:16.945 --> 00:52:18.485

And does the applicant have any,

1007

00:52:18.585 --> 00:52:20.085

any comments on that particular element?

1008

00:52:21.615 --> 00:52:23.055

I think the main concern there was

1009

00:52:23.795 --> 00:52:25.895

the future avoidance offset value

1010

00:52:25.995 --> 00:52:28.215

of exporting gas into the grid.

1011

00:52:28.435 --> 00:52:32.535

In terms of the preferred option, um, there's been a lot

1012

00:52:32.535 --> 00:52:34.615

of work, I guess done in the industry,

1013

00:52:34.835 --> 00:52:37.775

but also as part of the UK energy strategy in terms of

1014

00:52:37.775 --> 00:52:41.135

what role bioenergy will play, um, it very much is part

1015

00:52:41.135 --> 00:52:43.415

of the UK energy strategy at the moment

1016

00:52:43.635 --> 00:52:45.855

and likely to be for the foreseeable future.

1017

00:52:46.515 --> 00:52:48.415

The applicant hasn't assessed

1018

00:52:48.475 --> 00:52:53.135

but has understood alternatives in terms of if the,

1019

00:52:53.275 --> 00:52:55.455

the heat network, sorry, the gas network were

1020

00:52:55.455 --> 00:52:59.415

to completely become obsolete or even blended with hydrogen

1021

00:52:59.415 --> 00:53:00.655

or alternative low carbon fuels.

1022

00:53:00.825 --> 00:53:04.935

There are things that can be done with to either, um,

1023

00:53:05.275 --> 00:53:06.415

do those bits of it in terms

1024

00:53:06.415 --> 00:53:08.215

of maintaining its long-term value,

1025

00:53:08.275 --> 00:53:12.535

but also compressed into, um, other fuel sources

1026

00:53:12.635 --> 00:53:14.255

for industry or transport as well.

1027

00:53:14.255 --> 00:53:16.655

So in terms of, whilst we understand the concerns

1028

00:53:16.655 --> 00:53:18.895

of the uncertainty, I think like, um,

1029

00:53:18.955 --> 00:53:21.095

the response was it'd be very difficult to predict

1030

00:53:21.635 --> 00:53:24.975

the decisions have to be made on whether they're currently

1031

00:53:25.005 --> 00:53:27.205

form part of energy strategy and not.

1032

00:53:27.225 --> 00:53:29.245

And whilst there is a final

1033

00:53:29.345 --> 00:53:33.785

and there's never a kind of what you call it, um,

1034

00:53:33.905 --> 00:53:35.785

a certain future in terms of

1035

00:53:35.785 --> 00:53:37.385

what the energy strategy is going to be,

1036

00:53:37.475 --> 00:53:39.865

there is quite a strong commitment towards the need

1037

00:53:39.865 --> 00:53:42.465

for green gas as part of a, an energy mix

1038

00:53:42.885 --> 00:53:47.115

or Mr.

1039

00:53:47.285 --> 00:53:48.285

Gilda?

1040

00:53:49.575 --> 00:53:52.075

Yes, thank you ma'am. I dunno whether

1041

00:53:53.575 --> 00:53:56.315

you were going into the whole question of, of of

1042

00:53:56.315 --> 00:53:58.875

what the appropriate offsetting approach should be

1043

00:53:59.615 --> 00:54:01.235

if the CHP option is taken

1044

00:54:01.295 --> 00:54:04.235

or whether that's going to come further down the

1045

00:54:04.395 --> 00:54:05.475

line of your questioning.

1046

00:54:05.815 --> 00:54:08.195

Um, so perhaps we'll approach that first,

1047

00:54:08.695 --> 00:54:13.535

but secondly, um, as Ms. Wilkinson put it,

1048

00:54:13.715 --> 00:54:16.575

the principle uncertainty is not around the emission factors

1049

00:54:16.645 --> 00:54:19.575

that are being used, except that we note,

1050

00:54:19.635 --> 00:54:20.815

and we all have to note

1051

00:54:20.815 --> 00:54:24.455

that there are no assumptions about decarbonizing the gas

1052

00:54:24.455 --> 00:54:27.815

grid because there's a great deal of uncertainty as

1053

00:54:27.815 --> 00:54:29.455

to whether in 2040

1054

00:54:29.515 --> 00:54:31.735

or 2060 we shall have a,

1055

00:54:33.095 --> 00:54:35.495

a heating gas grid in existence at all.

1056

00:54:35.955 --> 00:54:37.255

Um, and, and

1057

00:54:37.255 --> 00:54:40.135

therefore it would be very difficult to, uh, assume that

1058

00:54:40.135 --> 00:54:42.985

that, that that's going to be in place

1059

00:54:43.125 --> 00:54:45.625

or indeed that there is a certain level of blending

1060

00:54:45.625 --> 00:54:46.745

or whatever can be done

1061

00:54:46.765 --> 00:54:49.625

to reduce the carbon content of that gas.

1062

00:54:50.365 --> 00:54:52.105

Um, the fundamental uncertainty,

1063

00:54:52.105 --> 00:54:55.825

and the one that I think needs to be most clearly accepted,

1064

00:54:55.845 --> 00:55:00.425

and I think the applicant accepts is, is that gas degree,

1065

00:55:00.965 --> 00:55:04.785

the feasibility and market for it is really not established.

1066

00:55:05.205 --> 00:55:09.325

Um, there's a lot of doubt in the industry about the whole,

1067

00:55:09.625 --> 00:55:11.005

um, arrangement

1068

00:55:11.065 --> 00:55:13.685

for either potentially blending hydrogen into the grid,

1069

00:55:14.405 --> 00:55:16.965

hydrogen only grids have, you know, we're going

1070

00:55:16.965 --> 00:55:19.125

to be experimented on and now being, um,

1071

00:55:19.505 --> 00:55:20.765

now being dropped by government.

1072

00:55:21.305 --> 00:55:24.735

Um, and therefore I think we do have to,

1073

00:55:24.755 --> 00:55:27.535

or you do have to, to focus very much on,

1074

00:55:28.205 --> 00:55:30.305

on the more feasible of the two options.

1075

00:55:30.305 --> 00:55:33.705

However, preferred gas to grid might be in a corporate sense

1076

00:55:33.805 --> 00:55:37.305

for, for, for the applicant, you have to focus and,

1077

00:55:37.325 --> 00:55:40.385

and the applicant should be focusing on, on a,

1078

00:55:40.565 --> 00:55:43.185

on a deliverable net zero option.

1079

00:55:44.255 --> 00:55:48.565

And, and that's part of, part

1080

00:55:48.565 --> 00:55:50.285

of this concern is that

1081

00:55:51.205 --> 00:55:52.985

the assessment is often being couched.

1082

00:55:53.325 --> 00:55:55.785

If I can be, um, clear about that.

1083

00:55:56.205 --> 00:56:00.105

In terms of corporate decision making about net zero,

1084

00:56:00.835 --> 00:56:05.455

we've got a specific project which is applied for as A DCO,

1085

00:56:05.715 --> 00:56:08.815

um, consent and any restrictions

1086

00:56:08.915 --> 00:56:11.495

or requirements that you may place on law,

1087

00:56:11.555 --> 00:56:14.055

the sexual state may place on that if it's granted consent,

1088

00:56:14.555 --> 00:56:16.375

um, apply to this project.

1089

00:56:17.035 --> 00:56:19.535

Um, and again, there needs

1090

00:56:19.535 --> 00:56:23.055

to not be a focus on corporate reduction or what's possible

1091

00:56:23.145 --> 00:56:27.205

or whether it's viable or not to, um, apply net zero.

1092

00:56:28.145 --> 00:56:32.385

Um, the question should be to what extent is it

1093

00:56:33.265 --> 00:56:36.465

feasible to get beyond net zero on this particular site?

