



Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Hearing Transcript

Project:	EN010128 – Cory Decarbonisation
Hearing:	Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2 (CAH2) – Part 4
Date:	11 February 2025

Please note: This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

00:00:06:20 - 00:00:17:09

Okay. It's, uh, five past, uh, 4:05. It's time for me to resume this, uh, this hearing. And, uh, if I can ask Mr., uh, Mr. Attorney to, uh,

00:00:17:27 - 00:00:37:12

We were going to suggest, if you were amenable to it, that we go on to the contiguous site point, because I think that's the one where, um, you'll benefit most from hearing from Doctor Edgar. Um, and then if we can spend some time on heat transfer, that sort of the good. But I think it's the contiguous site issue that is the most technically involved.

00:00:39:04 - 00:00:46:00

Okay. Thank you for that. Uh, just let me find the, um,

00:00:47:16 - 00:00:56:14

uh, I've got a few questions, but I'm very conscious that you got some points you want to make. So do make best use of time. Uh, if Mr. Edgar would like to make a point.

00:00:56:27 - 00:01:35:04

Uh, quick answer. Um, I think in terms of the contiguous site, um, the two is helpful to look at it in two parts. So in order to enable or allow a contiguous site, any operator would have to be satisfied of two things. The first of them is can you get the necessary process and electrical services from this part of the site to the other part of the site? So that's things like water pipes.

00:01:35:06 - 00:02:07:25

It's things like electricity in terms of the sort of more northern part of the site. It's um, flue gas ductwork. It's carbon dioxide. So we've obviously, from a landscape point of view, particularly concerned with the contiguous site argument as it affects, um, coming north and south of landfill. But I think you can see in other parts of the site, for instance, the Thames Water Access road, that from a services point of view, it is effectively non-contiguous in the sense you've got to cross a road.

00:02:08:13 - 00:02:49:07

Um, the technical challenges of taking, um, particularly water pipe and steam and electricity from one part of a site to another are easily surmountable. So before going on to the access, where I think that's more, um, nuanced, um, I think it might be helpful just to see what our position is in terms of the services and getting the services that would be required from north to south, particularly as regards that they are water, that they are low pressure steam, and that their electricity is that there is no technical challenge to achieving that.

00:02:52:03 - 00:03:06:27

I mean, just in terms of the principle of it, I mean, have you have you designed or have you advise clients on a sort of a side which is on. Effectively separated by another piece of land. And is it something you'd recommend for clients to do?

00:03:07:21 - 00:03:42:03

Not in an ideal world, no. I mean, it is clearly preferable to have everything in one single operational compound. Um, often that's not actually achievable, particularly on sites where you're supplying sort of heat or power to a neighbouring industrial facility. You sometimes get shared assets across the boundaries. But yeah, I mean, if you had coming back to this idea of a huge green field that you could design around, you are not going to put a barrier in the middle of that green field unnecessarily.

00:03:43:25 - 00:03:44:10

Thank you.

00:03:47:28 - 00:03:49:02

Sorry. Was there another point you want?

00:03:49:19 - 00:03:56:12

I'll go on to access, but it might be helpful if the applicant is allowed to give their view on the service as first.

00:04:00:26 - 00:04:34:26

To Nelson on behalf of the applicant then? Yes. Rooting sort of pipework cabling between one site and other is technically achievable, providing there is a suitable way lead through which that pipework and cabling can be routed. And that's, you know, a couple of options have been proposed by Lance, albeit, you know, to the rear of the existing building or across the yard in front, presumably as buried services in that instance rather than above ground. Um, it's it's not so much the, the ability to route service between the two side.

00:04:34:28 - 00:05:21:18

It's the second point that I believe is going to come on to in terms of the, the, the access requirements and under the issues around contiguous or non-contiguous, which are probably more of a more of a point of debate rather than the ability to route pipework between two sites. So if I understand your position, it's something that's that's feasible. And then in these circumstances may be feasible but not desirable in terms of your, uh, your objectives. If I can capture that correctly, the the requirement to have pipework between the two parts of the site isn't the primary concern we have of a non-contiguous site, but clearly you would have to we would have to provide that interconnection to, to enable, you know, the supply of the water power, your instrumentation, your signals, etc.,

00:05:21:20 - 00:05:30:11

between the two parts. Um, but that's not the primary reason why we believe a contiguous site is essential. Okay. Okay. Okay.

00:05:31:05 - 00:05:40:05

Uh. Quick answer. Um, so, as Mr. Alderson says there, I think that the more pertinent point of debate is.

00:05:42:12 - 00:05:56:29

The accessibility and the operability of having certain items of equipment located behind a different fence and gate from other items of your equipment. And

00:05:58:17 - 00:06:20:27

in response to your earlier question, sir. Um, there is no doubt that in an ideal world, it is more convenient to have everything, um, in one compound. I think the the question or that I would ask is how much of it is necessity and how much of it is convenience. So.

00:06:23:18 - 00:06:55:27

You shouldn't look at a contiguous site argument as a one size fits all. Um, for say, the the core carbon capture facilities, it would be certainly very undesirable to split them. But for some of the more ancillary plant items, um, heat transfer station, water tanks, even something like, say, an electrical Switchyard. There's less operational impact from having them separate.

00:06:56:08 - 00:07:32:18

So the heat transfer station will come on to later in terms of whether or not it's required. But the applicant has advised us that the heat transfer station is intended to be operated by a third party. Now, if that heat transfer station is to be operated by a third party, I would certainly say that there is no

barrier to having it in a separate compound, because that is indeed what the applicant has suggested to us that it should be segregated from the main facility.

00:07:33:13 - 00:08:06:05

Um, for something like, say, the the underwater storage tank that we earlier talked about. Um, for the tank itself, you're not going to have to go and access that very often. So the inconvenience of having to go through a secondary access is pretty limited, even if there is ancillary equipment there, such as pumps. Um, again, I would argue that there are numerous water pumps around the country that are not locked down every day.