1094

00:56:36.765 --> 00:56:39.935

Um, the applicant's position on meeting

1095

00:56:40.835 --> 00:56:44.615

the shortfall in operational net zero from the CHP option

1096

00:56:45.855 --> 00:56:48.205

seems to be that they'll put as much solar in

1097

00:56:48.205 --> 00:56:51.565

as is necessary to make, to make the books balance.

1098

00:56:52.505 --> 00:56:54.965

Um, I find that very difficult

1099

00:56:55.225 --> 00:56:56.325

and peculiar position

1100

00:56:56.345 --> 00:56:58.605

to take either from a corporate perspective,

1101

00:56:59.365 --> 00:57:02.125

'cause obviously, you know, more solar could contribute

1102

00:57:02.125 --> 00:57:06.165

to this, so their overall net zero um, contribution,

1103

00:57:06.265 --> 00:57:11.205

but it could also clearly improve the performance

1104

00:57:11.205 --> 00:57:13.925

of this site to, to give it, you know,

1105

00:57:13.985 --> 00:57:15.245

not operational net zero,

1106

00:57:15.265 --> 00:57:18.965

but operationally positive, um, contribution.

1107

00:57:19.545 --> 00:57:23.485

So that's, that's a very peculiar position for the applicant

1108

00:57:23.485 --> 00:57:26.485

to be adopting and it should be, it needs

1109

00:57:26.485 --> 00:57:30.775

to be much made much clearer what, what they intend to do,

1110

00:57:30.775 --> 00:57:34.055

whether they intend to provide the maximum seller that is

1111

00:57:34.965 --> 00:57:37.515

physically and practically feasible on the site.

1112

00:57:37.615 --> 00:57:40.435

Now I accept that that may not be the entirety

1113

00:57:40.495 --> 00:57:43.115

of the seven megawatts that's been settled,

1114

00:57:43.335 --> 00:57:46.275

the seven hectares that's been set in the application,

1115

00:57:46.335 --> 00:57:49.755

but they do need to be clear about what their commitment is.

1116

00:57:50.255 --> 00:57:52.195

Is it a commitment just to balance the books

1117

00:57:52.295 --> 00:57:56.595

or is it a commitment to maximize the, um, the carbon,

1118

00:57:57.755 --> 00:58:01.335

the carbon budget effectively will maximize carbon reduction

1119

00:58:01.525 --> 00:58:02.695

from this proposal

1120
00:58:03.155 --> 00:58:05.575
and it, it very much has to focus back on,

1121
00:58:05.915 --> 00:58:07.575
on this specific application

1122
00:58:07.675 --> 00:58:09.175
and not on the achievement

1123
00:58:09.175 --> 00:58:11.295
of their corporate net zero targets.

1124
00:58:12.615 --> 00:58:15.615
I think so far what the applicant has committed to,

1125
00:58:15.615 --> 00:58:17.935
and that is secured through the draft ECO is

1126
00:58:17.935 --> 00:58:21.295
to be operationally, um, net zero, um,

1127
00:58:21.395 --> 00:58:23.615
and that that is secured through the draft ECO

1128
00:58:26.055 --> 00:58:27.505
Well that, that may be the case.

1129
00:58:27.705 --> 00:58:29.545
I think I'm making the case madam for that,

1130
00:58:29.735 --> 00:58:31.825
that actually their commitment should be to go

1131
00:58:31.825 --> 00:58:34.665
beyond operational net zero if they can achieve that.

1132
00:58:35.325 --> 00:58:39.665
Um, and it should be to put a reasonable maximum amount

1133
00:58:39.685 --> 00:58:44.075

of solar, um, as part of the scheme, um, in order

1134

00:58:44.175 --> 00:58:47.435

to reduce the carbon footprint of this scheme

1135

00:58:47.775 --> 00:58:49.715

to the lowest practicable level.

1136

00:58:49.855 --> 00:58:53.125

Now I'm accepting that once it comes to the installation

1137

00:58:53.125 --> 00:58:57.005

of additional, so solar for example,

1138

00:58:57.485 --> 00:58:59.685

I mean there's clearly an economic assessment to be done,

1139

00:58:59.745 --> 00:59:02.045

but we're in a period going forward

1140

00:59:02.105 --> 00:59:03.845

and we have been for some years where,

1141

00:59:04.295 --> 00:59:06.245

where solar is cost effective,

1142

00:59:06.605 --> 00:59:09.165

I mean it's cost effective investment on the part

1143

00:59:09.165 --> 00:59:10.445

of the applicant and

1144

00:59:10.445 --> 00:59:13.925

therefore the restrictions are more likely to be around

1145

00:59:14.265 --> 00:59:17.525

how physically feasible it is to install that solar, um,

1146

00:59:17.945 --> 00:59:20.985

how it possibly the visual impacts of it

1147

00:59:21.100 --> 00:59:23.125

or other impacts of the solar panels which have

1148

00:59:23.125 --> 00:59:24.205

not of course been assessed.

1149

00:59:24.825 --> 00:59:27.565

Um, but the fundamental point is

1150

00:59:27.565 --> 00:59:29.085

that the commitment should be to go

1151

00:59:29.085 --> 00:59:31.765

beyond operational net zero on this site.

1152

00:59:32.265 --> 00:59:36.285

Um, given what we've seen now of the CHP option

1153

00:59:36.285 --> 00:59:40.695

and how that it can be comfortably offset by possibly

1154

00:59:41.695 --> 00:59:44.175

a quarter of the, the solar that's being proposed

1155

00:59:44.315 --> 00:59:45.815

or something of that, that order.

1156

00:59:46.275 --> 00:59:48.215

Um, so there's clearly scope

1157

00:59:48.355 --> 00:59:51.575

for significantly more carbon reduction than the

1158

00:59:51.575 --> 00:59:53.015

applicant's already committed to.

1159

00:59:54.165 --> 00:59:56.275

Thank you. Does the applicant want to respond to that?

1160

00:59:58.085 --> 01:00:00.285

I think there was a few bits in there.

1161

01:00:00.345 --> 01:00:01.565

One being the feasibility

1162

01:00:01.665 --> 01:00:04.005

and the established nature of gas to grid.

1163

01:00:04.405 --> 01:00:07.125

I guess in the UK water industry there's

1164

01:00:08.105 --> 01:00:10.785

a significant amount of gas to grid operation already.

1165

01:00:11.005 --> 01:00:14.105

And so I would say that from a technology point of view, um,

1166

01:00:14.135 --> 01:00:15.625

upgrading to SANE

1167

01:00:16.045 --> 01:00:17.625

and injecting into grid is a very,

1168

01:00:17.805 --> 01:00:18.945

is an established technology.

1169

01:00:18.945 --> 01:00:22.385

It has been for a, a good number of years now, five,

1170

01:00:22.405 --> 01:00:24.425

10 years I think is probably the first, yeah,

1171

01:00:24.425 --> 01:00:26.625

the first scheme and it's um, part

1172

01:00:26.625 --> 01:00:29.985

of the UK SEC water sector's net zero strategy to kind

1173

01:00:29.985 --> 01:00:32.025

of increase the amount of bio methane, um,

1174

01:00:32.545 --> 01:00:33.625
produced from the sites.

1175

01:00:33.705 --> 01:00:36.825
I think the second question around

1176

01:00:37.675 --> 01:00:40.345
maximizing the solar element of it, it is a

1177

01:00:40.935 --> 01:00:44.305
difficult balance because particularly in the area we are in

1178

01:00:44.305 --> 01:00:47.265
terms of grid network capacity, et cetera, oversizing,

1179

01:00:47.295 --> 01:00:49.865
your solar needs there for there to be a demand

1180

01:00:50.205 --> 01:00:51.665
for the additional energy

1181

01:00:51.665 --> 01:00:54.585
because of when you generate in a day

1182

01:00:54.585 --> 01:00:56.265
and then there's battery storage and all that kind of stuff.

1183

01:00:56.285 --> 01:01:00.585
But actually just increasing the scale of solar

1184

01:01:01.125 --> 01:01:02.665
on the site doesn't necessarily mean

1185

01:01:02.665 --> 01:01:05.465
that it will be utilized directly on the site

1186

01:01:05.465 --> 01:01:09.425
because the site needs power demand throughout the day,

1187

01:01:10.015 --> 01:01:12.425

even at nighttime kind of thing to keep on treating.

1188

01:01:12.525 --> 01:01:15.545

So there is an energy balance argument there to make sure

1189

01:01:15.895 --> 01:01:18.665

that the solar is sized to be utilized on site

1190

01:01:19.045 --> 01:01:21.345

and that it doesn't perhaps produce a burden onto the grid

1191

01:01:21.365 --> 01:01:25.145

by needing somewhere to export into when there isn't

1192

01:01:25.145 --> 01:01:27.305

that demand or grid capacity to do so as well.

1193

01:01:31.155 --> 01:01:35.335

Why, why wouldn't the grid take, take, take

1194

01:01:35.905 --> 01:01:37.015

extra solar energy?

1195

01:01:37.075 --> 01:01:38.375

Why wouldn't the grid want that back?

1196

01:01:38.685 --> 01:01:41.655

It's a capacity issue in terms of when you are expecting

1197

01:01:41.655 --> 01:01:42.775

to export

1198

01:01:42.915 --> 01:01:45.775

and that needs to be planned quite carefully in terms of

1199

01:01:46.445 --> 01:01:49.255

when grid capacity is available.

1200

01:01:49.455 --> 01:01:51.255

I think that's already an issue in the Cambridge area,

1201
01:01:51.385 --> 01:01:54.695
right, already in terms of developments where we would like

1202
01:01:54.695 --> 01:01:57.815
to export more and there is the ability, you know,

1203
01:01:58.345 --> 01:02:00.495
where you can additionally, sorry,

1204
01:02:00.495 --> 01:02:03.815
where you could efficiently increase the size of your solar

1205
01:02:04.795 --> 01:02:07.655
if you can't manage where you can export to.

1206
01:02:08.445 --> 01:02:10.735
Yeah, I suppose there's also the option of battery storage

1207
01:02:10.735 --> 01:02:12.255
that could solve

1208
01:02:12.255 --> 01:02:13.455
That which, which could optimize

1209
01:02:13.455 --> 01:02:16.215
and that's again, something that the applicant is willing

1210
01:02:16.215 --> 01:02:17.655
to look at, but again, needs

1211
01:02:17.655 --> 01:02:19.365
to be viability assessed in terms

1212
01:02:19.365 --> 01:02:20.965
of then further optimizing solar,

1213
01:02:21.145 --> 01:02:23.965
but it's not a matter of being able to double it

1214
01:02:24.505 --> 01:02:26.445

and that would reduce the schemes carbon

1215

01:02:26.725 --> 01:02:27.845

emissions in that sense.

1216

01:02:27.845 --> 01:02:30.885

It would be similar to the gas to grid argument is

1217

01:02:30.885 --> 01:02:34.405

that you are taking a systems view of what benefits

1218

01:02:34.915 --> 01:02:36.605

economy level decarbonization,

1219

01:02:36.605 --> 01:02:38.845

but by providing a lower carbon source,

1220

01:02:38.865 --> 01:02:40.765

so increasing the solar would then need

1221

01:02:41.185 --> 01:02:45.925

to offset current grid, um, power network one as well.

1222

01:02:46.025 --> 01:02:49.245

So it's not disagreeing with it, it's just making sure that

1223

01:02:49.955 --> 01:02:51.325

understanding that our

1224

01:02:52.005 --> 01:02:54.165

economic constraints are also technical constraints in terms

1225

01:02:54.165 --> 01:02:57.685

of how you can size it to make sure that at the MER in size

1226

01:02:57.685 --> 01:03:00.485

to utilize 95% of it within the sites,

1227

01:03:00.485 --> 01:03:02.085

you're only exporting a really small amount

1228

01:03:02.425 --> 01:03:04.765

and that could be battery stored potentially in the future,

1229

01:03:04.945 --> 01:03:08.085

but it's not a matter of we could double it, generate twice

1230

01:03:08.085 --> 01:03:11.085

as much energy and that would reduce emissions on the site

1231

01:03:11.555 --> 01:03:14.405

then needs to be balanced to what the demand profile

1232

01:03:14.405 --> 01:03:15.805

of the power consumption is.

1233

01:03:17.265 --> 01:03:22.155

Yes, Mr. Goda, I think I accept most of those points.

1234

01:03:23.895 --> 01:03:27.115

Um, in terms of gas grid point, I certainly wasn't arguing.

1235

01:03:27.345 --> 01:03:31.395

It's not technically export by

1236

01:03:32.335 --> 01:03:36.515

I'm do that

1237

01:03:36.535 --> 01:03:37.875

as a matter of practice now

1238

01:03:38.345 --> 01:03:40.635

What we're looking It Sorry, Mr, is your microphone on?

1239

01:03:42.685 --> 01:03:45.335

It's now I hope? Um, yes.

1240

01:03:45.555 --> 01:03:49.775

I'm, I I I fully accept that gas to grid is a, by me saying

1241

01:03:49.775 --> 01:03:51.895

to grid is a, an established technology

1242

01:03:52.315 --> 01:03:54.855

and it couldn't, um, in the present state of the market

1243

01:03:54.955 --> 01:03:58.935

for gas, um, it it could be a feasible proposition,

1244

01:03:59.035 --> 01:04:01.015

but as, as the applicant has already

1245

01:04:01.595 --> 01:04:03.575

set out preferred though it might be,

1246

01:04:03.885 --> 01:04:07.095

there's no certainty about the nature of the demand

1247

01:04:07.095 --> 01:04:10.065

through the grid in the years going forward

1248

01:04:10.165 --> 01:04:13.745

and no certainty that, um, there's gonna be a direct market

1249

01:04:13.885 --> 01:04:16.025

for bio methane as gas to grid,

1250

01:04:16.405 --> 01:04:19.805

um, and, and for that.

1251

01:04:20.025 --> 01:04:21.045

So, but I do accept

1252

01:04:21.045 --> 01:04:23.205

that it's entirely technically feasible to do it.

1253

01:04:25.785 --> 01:04:28.485

The the other point that was being made I think was,

1254

01:04:29.025 --> 01:04:31.525

was essentially that obviously there are,

1255
01:04:32.055 --> 01:04:33.805
there is the potential for the regional

1256
01:04:34.065 --> 01:04:38.365
or the local electricity network to not have capacity for

1257
01:04:39.155 --> 01:04:41.645
immediate, um, return of

1258
01:04:41.645 --> 01:04:43.845
that generated electricity to the grid.

1259
01:04:44.435 --> 01:04:48.365
Clearly battery storage can be used to overcome those,

1260
01:04:48.455 --> 01:04:50.165
those peaks and troughs

1261
01:04:50.625 --> 01:04:53.405
and it won't be necessarily that the, we are

1262
01:04:53.405 --> 01:04:54.885
after all talking about a net,

1263
01:04:56.105 --> 01:04:58.325
we we're talking about offsetting effectively.

1264
01:04:58.575 --> 01:05:01.565
We're not saying that further generation electricity on

1265
01:05:01.565 --> 01:05:05.285
site, it won't get you below zero import of the,

1266
01:05:05.825 --> 01:05:07.525
of electricity from the grid that

1267
01:05:08.065 --> 01:05:10.645
the spare electricity will have to be exported outwards.

1268
01:05:10.745 --> 01:05:14.525

And just to a limited extent, I accept that, you know,

1269

01:05:14.675 --> 01:05:16.645
that needs technical resolution,

1270

01:05:16.785 --> 01:05:20.445
but it's, it's the same resolution

1271

01:05:20.445 --> 01:05:23.205
that's required every time you consider a small solar,

1272

01:05:23.735 --> 01:05:25.325
solar farm or something like that.