00:08:06:21 - 00:08:47:28

Um, even if they were to be walked down once a shift, it would be once a shift where somebody has to walk down Norman Road a bit and enter a gate. So my challenge on the contiguous site is that whilst the applicant's position is that, um, it is not feasible and you couldn't possibly operate the facility with that non-contiguous site, I would argue that yes, it is slightly less convenient, but not significantly so, and it is entirely feasible to operate ancillary bits of equipment, um, behind a separate fence and gate from the main site.

00:08:49:07 - 00:08:59:25

Thank you. Okay. So what was the response? It's feasible. It may be less convenient. Um. But why? Why wouldn't you do that?

00:09:01:27 - 00:09:40:07

I think I think also, if I recall, one of the issues was you talked about was, um, you know, the convenience, the fact there isn't a footway on the east side of Norman Road, but I'd have thought that's eminently resolvable if that was the only barrier to, uh, improving connectivity between that and the other side. Certainly, Alison. On behalf of the applicant, if I pick up that that final point you raised there, sir, first, then the the east side of Norman Road as well as the ditch. So you couldn't put a foot there. So anyone having to leave the main site to access a separate southern site would have to cross Norman Road to the footway on the other side, then recross back to the site in order to access the remote site.

00:09:40:18 - 00:10:12:19

In terms of the more sort of general points, then yes, that inconvenience of operators needing to sort of leave site. Go through a separate entrance way to a normally unmanned site. Therefore presumably apparently locked gate except when access is required, having to lock it again behind them to prevent other access to that site when they are working on that site, or makes it inconvenient for the operation and maintenance of the facilities on that remote site. And the other element, you know, the provision of those locked gates, etc.,

00:10:13:06 - 00:10:48:22

you know, having a remote site not controlled through the main access, through the main security gate arrangement for the main site, you know, has a has a negative impact in terms of overall site security and the integrity of the facilities. But while we say the, you know, for example, the the sort of water tank etc., is, is a, you know, a minor part of the overall site and could be remote, you know, the the requirement for that facility is integral to the, to the operation of the facility. So it's as key as any other. So any interference in that facility would be, you know, completely detrimental to the to the safe operation of the site.

00:10:49:04 - 00:10:58:07

So from from an operational maintenance security aspect, having a non-contiguous site, we believe is is not an appropriate way to design the facility.

00:11:00:13 - 00:11:11:22

So I think just certainly for the applicant, I think would just be helpful to know why you couldn't have a security person at the site on on the southern site, if there was a separate site. Why not have a permanent security presence there?

00:11:13:22 - 00:11:24:01

Mr. Olsen, I think it's a reasonable question. Well, you'd have to employ another team of security personnel specifically for that. So there's obviously additional costs incurred to do that.

00:11:25:22 - 00:11:30:19

It's just cost rather than, uh, rather than any other problem.

00:11:33:17 - 00:11:59:18

Well, it's a balance of cost and security levels. And, you know, if you consider it would be like a justifiable cost to have additional personnel there because of the imposition of a non-contiguous site. Then that's not not an approach that we feel is is, you know, a viable solution to to the to the overall design and operation of the facility and maintaining its security.

00:11:59:28 - 00:12:19:21

So the attorney for landfill, the suggestion there is it would not be viable. Um, I just want to understand if that is the applicant's approach. It seems to be surprising in the context of £1 billion project. So the employment of another team of security staff, one person on the site, would mean that it was not viable as a project.

00:12:21:24 - 00:12:24:05

Again, Mr. Alton, if you want to answer.

00:12:25:24 - 00:12:30:09

Any question on behalf of the applicant, it's it's.

00:12:32:10 - 00:13:06:10

Looking at an approach that requires an imposition on the applicant of taking a, an approach to the operation and The security of the site, which is not best practice. From a number of perspectives. Your security being one of those. In addition to the operability and maintainability and the practicalities of operators accessing equipment within the overall compound and the. The design philosophy of Corey is always to have their facilities within a single contiguous site. And this would put you in a position to have to move away from from that design principle.

00:13:09:02 - 00:13:09:23

So I think

00:13:11:14 - 00:13:19:04

the question, um, Richard, I'm sorry, Richard, for the for answer. The the question is

00:13:20:22 - 00:13:54:29

do these reasons mean that it can't be done? We've got to accept that if you weren't constrained by the presence of third party land, you wouldn't do it. But you are constrained by third party land. So the question is, is the applicant saying the contiguous site cannot be done or that it is not preferred. And I think Mr. Alderson says convenience of operation, negative impact on site security. And then when challenged on negative impact on site security, he said that it's the cost of providing extra security.

00:13:55:01 - 00:14:01:12

That would be his concern. But. Well, fine.

00:14:03:09 - 00:14:19:10

Mr. Tate's going to going to, um, perhaps, uh, can I can I ask through you for Mr. Alderson whether that's a fair summary and whether he is saying that it cannot be done or whether he's saying it is a less attractive solution from Cary's perspective.

00:14:20:10 - 00:14:21:26

I think that's a reasonable question.

00:14:23:20 - 00:14:30:10

Tony Alderson, on behalf of the applicant, having a non-contiguous site would be unacceptable operationally.

00:14:30:29 - 00:14:34:05

And hang on. I think the question is, I suppose,

00:14:36:03 - 00:14:44:08

could it be done and then is Or is it undesirable? For the reasons that you've that you set out?

00:14:47:07 - 00:15:16:14

I think you're trying to say something is 100% impossible is not an engineering position. From an engineering perspective, everything is possible is whether it is a viable solution, and we don't consider it to be a viable solution. And I would also add that the whole question of a non-contiguous site only comes into play if the overall footprint of the carbon capture facility could be reduced to free up land, equivalent to the footprint of landfill. And we don't believe that is possible because the layer that we've developed said.