1273

01:05:25.425 --> 01:05:28.325
You clearly have to have the connections in the market for

1274

01:05:28.325 --> 01:05:30.565
that electricity before you'll establish it.

1275

01:05:30.945 --> 01:05:34.285
So it doesn't rule out maximizing

1276

01:05:35.095 --> 01:05:36.925
solar generation on this site.

1277

01:05:39.425 --> 01:05:41.015
Thank you. Um, yes, Ms. Cotton,

1278

01:05:42.035 --> 01:05:45.295
Um, um, I I was just, um, uh, interested,

1279

01:05:47.715 --> 01:05:48.715
Oh, there we go. I'm on,

1280

01:05:48.715 --> 01:05:51.655
um, uh, that Anglia water had said that, um,

1281

01:05:51.825 --> 01:05:56.015
given given funding limitations, it is unrealistic

1282

01:05:56.035 --> 01:05:58.535
to retrofit, retrofit, excuse me,

1283

01:05:58.715 --> 01:05:59.935
the wastewater treatment plant.

1284

01:05:59.935 --> 01:06:01.735
This is the one that's currently in action

1285

01:06:01.915 --> 01:06:04.215
to a high level IE the bio methane.

1286

01:06:04.275 --> 01:06:07.535
And I, I asked the question why that was the case, uh,

1287

01:06:07.535 --> 01:06:09.335
because it seemed, uh, um, strange

1288

01:06:09.335 --> 01:06:11.335
that she would only be upgrading a sewage fund

1289

01:06:11.335 --> 01:06:13.415
to the highest level if it was being paid for

1290

01:06:13.415 --> 01:06:15.655
by somebody else, was my take on that.

1291

01:06:16.115 --> 01:06:17.655
Um, and their response was

1292

01:06:17.655 --> 01:06:19.775
that angling water would very likely not receive

1293

01:06:19.915 --> 01:06:21.815
of what's approval for this option.

1294

01:06:22.275 --> 01:06:24.455
Um, which I found really interesting

1295

01:06:24.455 --> 01:06:27.175

and just wondered if that's something that they actually

1296

01:06:27.805 --> 01:06:32.065

have ever explored for the current site in terms of, uh,

1297

01:06:33.125 --> 01:06:35.585

how you would want to ma um, do the best by, uh,

1298

01:06:35.585 --> 01:06:37.905

carbon emissions for what you have currently until

1299

01:06:38.685 --> 01:06:41.265

the day you do or do not, um, move the sewage plant.

1300

01:06:43.575 --> 01:06:44.975

I think it's slightly outside

1301

01:06:44.975 --> 01:06:46.255

of the relevance of this particular,

1302

01:06:46.825 --> 01:06:47.825

Sorry. Yes, you are ab

1303

01:06:47.825 --> 01:06:49.615

just in terms of the, the comparison

1304

01:06:50.395 --> 01:06:53.495

we won't, will, this new one is gonna be so much better

1305

01:06:53.715 --> 01:06:55.815

and will never be able to make the old one as good.

1306

01:06:55.875 --> 01:06:59.855

And I just, it's interesting in, in, in that regard,

1307

01:07:00.555 --> 01:07:01.695

If the applicant wants to provide

1308

01:07:01.735 --> 01:07:03.175

a response to that, they can,

1309

01:07:07.125 --> 01:07:10.695

Mike Dexter for the applicant, um, as far as to say is

1310

01:07:11.615 --> 01:07:14.175

Anglin's carbon reduction strategy

1311

01:07:14.275 --> 01:07:15.935

for being net zero by 2030.

1312

01:07:15.995 --> 01:07:18.415

Gas to grid is, uh, very much at the heart of that.

1313

01:07:18.715 --> 01:07:20.455

We are in discussions with a regulator

1314

01:07:20.455 --> 01:07:23.295

with our determination to understand how our

1315

01:07:23.935 --> 01:07:25.095

business plan is being put forward.

1316

01:07:25.475 --> 01:07:28.535

Um, and I would prefer not to go forth on that.

1317

01:07:28.535 --> 01:07:31.255

So still in determination period with, with the regulator.

1318

01:07:32.745 --> 01:07:36.635

Okay. Thank you. Um, sorry, I Sarah, uh, Mr. Wilkinson, I,

1319

01:07:36.755 --> 01:07:38.155

I, you've had your hand up for some time.

1320

01:07:38.295 --> 01:07:40.115

Uh, did you want to submit some

1321

01:07:40.235 --> 01:07:42.035

comments? Thank you for being patient.

1322

01:07:42.725 --> 01:07:46.835

Thank you. Just briefly, um, to um, add to

1323

01:07:46.835 --> 01:07:50.475

what I said earlier about, uh, the uncertainty of Tane, um,

1324

01:07:51.655 --> 01:07:55.675

the avoided emissions from the gas to grid option.

1325

01:07:56.095 --> 01:07:59.115

Um, just a related point to that is that

1326

01:07:59.495 --> 01:08:02.995

as if the gas grid does become greener perhaps

1327

01:08:02.995 --> 01:08:05.875

through other, uh, green gas projects across the country,

1328

01:08:06.455 --> 01:08:09.835

um, that will of course reduce the carbon benefit

1329

01:08:10.455 --> 01:08:13.075

of avoided emissions from fossil fuels.

1330

01:08:13.135 --> 01:08:16.765

And that's something that isn't currently profiled, unlike,

1331

01:08:16.765 --> 01:08:20.285

we're used to doing that for electricity where there is, uh,

1332

01:08:20.925 --> 01:08:23.045

a forecast of decarbonization.

1333

01:08:23.385 --> 01:08:26.045

So that's just something to, uh, take into account.

1334

01:08:26.175 --> 01:08:27.175

Thank you.

1335

01:08:30.775 --> 01:08:32.635

So is that forecast something

1336
01:08:32.635 --> 01:08:35.235
that the applicant can incorporate within their

1337
01:08:35.435 --> 01:08:36.835
considerations in the carbon management

1338
01:08:36.835 --> 01:08:37.995
plan and potential offsetting

1339
01:08:39.575 --> 01:08:40.635
My Dexter for the applicant?

1340
01:08:40.775 --> 01:08:45.315
Um, we, we can, uh, just generally, there is a, a blend

1341
01:08:45.865 --> 01:08:48.755
with bio methane into the grid with, with fossil fuels.

1342
01:08:48.755 --> 01:08:50.955
So being able to have a completely

1343
01:08:52.355 --> 01:08:55.135
bio methane fueled gas network is, is unlikely.

1344
01:08:55.435 --> 01:08:57.695
But we, we can add that into the carbon management plan.

1345
01:08:58.925 --> 01:09:00.945
So I'm saying, my point is that there's always likely

1346
01:09:00.945 --> 01:09:04.545
to be an offset if we are, um, in agreement with the,

1347
01:09:04.605 --> 01:09:07.905
the grid operator to inject our methane.

1348
01:09:08.015 --> 01:09:09.905
They, they come on a first come first serve basis.

1349
01:09:09.905 --> 01:09:14.145

Once we have our, um, quantum injecting into their grid,

1350

01:09:14.445 --> 01:09:15.625
people can't then come

1351

01:09:15.625 --> 01:09:18.425
and take that injection allowance away from us.

1352

01:09:19.525 --> 01:09:21.305
And, and the opposite is true as well.

1353

01:09:25.045 --> 01:09:27.985
Um, sorry, pri for the, can I just add to that as well,

1354

01:09:27.985 --> 01:09:30.585
which is, it's a constant challenge, right?

1355

01:09:30.585 --> 01:09:33.545
And I think it feeds into the solar point there as well,

1356

01:09:33.545 --> 01:09:35.705
which is the grid decarbonize,

1357

01:09:36.095 --> 01:09:37.945
because schemes like this, go ahead.

1358

01:09:38.565 --> 01:09:41.505
So it becomes really difficult to assess those things,

1359

01:09:41.505 --> 01:09:44.345
which is yes, the gas grid might decarbonize,

1360

01:09:44.565 --> 01:09:46.665
but it's gonna decarbonize through schemes

1361

01:09:46.665 --> 01:09:48.065
that are trying to decarbonize it.

1362

01:09:48.365 --> 01:09:51.385
And you can end up in a bit of a, we're not gonna go ahead

1363

01:09:51.385 --> 01:09:52.665

with a transition scheme

1364

01:09:52.665 --> 01:09:55.265

because it's going to transition anyway.

1365

01:09:55.265 --> 01:09:59.615

And these things don't happen without a mix of kind of

1366

01:10:00.135 --> 01:10:01.535

dispatch generation and stuff.

1367

01:10:01.535 --> 01:10:04.175

And it is part of the UK energy strategy

1368

01:10:04.235 --> 01:10:06.095

and I should think it's a, it's a tough,

1369

01:10:06.255 --> 01:10:09.095

I just get highlighting the difficulty of projecting

1370

01:10:09.115 --> 01:10:10.735

for the decarbonization, assuming

1371

01:10:10.735 --> 01:10:12.335

that everyone else is going to do it.

1372

01:10:12.915 --> 01:10:14.455

Um, and then it doesn't happen

1373

01:10:14.915 --> 01:10:18.015

and then you revisit your decision when it's

1374

01:10:18.015 --> 01:10:19.055

too late or just a

1375

01:10:19.685 --> 01:10:20.855

Yeah, I know what you're saying.

1376

01:10:20.895 --> 01:10:22.375

I think it would probably be useful to do that

1377

01:10:22.375 --> 01:10:24.775

for the purposes of addressing comments from Cambridge

1378

01:10:24.775 --> 01:10:25.895

County Council, for example,

1379

01:10:27.505 --> 01:10:28.525

The only thing that I would say is

1380

01:10:28.525 --> 01:10:31.845

that the reason the grid decarbonization has been included

1381

01:10:31.865 --> 01:10:35.205

for in terms of the power grid, the, the electricity grid,

1382

01:10:35.205 --> 01:10:36.805

is that there is policy

1383

01:10:37.025 --> 01:10:38.725

and grid emissions factors available

1384

01:10:39.315 --> 01:10:41.485

through the Green Book that allow us to do that.

1385

01:10:41.695 --> 01:10:44.245

There isn't the same for the gas grid and

1386

01:10:44.245 --> 01:10:46.045

therefore there's an element of, we could have been

1387

01:10:46.865 --> 01:10:49.845

of cherry picking and kind of producing a number so

1388

01:10:49.845 --> 01:10:51.045

that it makes it a lot easier

1389

01:10:51.145 --> 01:10:53.605

to incorporate those assessments when there is a

1390
01:10:54.325 --> 01:10:56.965
referenceable projection to base it on as well.

1391
01:10:56.985 --> 01:10:58.125
So whilst we can,

1392
01:10:58.825 --> 01:11:00.525
and we have highlighted in the chapter

1393
01:11:00.635 --> 01:11:01.965
that it is an uncertainty

1394
01:11:01.965 --> 01:11:06.085
and we do expect it to, I guess, decarbonize in some form

1395
01:11:06.085 --> 01:11:08.845
and whatever process that's gonna be, it is difficult

1396
01:11:08.845 --> 01:11:10.245
to quantify to an extent

1397
01:11:10.245 --> 01:11:12.765
because it does require assumptions to be made

1398
01:11:12.765 --> 01:11:14.565
that are gonna be relatively subjective.

1399
01:11:15.035 --> 01:11:15.645
Okay. Thank you.

1400
01:11:24.695 --> 01:11:26.875
Uh, regarding the carbon management plan,

1401
01:11:27.175 --> 01:11:29.075
can the applicant confirm whether it would allow

1402
01:11:29.075 --> 01:11:30.755
for design refinement monitoring

1403
01:11:30.755 --> 01:11:33.115

and review of carbon emissions as per South ca,

1404

01:11:33.115 --> 01:11:35.035

south Cambridge District Council's request?

1405

01:11:41.895 --> 01:11:43.475

So the carbon management plan

1406

01:11:43.695 --> 01:11:45.915

that's there at the moment is specifically on the

1407

01:11:45.915 --> 01:11:48.995

operational part of it at deadline for, we're proposing

1408

01:11:49.455 --> 01:11:52.035

to submit design codes, which are looking

1409

01:11:52.175 --> 01:11:55.555

to provide a mechanism to do that in regard to

1410

01:11:56.675 --> 01:11:59.125

reviewing with the council to further refinements

1411

01:11:59.125 --> 01:12:00.565

that we'd like to make to the design

1412

01:12:00.665 --> 01:12:03.685

to keep on striving towards the 70% commitment on the,

1413

01:12:03.945 --> 01:12:05.125

the construction emissions.

1414

01:12:05.545 --> 01:12:08.045

So I think that would be a deadline for rather than

1415

01:12:09.105 --> 01:12:11.165

the out at the moment, the carbon management plan,

1416

01:12:11.165 --> 01:12:12.485

which is focused on operational

1417

01:12:12.545 --> 01:12:15.805

and the secure of the net zero operational position. Have

1418

01:12:15.805 --> 01:12:17.325

You discussed that with the council in terms

1419

01:12:17.325 --> 01:12:18.845

of addressing their concerns?

1420

01:12:19.575 --> 01:12:20.725

We've had the conversation

1421

01:12:20.745 --> 01:12:23.125

before Christmas around the fact that that was a concern

1422

01:12:23.225 --> 01:12:24.605

and what that mechanism would be.

1423

01:12:24.605 --> 01:12:26.485

We haven't had any follow up since then

1424

01:12:26.485 --> 01:12:28.845

because we've been discussing what a pragmatic

1425

01:12:29.395 --> 01:12:31.005

mechanism would be to review that,

1426

01:12:31.005 --> 01:12:35.845

because there's also the wanting to refine the design,

1427

01:12:35.905 --> 01:12:38.765

but also understanding when would be valuable rather than it

1428

01:12:38.885 --> 01:12:40.365

becoming a constant position.

1429

01:12:40.365 --> 01:12:41.605

So what a mechanism would be,

1430

01:12:41.625 --> 01:12:45.205

and I think that does, does need further discussion

1431

01:12:45.205 --> 01:12:47.005

with the council in terms of what's seemed pragmatic,

1432

01:12:47.105 --> 01:12:51.725

but also a reasonable kind of, um, level of burden to both,

1433

01:12:51.725 --> 01:12:52.805

both parties as well.

1434

01:12:52.805 --> 01:12:53.805

Mm-Hmm.

1435

01:12:55.035 --> 01:12:56.275

I won't go back to you just 'cause I think

1436

01:12:56.275 --> 01:12:57.435

until you've probably seen it,

1437

01:12:57.615 --> 01:12:59.235

you can't really offer too many comments, but

1438

01:12:59.235 --> 01:13:03.565

unless you have no, nothing I can say at this stage, ma.

1439

01:13:03.675 --> 01:13:05.085

Fine. Mr. Gilda.

1440

01:13:06.655 --> 01:13:09.765

Thank you ma'am. Um, Ian Gilda for Save Honey Hill.

1441

01:13:10.185 --> 01:13:13.035

Um, it's a point I was going to raise later,

1442

01:13:13.035 --> 01:13:16.805

but if we're we're talking about state, the form

1443

01:13:16.925 --> 01:13:20.645

that the requirements take, um, clearly requirement three

1444
01:13:21.225 --> 01:13:24.365
in its latest form requires a commitment to CHP

1445
01:13:24.425 --> 01:13:27.085
or gas to grid when the phasing scheme

1446
01:13:27.145 --> 01:13:28.285
is submitted for approval.