00:15:17:03 - 00:16:25:09

I don't want to drop that. So this is this is our time to have our objection. And just going back on other points is, is really can take more time. It was we know when the contiguous site arises. But I think from our perspective the applicant's position is that it is said that the issues are convenience for operation, and it's then said that it's an unacceptable. But we need to understand from our perspective unacceptable to who is it that it is so unsafe that it couldn't require that it couldn't obtain relevant consents? Is it that these things cannot be mitigated such that you could, um, have staff walking down Norman Road, for instance? Doctor Edgar will want to come in on this, but our position is that we completely agree the non-contiguous site is less desirable, but it may, subject to finding a few thousand square metres of extra space, be the difference between needing the landfill site and not needing the landfill site and the inflection point there.

00:16:25:13 - 00:16:32:07

I know, Mr. Alderson said. It's only if, but the inflection point there is a is a matter of a few thousand square meters.

00:16:33:03 - 00:16:44:12

So you stopped him. I'm sorry, Andrew, that you stopped him saying whether it does make a difference in needing the landfill site or not, which you've just then said is the point you're interested in. So I wonder whether.

00:16:46:04 - 00:17:13:24

It's a mistake. We've been told we need to finish very soon, and there's questions there about fairness here. I've made my point already, and you've rejected it about the ability to cross it. I mean, I said at the outset of the examination that we needed a day to examine this issue. We haven't been afforded a

day. This is a serious issue for my client. And, um, the risk on the applicant side is that instead of answering questions they're taking, they're simply taking up examination time, which we need.

00:17:15:28 - 00:17:41:08

Well, I think I think Mr. Tierney's question wasn't entirely answered, which is about, you know, is it feasible you gave the answer. You know, that I've heard for in engineering, nothing's nothing's impossible. Um, but I think the. Yeah. I think the point that, uh, that this attorney was, uh, was making is, you know, is it just a sort of, uh, you know.

00:17:41:10 - 00:17:41:25

Your.

00:17:41:27 - 00:18:02:02

Preference and to the undesirable. And I think I, I think actually just turning to Mr. Turning Point, I mean, again, uh, you know, that is a reasonable question. I did say that, you know, I would allow questions to myself to to. So, um, can you just sort of finish off that, that that answer, please? Mr. Olson.

00:18:03:04 - 00:18:12:16

Attorney Olson, on behalf of the applicant, we believe on balance and non-contiguous site isn't a viable solution for the development of the project, and that is our position.

00:18:12:26 - 00:18:13:21

But it's feasible.

00:18:14:21 - 00:18:23:28

It could technically be done, but as I said, you can do a lot of things technically, but that doesn't make them practical and viable solutions and viability.

00:18:24:00 - 00:18:26:07

Is that a financial viability or a.

00:18:26:12 - 00:18:36:00

Practical and operational having personnel required to to, to leave site and rejoin a separate site via log gate, you would have a negative impact on the operability of the facility.

00:18:37:11 - 00:18:50:18

Sorry, can I come in on this quick idea for for Lonzo? Um, I'm quite surprised to hear the level of technical concern there. I mean,

00:18:52:17 - 00:19:28:20

whilst a split site that this is somewhat unusual, there's a lot of facilities around the UK and wider which have more complicated process plants than we would necessarily suggest. Being on the other side of this fence that are, say, run with someone coming in day shift and being completely unmanned overnight. You can see biogas facilities. Um, there really is not a technical impediment to having a site that is unmanned and just checked on occasionally.

00:19:28:29 - 00:19:58:02

Um, it can undoubtedly be done and is done relatively often across the industrial world. Um, it for me, it very much is a case of convenience, and I strongly disagree that it isn't technically viable, or it is massively technically challenging to have a water tank and some pumps that are on a non-contiguous site.

00:20:00:11 - 00:20:04:14

Okay. Is the applicant or anything they want to do respond to that?

00:20:04:20 - 00:20:10:14

It's only Alderson on behalf of the applicant. Sir, I think I'd just be reiterating the point I've made previously, so I don't think I have anything else to add.

00:20:11:29 - 00:20:12:19

Mr. Turney?

00:20:12:25 - 00:20:55:05

Yeah. Richard Turney for the applicant. So, um, perhaps perhaps if we give an example. I know mistakes familiar with this, but, um, water pumping stations that are used by water companies, uh, are often provided as segregated facilities containing extensive pump houses, and they're not subject to 24 hour maintenance. And they'll be have maintenance visits and inspections maybe once every few weeks. And it's just the question that I would put to Mr. Alderson if I was allowed to was, was is he aware of such situations where pump houses are not permanently attended and where water tanks are not permanently attended?

00:20:57:06 - 00:20:59:24

A quick answer, Mr. Olsen. Sorry.

00:21:01:02 - 00:21:40:18

Tony Olsen, on behalf of the applicant. Then there are facilities which are not permanently, permanently manned as standalone facilities, but not integral to a larger facility which is manned. So it's a different type of facility with with different different requirements and different security operation, different security arrangements, different operational arrangements. In this instance, we're talking about part of an overall integrated site, which is covered by the overall sort of site security, the site integrity, the requirements to maintain the asset integrity, avoid the potential for for third party interference, you know, trespass, you know, deliberate malicious damage to the facilities, etc..

00:21:40:27 - 00:21:58:22

And this code is designed to maintain a robust integrated site, you know, to to provide that security as well as the operational provision to facilitate efficient access for operation and maintenance purposes, you know, throughout the entire facility and not impose a, you know, a constraint which which hampers those aspects of operation.

00:21:59:19 - 00:22:01:22

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Tierney.

00:22:05:00 - 00:22:16:18

So I just, um, I think the only remaining point on, um, contiguous site really is, um, to work out, first of all,

00:22:18:10 - 00:23:03:13

the applicant, when you ask about financial viability and, um, Mr. Olsen's a practical and operable. Um. He said earlier about the cost of site security. So I just wanted to understand, as the applicant's case, that provision of cybersecurity for that segregated site is a cost that it could not afford, in other words, would undermine the viability of the project. That's the first point. And, um, the second point in respect of, um, uh, is in respect to the heat transfer station, um, uh, Doctor Edgar's, uh, point, which is that the heat transfer station has been designed to be, uh, a separate facility run by third party.