1447
01:13:30.085 --> 01:13:32.825
And obviously requirement 21 deals

1448
01:13:32.825 --> 01:13:34.825
with the detailed carbon management plan,

1449
01:13:34.825 --> 01:13:37.265
which is effectively the operational, um,

1450
01:13:37.405 --> 01:13:40.105
carbon management regime, um,

1451
01:13:40.195 --> 01:13:41.745
which we've already talked about as

1452
01:13:41.745 --> 01:13:43.625
to whether it should be operational net zero

1453
01:13:43.685 --> 01:13:48.155
or operationally positive based on that.

1454
01:13:49.845 --> 01:13:50.945
The gap in this is

1455
01:13:50.945 --> 01:13:53.265
that there isn't a clear commitment in requirement three

1456
01:13:53.925 --> 01:13:56.625
to demonstrating, for example, in the phasing scheme

1457
01:13:56.655 --> 01:14:00.745

that the design to be built is either achieving the 70%

1458

01:14:00.745 --> 01:14:02.225

capital, carbon reduction

1459

01:14:02.565 --> 01:14:06.875

or whatever, um, target we should be setting

1460

01:14:07.255 --> 01:14:10.195

for them to reduce the capital carbon, um,

1461

01:14:10.575 --> 01:14:11.815

by the end, end of the process.

1462

01:14:12.555 --> 01:14:15.015

Um, I recognize that some of that is going

1463

01:14:15.015 --> 01:14:16.455

to come forward in this design code.

1464

01:14:16.455 --> 01:14:19.575

Of course, it's clearly not very satisfactory that we've yet

1465

01:14:19.575 --> 01:14:22.775

to see a design code in relation to this or other matters.

1466

01:14:23.315 --> 01:14:26.515

Um, but that, that's the fundamental point, madam,

1467

01:14:26.515 --> 01:14:28.435

that the requirements three, as it's

1468

01:14:29.985 --> 01:14:32.595

phrased at the moment only goes to the question

1469

01:14:32.595 --> 01:14:34.555

of the choice between the technologies.

1470

01:14:34.775 --> 01:14:37.875

It doesn't go to the question of achieving, um,

1471

01:14:38.795 --> 01:14:41.555

a demanding target, how we can set a demanding target

1472

01:14:41.735 --> 01:14:45.035

for capital cost reduction, capital carbon reductions.

1473

01:14:51.925 --> 01:14:52.925

I have got some questions

1474

01:14:52.925 --> 01:14:54.965

around this slightly later on, so I, I note your comments.

1475

01:14:55.025 --> 01:14:55.725

Mr. Gilda,

1476

01:15:00.285 --> 01:15:01.865

uh, have the applicant

1477

01:15:01.865 --> 01:15:03.865

and councils progressed, how might decommissioning

1478

01:15:03.865 --> 01:15:05.705

of the proposed development be addressed in terms

1479

01:15:05.705 --> 01:15:06.705

of carbon emissions?

1480

01:15:11.935 --> 01:15:14.535

I think we've responded in the, like

1481

01:15:14.535 --> 01:15:16.855

that there isn't an expectation, I don't know, I don't,

1482

01:15:16.895 --> 01:15:18.415

we've had this conversation a bit back and forth,

1483

01:15:18.415 --> 01:15:19.815

but, uh, there is an expectation

1484

01:15:19.815 --> 01:15:21.055

that it would be decommissioned.

1485

01:15:22.105 --> 01:15:25.455

There is, um, at the end of its current kind

1486

01:15:25.455 --> 01:15:28.855

of proposed life, it's the idea is that it would continue

1487

01:15:28.855 --> 01:15:30.465

to be upgraded

1488

01:15:30.525 --> 01:15:32.665

and maintained that its current proposition within

1489

01:15:33.565 --> 01:15:35.825

any reasonable timeframe out to 2090.

1490

01:15:36.125 --> 01:15:37.425

The idea being that the area

1491

01:15:38.345 --> 01:15:41.385

required within the London area would keep on maintaining

1492

01:15:41.385 --> 01:15:43.745

service to the population out to that farm.

1493

01:15:44.805 --> 01:15:48.385

So whilst there might be a reason to decommission it,

1494

01:15:48.385 --> 01:15:52.385

there's nothing foreseeable that would reduce the need for,

1495

01:15:53.325 --> 01:15:56.305

um, the way for treatment works

1496

01:15:58.055 --> 01:15:59.595

to serve the population that it is.

1497

01:16:04.065 --> 01:16:05.925

Did the councilors want to respond to that at all?

1498

01:16:07.775 --> 01:16:08.865

Adam? Lemme just check.

1499

01:16:17.285 --> 01:16:19.915

We're we're doing, we're trying to contact on online.

1500

01:16:20.455 --> 01:16:24.155

Not at the moment, but, but certainly, um, we, we are,

1501

01:16:25.785 --> 01:16:27.625

I can say we are in discussion about the issue.

1502

01:16:27.805 --> 01:16:29.025

Oh, there, she's,

1503

01:16:30.565 --> 01:16:31.565

Hi. Um, yeah, I

1504

01:16:31.565 --> 01:16:33.105

mean in terms of decommissioning, we've had lots

1505

01:16:33.105 --> 01:16:35.345

of conversations about how the carbon from that is counted.

1506

01:16:35.925 --> 01:16:38.665

Um, I think in the conversations we've had, it's been agreed

1507

01:16:38.665 --> 01:16:40.945

that, um, carbon associated

1508

01:16:40.945 --> 01:16:42.745

with decommissioning would be counted as part

1509

01:16:42.745 --> 01:16:43.985

of the redevelopment of the site

1510

01:16:43.985 --> 01:16:48.265

by whoever takes the site on for whatever it, it comes,

1511

01:16:48.265 --> 01:16:49.785

whether it's housing or whatever comes from

1512

01:16:49.785 --> 01:16:51.305

that site, uh, in the future.

1513

01:16:51.765 --> 01:16:53.185

Uh, and I think that's the position

1514

01:16:53.185 --> 01:16:56.105

that was taken from the beginning, um, of, of this process.

1515

01:16:57.625 --> 01:16:59.485

My question was on, uh, decommissioning

1516

01:16:59.485 --> 01:17:02.645

of the proposed development rather than the existing site.

1517

01:17:03.905 --> 01:17:07.045

Uh, apologies, uh, again, on that matter, um,

1518

01:17:07.395 --> 01:17:11.285

because of the long time scales, um, that the, uh,

1519

01:17:11.285 --> 01:17:13.765

development is due to run over, um,

1520

01:17:13.945 --> 01:17:16.125

and the uncertainty of sort of the carbon factors

1521

01:17:16.125 --> 01:17:18.445

that will be associated with, uh, materials

1522

01:17:18.445 --> 01:17:22.045

and decommissioning in the future, we were, um,

1523

01:17:22.335 --> 01:17:24.005

relatively happy with the position

1524

01:17:24.005 --> 01:17:26.765

that the decommissioning is very difficult

1525
01:17:26.765 --> 01:17:28.325
to count at this time and something

1526
01:17:28.325 --> 01:17:31.005
that potentially is addressed sort of further down the line,

1527
01:17:31.425 --> 01:17:34.245
uh, with the project in terms of, uh,

1528
01:17:34.275 --> 01:17:36.005
towards the end of its operational life.

1529
01:17:45.675 --> 01:17:46.365
Okay. Thank you.

1530
01:17:52.595 --> 01:17:54.345
Given that the, um,

1531
01:17:54.475 --> 01:17:57.585
greenhouse gas calculations have identified the emissions

1532
01:17:57.585 --> 01:17:59.545
from capital replacements, um,

1533
01:17:59.805 --> 01:18:02.265
the examining authority is unclear why these haven't been

1534
01:18:02.265 --> 01:18:04.025
factored into the whole life carbon assessment.

1535
01:18:04.675 --> 01:18:07.665
Could a a best estimate be offered in this regard?

1536
01:18:11.755 --> 01:18:13.055
Can I clarify that? Um,

1537
01:18:14.035 --> 01:18:16.195
I think they are included in the whole life

1538
01:18:16.215 --> 01:18:19.785

carbon Chapter 10. Is there anywhere

1539

01:18:20.565 --> 01:18:22.345

In the, the whole life carbon assessment?

1540

01:18:22.575 --> 01:18:23.575

Yeah,

1541

01:18:26.155 --> 01:18:28.655

So they are, I think is what we're saying.

1542

01:18:28.655 --> 01:18:30.575

If they're not presented, they might be, um,

1543

01:18:30.755 --> 01:18:31.815

if there's any specific table,

1544

01:18:31.815 --> 01:18:34.015

but all the graphics kind of show a step change where

1545

01:18:34.565 --> 01:18:38.655

significant replacements are required in each of the, um,

1546

01:18:39.405 --> 01:18:41.495

periods where there's significant capital replacement.

1547

01:18:41.895 --> 01:18:44.215

I think there's, we had a question previously

1548

01:18:44.215 --> 01:18:46.135

around why they weren't included in the operational

1549

01:18:46.815 --> 01:18:48.175

emissions, but that was because they don't

1550

01:18:48.175 --> 01:18:49.455

happen every year.

1551

01:18:49.845 --> 01:18:53.455

They happen at given periods when significant proportions

1552

01:18:53.455 --> 01:18:55.695

of assets reached their end of life and are replaced.

1553

01:18:56.515 --> 01:18:58.175

So that has been included. Okay.

1554

01:18:58.175 --> 01:18:59.895

Within the assessment and the whole life carbon assessment.

1555

01:19:00.955 --> 01:19:05.175

And, um, just moving on

1556

01:19:05.175 --> 01:19:09.295

to waste disposal, cre, county Council state within their,

1557

01:19:09.435 --> 01:19:10.575

um, relevant representation

1558

01:19:10.645 --> 01:19:13.015

that the carbon emissions from waste disposal should be

1559

01:19:13.015 --> 01:19:15.095

accounted for within the decommissioning process.

1560

01:19:15.955 --> 01:19:17.535

Can you, can the applicant confirm whether

1561

01:19:17.535 --> 01:19:18.575

this is accounted for?

1562

01:19:20.845 --> 01:19:23.185

Can I confirm that's referring to the decommissioning

1563

01:19:23.185 --> 01:19:24.705

of the proposed site?

1564

01:19:25.075 --> 01:19:26.065

Again, in terms of

1565

01:19:26.725 --> 01:19:31.055

for the existing site? Uh,

1566

01:19:31.055 --> 01:19:32.895

Can Cambridge account Council confirm please?

1567

01:19:34.425 --> 01:19:36.475

This was a statement within their relevant representation.

1568

01:19:39.435 --> 01:19:41.275

I think Ms. Wilkinson is able to answer.

1569

01:19:42.085 --> 01:19:44.715

Thank you. Sarah Wilkinson from Cambridge County Council.

1570

01:19:45.215 --> 01:19:49.795

Um, from memory, I think this did refer to the, uh,

1571

01:19:50.115 --> 01:19:52.875

eventual decommissioning of the proposed development.

1572

01:19:53.415 --> 01:19:53.635

Um,

1573

01:19:58.205 --> 01:20:00.585

yes, but yeah, I think it's, it's a minor point

1574

01:20:00.585 --> 01:20:03.585

because, um, I agree

1575

01:20:03.585 --> 01:20:06.265

that this is a long way in the happen.

1576

01:20:06.885 --> 01:20:09.125

It's, it's just for completion. Thank you.

1577

01:20:11.615 --> 01:20:12.915

So you wouldn't want that taken further?

1578

01:20:15.245 --> 01:20:17.305

Um, no, I'm happy with the response

1579
01:20:17.545 --> 01:20:18.945
previously provided on that one.

1580
01:20:24.675 --> 01:20:26.015
Uh, Mr. Gid, you had your hand up

1581
01:20:27.385 --> 01:20:29.815
Madam, um, Gilder for save honey hill.

1582
01:20:30.195 --> 01:20:33.935
Um, yeah, I, I think I concur with the applicant up

1583
01:20:33.935 --> 01:20:38.775
to a point that the plant plant upgrades unspecified

1584
01:20:39.435 --> 01:20:41.375
now appear as step changes in,

1585
01:20:41.755 --> 01:20:44.055
in those cumulative carbon emission grafts.

1586
01:20:44.055 --> 01:20:46.295
Take figure 4.4 as a as an example,

1587
01:20:47.145 --> 01:20:49.835
what is it completely unclear in this assessment?

1588
01:20:50.055 --> 01:20:53.555
And this goes back madam to one

1589
01:20:53.555 --> 01:20:55.915
of save honey hill's longstanding points as to

1590
01:20:55.915 --> 01:20:58.235
what is the future after phase two is built?

1591
01:20:59.105 --> 01:21:00.275
What are they assessing?

1592
01:21:00.335 --> 01:21:03.555

Are they assessing capital replacements of worn out plants?

1593

01:21:03.575 --> 01:21:06.995

Are they looking at further expansions on the existing site

1594

01:21:06.995 --> 01:21:08.475

to a much greater capacity?

1595

01:21:08.975 --> 01:21:11.035

Um, none of those are made clear in that,

1596

01:21:11.135 --> 01:21:12.315

um, carbon assessment.

1597

01:21:12.345 --> 01:21:15.995

There's just two lumps, two lumps in the graph.

1598

01:21:16.415 --> 01:21:20.245

Um, and clearly that makes quite a lot of difference,

1599

01:21:20.245 --> 01:21:23.285

presumably as to whether it's a capital cost,

1600

01:21:23.755 --> 01:21:25.525

capital replacement of plant

1601

01:21:25.545 --> 01:21:29.355

or whether it's potentially, if we look at some

1602

01:21:29.355 --> 01:21:31.475

of the figures, a doubling of the size of

1603

01:21:31.475 --> 01:21:34.075

that plant's capacity between now and 2090,

1604

01:21:38.155 --> 01:21:39.155

The par for the applicant.

1605

01:21:39.195 --> 01:21:42.895

Um, they are replacement, sorry, it covers up to phase two

1606

01:21:43.075 --> 01:21:44.375
and replacement for everything.

1607

01:21:44.375 --> 01:21:48.375
Theres, that is at phase two as a like for like replacement.

1608

01:21:48.675 --> 01:21:50.415
So that's what it's been done at moment.

1609

01:21:50.415 --> 01:21:51.655
Obviously some of this stuff happens

1610

01:21:51.655 --> 01:21:52.935
20, 30 years in the future.

1611

01:21:53.475 --> 01:21:55.655
We haven't assumed any grid decarbonization

1612

01:21:55.835 --> 01:21:56.975
for the carbon intensity of that

1613

01:21:57.195 --> 01:22:00.895
or any efficiency gain within the technology in that period

1614

01:22:00.925 --> 01:22:03.455
that may allow greater populations to be served.

1615

01:22:03.605 --> 01:22:06.695
It's taken a reasonable worst case of it is the wearing out

1616

01:22:06.695 --> 01:22:09.055
of kit, um, pumps.

1617

01:22:09.515 --> 01:22:12.175
Um, anything else that is gonna be on that, um,

1618

01:22:12.265 --> 01:22:15.735
based on typical asset standards and lives of equipment?

1619

01:22:19.345 --> 01:22:22.125

Yes. Thank you madam. I, I've, I've, I've got my answer,

1620

01:22:22.135 --> 01:22:25.445

which is that it is replacement plant, which is fine.

1621

01:22:25.655 --> 01:22:26.655

Thank you.

1622

01:22:29.995 --> 01:22:32.245

Just moving on to the whole life, uh,

1623

01:22:32.245 --> 01:22:34.925

carbon assessment contained within ES chapter 10, uh,

1624

01:22:35.165 --> 01:22:37.405

reference rep three, uh, 19.

1625

01:22:37.985 --> 01:22:39.565

So the scope, uh,

1626

01:22:39.565 --> 01:22:42.605

could the applicant share please table four dash 10

1627

01:22:42.985 --> 01:22:45.845

of ES chapter 10 on page, uh, bless you.