00:23:04:10 - 00:23:09:17

If that's the case, then why does the concern arise in respect to the heat transfer station?

00:23:14:18 - 00:23:42:21

Attorney Ellison, on behalf of the applicant. So take the two points in sequentially. Firstly, additional security would be an unnecessary additional cost. We're not saying it's an unaffordable additional cost, but it would be unnecessary with a contiguous site. On the second point, the heat transfer station may be operated by a third party, but it may also be operated by Corey as part of the Corey facility. So maintain that flexibility to have it either independent or part of the Corey site is within the design provision at present.

00:23:42:28 - 00:23:53:21

I think so then if that's the case, then if it is operated as by third party, then is the position that it could be in a non-contiguous site.

00:23:55:19 - 00:23:58:04

Again? Mr.. Mr.. Olsen, if you can answer that.

00:23:58:16 - 00:24:22:12

On that specific point, I would agree. If it were to be operated by a third party, it could be non-contiguous to the Corey site because it would be accessed separately, as we've indicated in the indicated layout, with a separate access from from Norman Road. Yes, but we wish to maintain the flexibility to have it either third party operated or Corey operated, hence part of the contiguous site in terms of its specific location.

00:24:23:28 - 00:24:24:16

Thank you.

00:24:30:03 - 00:24:35:15

Mr. Tony, I think you also indicated. Was there another point on the, uh, heat transfer station?

00:24:36:10 - 00:24:37:03

So I.

00:24:37:05 - 00:24:39:02

Uh.

00:24:39:14 - 00:24:51:10

I need your guidance. Uh, the heat transfer station. There's quite a lot of points, but, um, how much time will you be able to afford us, um, in just working out how to deal with it.

00:24:51:16 - 00:24:59:00

I think, unfortunately, we're not going to have very much time left, because I have I do want to hear from, uh, from other other people.

00:24:59:08 - 00:25:03:16

Um, can I maybe five, five, just just.

00:25:04:00 - 00:25:04:15

Five minutes.

00:25:04:22 - 00:25:05:21

4 or 5 points.

00:25:06:00 - 00:25:07:00

But if if.

00:25:07:02 - 00:25:47:02

I could just if I could just say, I think just going back to the very start of this conversation, it was clear that there's some, some new evidence. So I was already expecting, uh, there to be some further, uh, further exchange in, in writing. And I think going back to your point, uh, that you've made it a couple of times, Mr. Attorney, about fairness. I mean, I do think given the position we are with the two parties in terms of the level of of evidence, I don't think it's going to be unfair to, uh, allow that, uh, further exchange where everyone's in, in possession of the information, especially myself, because I'm conscious that the two parties have seen this, but I but but but I haven't.

00:25:47:16 - 00:26:18:21

So, so on that note, I mean, I'm expecting that. So, um, you know, whilst in some respects it would have been helpful to have reached a conclusion, uh, or at least the conclusion in terms of the parties positions today. I mean, I don't think that was going to going to happen in any event. So, uh, let's say if you want to make the if you want to make those points, then I'll give the the applicant a chance to respond. And I think I think at that point I really will need to then uh, go on to other other agenda items. Mr. Bryant, you've got your hand up.

00:26:19:11 - 00:26:25:09

So just to say we won't make seek to make any points today. We can put ours in writing and that should hopefully save some time.

00:26:27:26 - 00:26:30:18

If there's five minutes at the end, Mr. Ryan, I will give you the opportunity.

00:26:31:14 - 00:26:34:00

So just have someone with their hand up on the screen.

00:26:35:24 - 00:26:39:15

Oh, sorry. Someone's got the hand up. Is it Mr. Wilson?

00:26:41:06 - 00:27:12:26

Yeah. Thank you, sir. David Wilson of Thames Water, just on the two year contiguous site point. I was going to make the point. We have a number of our largest sewage stream. Works are not on contiguous sites, although from a practical point of view, it'd be much easier. For example, just to the north of the river, the Beckton sewers, Dreamworks, our largest sewage. Dreamworks, the new large sewage treatment extension, is on the other side of a public highway, so the site is obviously operated by all the staff on the main part of the site, who just have to travel over as and when to the other part of the site. I mean, there's not two separate security teams.

00:27:12:28 - 00:27:25:00

It's all run by the one site operational team. We've got a number of examples and Rye Meads in north London. That's got a public highway going through the middle of it. So we have a number of examples where sites are not contiguous.

00:27:26:02 - 00:27:33:02

Okay. Thank you Susan. I think that's information that both both parties can can reflect on. Uh, Mr..

00:27:33:04 - 00:28:02:22

Chairman, um, Richard attorney for landfill. So, um, so the position on heat transfer, if I can summarize is this there are existing consents for Riverside one and two, both of which require in various forms, progress towards developing heat networks and the provision of heat transfer stations. Now, obviously, is the foundation of those networks. Now those heat transfer stations are to be provided within Riverside one and Riverside Two's uh, perimeters.

00:28:04:14 - 00:28:38:08

In discharging those conditions, the applicant, Corrie, prepared a report, uh, which was submitted to London Borough of Bexley in 2022 I think which is called the Fichtner Report. It's an appendix to our deadline for submission. That report assessed the, um, the viability of exporting heat from, uh, Riverside one and Riverside two, and, uh, the amount of heat that could be exported, the likely demand and the viability of a network.

00:28:39:01 - 00:29:13:07

It concluded that, um, Riverside one could export 28 megawatt, uh, megawatt, megawatt thermal, um, uh, and Riverside two 30 megawatt thermal. And it identified a demand which was less than, um, taking into account seasonality as well, less than what those two, uh, facilities could export. Um, the heat network identified was not found to be viable, but the government gave a grant of £12 million, which would alter the viability of that.

00:29:13:09 - 00:29:51:18

So total Available heat consumers that could be connected to Cory's land at Belvidere. Less than the heat that could be transferred from Riverside one and two. That's the position in 2021, in the applicants assessment. Now they're promoting a new heat transfer station as part of this development, and they have provided to the examination until last week. No evidence that the heat demand is different from that which was set out in the very detailed report in 2021.

00:29:54:00 - 00:30:24:20

And we say that evidence is that there is no case for the heat transfer station in compulsory purchase terms. Again, it may be you should grant development consent for it because it provides future flexibility, but there's no compelling case in the public interest. So that's the that's the position in terms of where we are. If heat demand could be connected through a transfer through through a heat network, could heat demand, could be met through a heat network.

00:30:25:01 - 00:30:59:02

Then, because of the existing consents, Riverside one. Riverside two would have to provide that. In other words, they will come first before any heat demand. Uh, any heat export from this site could come forward. There has now been further evidence in the past few weeks, um, from the applicant. Um, just to put this in context, Fichtner identified on behalf of the applicant 30MW of heat demand, um, in 2021.

00:30:59:22 - 00:31:33:21

The applicant's position now, which isn't supported by any technical evidence, is that there might be up to 900MW thermal of heat demand. Um, so, in other words, a 30 times increase in the heat demand that their own experts assessed. We say that's not credible and you don't have any evidence to support that. Secondly, they say that that heat demand could be served by new networks, which include, for example, the possibility of um, transferring heat via batteries, um, on the Thames.

00:31:34:20 - 00:32:06:05

There's no evidence that such a scheme is viable. It would obviously require further planning consents. Um, and similarly, there's no evidence that there is another viable network that can lead to this, um, heat from this site being exported viably to a network. The, um, the final point I think would make is that the applicant seems in its, um, assessment that it's provided most recently to have misunderstood what the possible output is.

00:32:07:02 - 00:32:37:09

Um, it's claimed that, um, the total heat output from Riverside one. Riverside two is 492MW. Thermal, which is inconsistent with Fitna. And we think that the mistake that they've made in their recent submission is that that is the total energy input into Riverside one and Riverside two, not the waste heat. So, in other words, all of the waste going in. So it would assume that it's 100% efficient.

00:32:37:15 - 00:32:56:12

Plus, uh, it only goes to waste heat as opposed to, uh, electricity and other outputs. So they seem to have significantly changed their numbers. They haven't produced evidence to support it. None of this is in the application documents, none of us at all about, um, where heat might go.

00:32:58:03 - 00:33:32:18

We accept that Aspirationally heat transfer is a good idea, but there is no evidence that it's likely to be implemented here. It will inevitably follow Riverside one and Riverside two, which can more than meet the identified heat demand in the area, and it would only then come forward after that if there was further heat demand that could be viably connected. And at this point, there is no evidence that that's the case. The final point I think, on this is, is about the doubling up and as Mr..

00:33:32:23 - 00:34:05:02

Sorry. As Doctor Edgar explains in his first report, the applicant's design at the moment includes a full cooling, 100% cooling that it might require, plus a heat transfer station. If heat transfer station is built. Less cooling will be required because some of the heat will go via the heat transfer station. It essentially consented both options for seeking to accept both options. If the heat transfer station is removed, 4000m² of space saving and that allows further

00:34:06:24 - 00:34:30:12

flexibility And just to note that obviously Doctor Edgar has included the heat transfer station alternative layout. So this is an important point which is additional. Or for example, if, um, Corey's right on six CO₂ tanks, then the difference in CO₂ tank storage area would be more than outweighed by the removal of the heat transfer station.

00:34:32:07 - 00:34:36:29

Okay. Thank you. The applicant I just want any of those points.

00:34:38:06 - 00:34:43:12

Um, I'm going to ask David Carter, who is Corey's managing director for heat, to respond.

00:34:45:17 - 00:35:23:25

Uh, David Carter to the applicant. Um. Thank you. I'll respond in turn to the points that have been made. So the first observation is that, uh, there is a requirement within the Riverside one and two planning permissions for heat transfer from those sites. Uh, and therefore, there can only be consent to heat transfer from, uh, the carbon capture facility to the extent that the heat is captured within the carbon capture facility. We agree with that. And the specification that's been created is based on heat from carbon capture. The second point is, uh, the submission that the demand does not exist such that any heat is required to be captured from the carbon capture facility.

00:35:24:11 - 00:35:57:17

The first observation is that the heat available from Riverside one and two will suffer a significant parasitic load once uh CCF is established, or circa one third coming on to demand. The final report from June 21st, which we supply, is the latest public document. Um, looked only at ten kilometres immediately around the site, which is the planning requirement that it was submitted to fulfil.

Significant further work has been done to look at heat transfer beyond that boundary, as well as within that boundary.

00:35:57:22 - 00:36:27:29

And within the boundary works also should increase. Um, not only is the heat demand within London. Well documented via the London Heat map via other policy documents that have been produced both nationally in terms of advanced zone, which I'll come back to in a moment, but also by the GLA. There is enormous heat demand within central London, vastly in excess of what is shown in the final report. There is no conflict with the report in that. It's just, um, it's sort of they they serve different, different points.

00:36:28:18 - 00:37:02:11

Um, Corey has been actively pursuing heat export. We currently have MoUs, uh, either signed or under negotiation with Ultimate Heat network distributors who are bringing forward networks and based on their own forecasts, have in the aggregate, over 900MW of demand, which which is the figure that we've supplied. We only supplied that figure in the recent weeks, because we've only been challenged on the level of heat demand in in recent weeks, and we would have happily shared it earlier if it was, um, if it was requested, uh, in terms of the level of heat available on the site.