1628

01:22:45.845 --> 01:22:46.965

42 43.

1629

01:22:48.195 --> 01:22:52.725

This document was updated to, um, extend the time period

1630

01:22:53.025 --> 01:22:55.245

of the assessment on carbon emissions.

1631

01:22:59.045 --> 01:23:01.865

Can the applicant explain why the construction emissions

1632

01:23:01.865 --> 01:23:04.945

have been amended and increase for both the um, CHP and

1633

01:23:05.025 --> 01:23:07.565

and preferred DC0 options at deadline three?

1634

01:23:10.575 --> 01:23:12.995

Yes. Um, that was in response to, um,

1635

01:23:13.295 --> 01:23:16.595

an issue raised regard to the solar, um, assessment.

1636

01:23:17.375 --> 01:23:20.005

Um, there was an error there.

1637

01:23:20.005 --> 01:23:21.485

They largely doubled in emissions.

1638

01:23:21.485 --> 01:23:23.435

I believe that is the case.

1639

01:23:24.585 --> 01:23:27.835

It's page 42 43, table four dash eight.

1640

01:23:28.465 --> 01:23:31.855

Yeah. Yeah.

1641

01:23:31.955 --> 01:23:34.095

So that was how the solar had been assessed

1642

01:23:34.715 --> 01:23:37.255

at the early stage in the outlined carbon management plan

1643

01:23:37.285 --> 01:23:41.135

highlighted that there was an updated, um, capacity

1644

01:23:41.275 --> 01:23:43.335

and arrangement and that had been updated

1645

01:23:44.155 --> 01:23:46.295

as a raise in terms of the inconsistency

1646

01:23:46.295 --> 01:23:47.815

between the original ees chapter

1647

01:23:48.275 --> 01:23:50.215
and the outside carbon management plan,

1648

01:23:50.345 --> 01:23:51.935
which took a later position on the solar

1649

01:23:52.355 --> 01:23:55.295
and updating the solar assessment increased the capital

1650

01:23:55.295 --> 01:23:56.695
carbon emissions for both

1651

01:23:58.675 --> 01:23:59.675
At present. Solar's not

1652

01:23:59.675 --> 01:24:00.815
secured as a minimum?

1653

01:24:05.705 --> 01:24:07.445
No, it's not secured as a minimum.

1654

01:24:07.665 --> 01:24:09.285
It is part of the design

1655

01:24:09.345 --> 01:24:11.765
and the outline carbon management plan being something

1656

01:24:11.765 --> 01:24:13.685
that's live or carry on refining the

1657

01:24:13.685 --> 01:24:14.845
amount of solar that we're,

1658

01:24:23.145 --> 01:24:24.685
Uh, my next, if the applicant, uh,

1659

01:24:24.825 --> 01:24:28.485
the reason we've not secured, uh, zero, um, we don't have,

1660
01:24:28.485 --> 01:24:31.365
we don't have solar for the CHP option.

1661
01:24:32.105 --> 01:24:35.085
Um, so while we're still, um, making a decision

1662
01:24:35.085 --> 01:24:36.525
between caster grid

1663
01:24:36.525 --> 01:24:41.165
and CHP, um, there isn't a solar option, um, for the CHP,

1664
01:24:41.245 --> 01:24:42.765
'cause the CHP makes power.

1665
01:24:43.305 --> 01:24:45.885
Um, and therefore the, the, going back

1666
01:24:45.885 --> 01:24:48.325
to our previous discussion about grid capacity

1667
01:24:48.385 --> 01:24:51.485
and having seven megawatts of solar with nowhere for it

1668
01:24:51.485 --> 01:24:53.245
to go, we, we would have a, an issue

1669
01:24:53.245 --> 01:24:56.085
with whilst burning gas in the CHP producing power.

1670
01:24:57.205 --> 01:24:59.205
I, I take that point, I think I'm just trying

1671
01:24:59.205 --> 01:25:00.445
to understand how that affects

1672
01:25:00.505 --> 01:25:01.645
the table that we're seeing here.

1673
01:25:03.485 --> 01:25:05.105

So it's solar's not secured.

1674

01:25:05.125 --> 01:25:07.225

How is this affecting, you know, we should take

1675

01:25:07.225 --> 01:25:09.585

that effectively out the equation to a certain extent

1676

01:25:09.585 --> 01:25:11.345

because we can't rely on its provision.

1677

01:25:11.765 --> 01:25:15.665

How has that impacted on the whole life? Carbon emissions?

1678

01:25:17.355 --> 01:25:20.035

I think here, here is another example,

1679

01:25:20.035 --> 01:25:22.075

just taking the reasonable worst case where we've accounted

1680

01:25:22.075 --> 01:25:23.795

for the construction emissions

1681

01:25:23.795 --> 01:25:26.115

but not the operational emissions 'cause they're not secured

1682

01:25:26.355 --> 01:25:27.795

'cause it's part of what we would like to deliver.

1683

01:25:27.855 --> 01:25:30.395

So there is an increase in the construction emissions,

1684

01:25:30.395 --> 01:25:33.035

but not a decrease in the operational emissions,

1685

01:25:33.035 --> 01:25:34.755

which have all assumed grid power.

1686

01:25:34.775 --> 01:25:35.775

That's,

1687

01:25:38.725 --> 01:25:39.725

Thank you.

1688

01:25:44.155 --> 01:25:47.055

The summary at the beginning of ES chapter 10 suggests

1689

01:25:47.055 --> 01:25:49.055

that the whole life carbon assessment covers the carbon

1690

01:25:49.535 --> 01:25:52.015

emissions associated with decommissioning construction,

1691

01:25:52.245 --> 01:25:54.055

land use, change and operation.

1692

01:25:54.325 --> 01:25:57.775

However, at paragraph 4.6 0.1, this confirms

1693

01:25:57.775 --> 01:25:59.055

that the whole life assessment does not

1694

01:25:59.055 --> 01:26:00.135

include decommissioning.

1695

01:26:00.635 --> 01:26:02.415

So should the summary of ES chapter 10

1696

01:26:02.415 --> 01:26:04.640

therefore be updated, updated to be clearer in this regard?

1697

01:26:15.145 --> 01:26:17.635

I think that's, um, a typo

1698

01:26:17.725 --> 01:26:19.475

where we haven't included decommissioning in

1699

01:26:19.475 --> 01:26:21.235

that section there where there is assessed

1700

01:26:21.235 --> 01:26:23.835

as 13 tons of decommissioning.

1701

01:26:24.565 --> 01:26:26.625

Um, so it is included in the whole life carbon assessment.

1702

01:26:27.325 --> 01:26:29.865

Um, so I think that's an error that we can update.

1703

01:26:33.535 --> 01:26:36.065

Yeah, just to be clear there, that's the decommissioning,

1704

01:26:36.445 --> 01:26:37.825

not the demolition bit

1705

01:26:37.825 --> 01:26:39.745

of the separate element that was gonna say Yeah.

1706

01:26:40.925 --> 01:26:43.345

Of sorry, yeah, sorry. Of the existing site.

1707

01:26:43.415 --> 01:26:44.825

Yeah, not the, yeah. Yeah,

1708

01:26:45.105 --> 01:26:47.145

I think it's just a point of being extremely clear about

1709

01:26:47.335 --> 01:26:49.265

what and what isn't considered.

1710

01:26:52.775 --> 01:26:53.595

Yes, I think. Yeah.

1711

01:27:01.125 --> 01:27:03.875

Shall we, I think we'll take a opportunity there just

1712

01:27:03.875 --> 01:27:05.475

to break for 10 minutes just to give everybody,

1713

01:27:05.855 --> 01:27:07.475

um, quick comfort break.

1714

01:27:07.895 --> 01:27:12.105

Um, so I'll adjourn the hearing until quarter past five,

1715

01:27:12.975 --> 01:27:14.165

until quarter past five.