00:37:02:16 - 00:37:36:07

Um, I appreciate it. Significantly larger than was previously looked at. The final report considered a conventional turbine blades, as we indicated, not just in our most recent sort of responses, but actually a little bit earlier. We've been looking at advanced heat recovery techniques, including excess heat and the flue stack, but also recovery of heat by replacing the air cooled condenser with, um, either heat pumps or mechanical vapor compression, which does indeed allow a very much greater level of heat recovery that's been validated by, um, several layers of independent technical assessment.

00:37:36:22 - 00:38:13:23

Um, there is a typo for which I apologize. It shouldn't be 490, it should be 390. But that is still a very significant figure. The one third parasitic load, uh, would reduce that 390 to circa 260. Um, we've indicated from the start that we believe there's at least 100MW of additional heat capacity within the site, which would take us back to 360 emerging technical work. In fact, um, leads us to believe that we could significantly exceed that, it could be up to 300MW recoverable, again using heat pump or more advanced heat recovery techniques, which would take us to between 360 and 560.

00:38:14:04 - 00:38:44:04

We therefore have active commercial negotiation with counterparties for demand, as I say, up to 900 plus megawatts. We have supply, which can make a very significant contribution to to addressing that. There's been been a submission that it's not technically feasible to get the heat to the locations where that demand exists, that we'd submit. Incorrect. So we've looked, as has been referenced at moving heat via thermal stores located on barges.

00:38:44:08 - 00:39:06:28

That's been a project in the public domain, uh, with reference from the PLA and numerous other stakeholders. For about a year now, with a pilot that was examined looking at supply and strategic undertaking in the City of Westminster, which had been done in cooperation with the City of Westminster. That's a heat network that used to take waste heat from Battersea Power Station. As further large heat networks have come forward in central London,

00:39:08:24 - 00:39:43:15

including some sponsored by central government, for instance. They have also engaged with us on that as a heat supply technique that has been evaluated on an end to end basis and has reached the level of technical maturity required to be granted a subsidy under the successor to the Heat Network Investment Programme, which will receive support for in respect of the local heat network that was

previously referred to. The second transmission approach, which is also entirely technically viable and demonstrated to be such by the fact it's been done elsewhere, is long range heat transmission pipelines.

00:39:44:15 - 00:40:03:27

If one looks, for instance, at Copenhagen, there are heat transmission pipelines twice the length that will be required to transmit transmit heat along the central London corridor and with a significantly lower linear heat density. I would also note that the GLA published a report in December of last year in which they identified that

00:40:05:18 - 00:40:10:12

a pathway to the decarbonisation of London's heat being a key policy goal

00:40:12:02 - 00:40:49:16

of promoting the approach of the use of strategic heat sources, including, for example, Corrie and strategic heat mains of the source of length and carrying capacity that I have just described. Therefore, it's not only demonstrated to be technically feasible on the basis it has been done elsewhere, but to be supported by policy, including that recent GLA report. Various points have been made as to the financial viability of such networks. I would highlight that as far as utilities, the key sort of moment of stress in establishing a heat network is sort of critical mass, and that's why it's subsidies that exist and that have been referenced in the documents do exist.

00:40:50:04 - 00:41:20:26

Um, as scale is achieved, um, those, those barriers begin to fall away and the level of demand that's under discussion easily surpasses the barriers required to achieve that. Um, in terms of that sort of central London heat network point, I would highlight not only is the level of heat demand there, but this is supported, uh, very strongly by government policy. So the Energy Act 2023 has significant provisions, um, which were designed to promote the Climate Change Committee goal of 20% of the UK's heat being supplied by heat networks.

00:41:21:08 - 00:41:31:24

I think I have to say to interrupt, but again, I think we're going into just detail as oppose. Uh, that doesn't really touch on this scheme. The Energy Act targets and so on.

00:41:32:14 - 00:41:33:16

I just agree that.

00:41:34:15 - 00:41:35:00

That's.

00:41:35:02 - 00:41:35:24

Actually for London.

00:41:35:26 - 00:41:41:27

But I think I think this is correct. I think you've you've answered you've addressed the point 70.

00:41:42:26 - 00:41:51:19

I was only going to say that the credibility of that is what is being tested by the questioning of there being heat networks of the relevant scale under discussion in central London.

00:41:51:21 - 00:41:52:08

We.

00:41:52:14 - 00:41:54:27

Specifically envisaged and they are being advanced.

00:41:55:12 - 00:42:06:09

So I think I think we've made clear so far that we understand that it's beneficial. The question is a viable and deliverable scheme. Bring Doctor Green in one moment, but.

00:42:06:26 - 00:42:38:10

I'm afraid I know we are going to have to call this to all this to a to to a close. I, I, I, I think a lot of what Mr. Khan said. I think we've already heard some of that in, in, in your response to, uh, to to Mr. Turney. Um, and I think, Mr. Turner, you've also made your point, which is it's about the, the demand and and whether there's something viable, uh, in the in the time scale of the, uh, the application.

00:42:38:12 - 00:42:49:08

So, uh, I think I have, I think I have heard that because it's going to be unfair to other other attendees here if I don't call a closed list. Uh, as I've already mentioned, there is opportunity to.

00:42:49:20 - 00:42:54:22

Uh, continue to make representations in, uh, in, in writing. Um.

00:42:55:06 - 00:43:06:26

Um. Uh, Richard, attorney for, uh, Lancelot Munster. Um, I don't think we've had the chance to have a full hearing on our objection. We're entitled to a full hearing. Um, well.

00:43:07:15 - 00:43:41:10

If you if you want to, uh, make representations in respect of, uh, I think what I'd like is something very precise in terms of, uh, if you think you need to hear other things orally. Um, what I must say is a lot of the discussion this afternoon has actually gone over stuff which you've already raised and the applicant's already raised. Now, I appreciate that I said I wasn't prepared to allow you to cross-examine the, uh, the opposite party. I have given you plenty of opportunities to ask questions. Cross questions. Um, so I think, by all means, if you can make that request to me and I'll consider it.

00:43:41:18 - 00:44:11:24

Um, but what I'm not prepared to do is to spend a very long time going over things which have already been explained in writing, because this is a written process, and I'm not in any way trying to stop you represent your clients or to be fair to your clients. But what I don't want to do is to spend more hearing time going over things which have already been explored through the exchange of written, written questions. So I understand on that basis, Mr. Tierney, as I say, I'll consider a I'll consider a request.

00:44:11:26 - 00:44:16:01

But I'd like you to be very clear why it's needed and what questions you need to ask.

00:44:16:15 - 00:44:26:07

Yes, sir. Well, I think I perfectly understand this is primarily a written process, but not so in respect of affected persons for compulsory acquisition who are entitled to a hearing.

00:44:26:12 - 00:44:56:18

You are entitled to it to a hearing. But, Mr. Tierney, um, in some respects I think I've been quite generous in the way because I could have just said, well, Mr. Tierney, say your piece, and then I'll ask the the applicant to hear it. So, as I've already explained. Yes. If that's what you want to want to do, by all means do that. Be very clear in your representation to me what you want, what you want to ask and how long you'll need to need to do it. Now, as I said, we've finished this item now.

00:44:57:02 - 00:45:03:00

Mr.. Mr.. McPhee, if you'd like to make any points on behalf of his client.

00:45:05:07 - 00:45:08:19

Sorry, Mrs. Norris, could we have a microphone, please?

00:45:26:29 - 00:45:30:13

Hi, my name is James McFeely. I represent Mr. Gannon and.

00:45:30:15 - 00:45:35:08

Also Creekside Developments, Kent. I own the site on the other side of land.

00:45:35:17 - 00:45:37:01

So is that creekside?

00:45:37:12 - 00:45:38:03

Creekside? Yes.

00:45:38:09 - 00:45:38:24

Thank you.

00:45:42:02 - 00:45:42:29

So please carry.

00:45:43:01 - 00:46:27:24

On. Yeah. So I know we haven't got much time, so I'll just go very briefly. Um, a point that Nancy mentioned earlier. Um, so Mr. Gannon is a recycling company, um, originally based over in East London and was compulsory acquired. Um, moved to Charlton, um, around the Charlton Riverside area, and in 2010 saw the opportunity to expand his business out towards Belvedere. Um, post-purchase um, there was a disagreement over the way leave agreements, access in the site, and unfortunately, the applicant put a hold on the whole of development for seven acres of land between 2011 and 2019, which is what stopped landfill occupying.

00:46:27:26 - 00:46:49:17

So operating their site correctly with proper water and services, which is the point that was raised earlier. We have found, um, we've tried to engage in this process and coming back to section two earlier, um, where you asked about the progress with the other parties. We have been willing to engage.

00:46:51:11 - 00:46:56:29

But to say there's been slow progress is, um, is more than fair.

00:46:58:14 - 00:47:03:27

All we've wished to do is there was a rent review on two of the sites, and since January 2024,

00:47:05:15 - 00:47:11:18

we've asked to agree the review. And it wasn't until yesterday do we actually get.

00:47:13:24 - 00:47:15:21

The terms of agreement in place.

00:47:17:07 - 00:47:31:05

Whilst the applicant has put forward a proposal back in September, we did make it clear then as well that we need to agree the review in order to ensure it has an impact upon the value of the sites.

00:47:33:00 - 00:48:03:10

Looking around Belvedere when they originally acquired the site, um in 2010, Belvedere was an area that we saw had, um, some land availability that the inner London areas did not. Since then you have seen the introduction of areas like Charlton Riverside, which has further restricted the available land. Since 2015, we've seen the development of Belvedere with the likes of Amazon, um, Lidl, um, Seagrove acquired a lot of sites at this point in time.

00:48:03:12 - 00:48:41:05

There is no available land for other occupiers of similar sites. 1 to 2 acres to relocate. It's not feasible for land sale Munster to relocate to another two acre site locally because there are none available. So coming on to the design principle, um, there's been raised by Lancelot Munster. I think it's very interesting that the applicant has not considered alternative ways of laying out the site, because if it is feasible to reduce the amount of land take, that would be a huge help to a recycling business like Mr.

00:48:41:07 - 00:49:13:17

Gannon and his associated businesses. Recycled metal supplies. So if there is an opportunity for the applicant to reconsider their design, to take into account that perhaps they don't quite. Yes, it would be nice to have. But I think, you know, quoting Mr. Tierney earlier, there doesn't seem to be an actual compelling case that they cannot redesign the scheme in a way that doesn't take all the land for other occupiers.

00:49:14:22 - 00:49:48:19

As I say, it comes back to. There is no available science for either lens or monster. Uh, Mr. Gannon, Creekside developments got planning for their site for their own occupation, and they've had to their subsidiary business, Elm Scaffolding, have had to lease sites in order to occupy the area. Fundamentally, in 2019, when eventually the way leave agreement was granted, it was granted on the basis that the Capricorn would lease the site to aid them with Riverside One.

00:49:49:15 - 00:50:23:13

This was supposed to be a short term arrangement to enable the development of that. So coming on to the timing, my question to the applicant is bear in mind the lease was 2019 and you did not approach my client until the summer of 2023. When did the idea of carbon capture on our site? On my client's two sites start to be considered, and why did it take you so long to come forward to discuss it? With my client's bearing, both.

00:50:23:25 - 00:50:26:21

Both clients are actually your landlords.

00:50:29:09 - 00:50:49:09

I mean, in terms of that history, I think, um, Mr. McFeely, I'm more interested in, you know, what the position is, uh, what the position is now. But obviously, yes. One of the questions I did ask the applicant at the start was around why they didn't seem to have been engagement over. Over some time. So what would the applicant like to say?

00:50:50:23 - 00:50:52:18

Mr. Stuart Cooper from ardent.

00:50:54:29 - 00:50:55:14

Thank you.

00:50:55:18 - 00:51:23:11

Stuart Cooper from ardent. Um, I would dispute what's, um, just been said, to be frank. So, um, in terms of engagement, the representatives for Creekside and Mr. Gannon were actually some of the earliest people that we engaged with on the project. I'm not able to answer specifically what date that. Um.

00:51:23:24 - 00:51:38:08

I mean, it's obviously I can appreciate that. Obviously there's some, some concerns about that, but but in, in terms of, uh, you know, the engagement. So where where are we now? On, on, on the, on this site.

00:51:38:18 - 00:52:00:28

So and frankly if they would like to meet to discuss their terms they've been given this week. I would be delighted to find the time. In both cases, both parties have been clear they do not wish to discuss it at this time. They've been offered and in some cases given undertakings to do so. So if they want to negotiate the heads of terms, then we're delighted.

00:52:02:23 - 00:52:11:02

We have been willing to negotiate. We just need to agree. One point that was outstanding, which materially affects value. We haven't been able to arrange that for over a year.

00:52:11:04 - 00:52:15:17

Some of that's relevant and I would entirely dispute that as well. Well, rather.

00:52:15:19 - 00:52:16:18

Than having an argument,

00:52:18:17 - 00:52:35:05

it sounds it sounds like you're very close to putting aside the history and your frustrations. I mean, is this something that you think is resolved or sorry, is your position that you're objecting to it? Just just so I understand what what your position is.

00:52:35:10 - 00:53:07:16

The position is that the preference is not for the site to be sold. So would object to the development because they believe that the site could be looked at once more. Design could be looked at once more, so it wouldn't impact them in the way that Lens or Munster have shown. Um, and then the other point on funding is, um, given there is no availability of land in the area, um, and they've set aside around 60 million for the for the acquisition. We do wonder if actually there is the funding available for what the potential costs are given.

00:53:07:27 - 00:53:14:28

What's the value of when there is no land available? That's another point. Um,

00:53:16:21 - 00:53:23:10

I mean, I know we're under the pressure. So I think from my point of view that's probably, you know, there's probably some other points, but that's the main points we wanted to make.

00:53:24:22 - 00:53:36:22

Thank you. Obviously, um, I would encourage both parties to continue, uh, the negotiations discussing that if they want. Um, the applicant, do you have any final comments on.

00:53:38:24 - 00:53:41:14

No, I don't think so. I think we said enough this morning.

00:53:42:22 - 00:53:43:13

Okay. Thank you.

00:53:45:10 - 00:54:20:08

I'm very conscious. We're getting. We're running out of time. Mr. Bryant, I think I did indicate that I'd try and give you five minutes, but, uh, I think seeing as you're not representing an infected person, I think it'd be more appropriate if you could put the comments in, uh, comments in writing for the forthcoming deadline, which is deadline, uh, deadline for, um. Again, I think if there are any other requests to speak. Unfortunately there isn't. There isn't going to be time to do that, uh, today. Uh, if anybody had any points they wanted to make about compulsory acquisition, uh, or temporary possession, again, there will be an opportunity to put those in writing for deadline.

00:54:20:16 - 00:54:33:07

Uh, for deadline. Uh, the deadline for, um, in terms of any other matters, I just very quickly see if there are any other, any other matters that we need to need to discuss. Mr. Fox, about that.

00:54:33:12 - 00:54:48:24

I just have one, um, a question that came this morning about does the government government cover all the costs, even if it's, as I explained, it comes afterwards. The answer to that is no, it doesn't. And we can explain that in in more fully in writing. But just to confirm that.

00:54:49:13 - 00:55:00:12

I think if we can, if that can be something we can capture in writing. Um, now the final matter was to review any, uh, any actions arising. I did ask the applicant whether you could keep keep a log of those.

00:55:01:01 - 00:55:35:04

So I've got a list of what one project does the project cost include heat? We'll do that in writing, but yes, it does. Um, funding position about the return. This is a miss attorney question. Um, uh, we we can deal with that in writing in so far as that hasn't already been dealt with. That's one be um, uh, Mr. Fox has just dealt with, uh, question about getting all the investment back. And then thirdly, I've got down, um, quarry management track record in relation to, um, nature reserves and the like.

00:55:35:06 - 00:55:37:26

And again, we'll come back to you in writing on that. That's amazing.

00:55:38:02 - 00:55:40:21

So those are all actions for for yourselves.

00:55:40:27 - 00:55:43:08

They're all actions for ourselves, Mr. Fox.

00:55:43:10 - 00:56:04:21

Sorry, sir. Yeah, sorry. I think I think so those were points. I think we said we'd come. We'd we would, um, come back to and explain if we were going to do in writing. But we have got the list that my colleague has been keeping in the background, which has been sent to me if I just read them all out. So I think it was the explanation on the compelling case for the access road on Thames Waters points.

00:56:06:10 - 00:56:38:02

Um, action point two, as Mr. Tate just explained, the note on um, um, applicant's management of the expanded Cross National Nature Reserve. Third point was, um, the response to the Blake Cluff report.

Um, the fourth was, um, the, um I don't want to relitigate the substance, but if obviously we don't accept this, but if it was accepted that co-location, um, was acceptable.

00:56:38:16 - 00:56:45:22

Um, on top of the water treatment plant, the discussion point that we had on that. Um, yes.

00:56:45:24 - 00:56:50:19

I think I think Mr. Tate said that would be something you'd go away and respond to in writing.

00:56:51:02 - 00:57:26:00

Yeah, exactly. Um, yeah. So these are all for D4. I should have said sorry. Action point five was, um, as I mentioned, after Mr. Pratt spoken on this point, just a note explaining our approach to buffer zones. Um, and then the final, uh, 2.6, um, just, um, building on what Mr. Carter had talked about in terms of, um, heat demand, um, including the, um, submitting the GLA 2024 report that he mentioned. Um, and then, yes, the last point is an explanation of the relationship with government funding.

00:57:26:19 - 00:57:27:16

So that was seven.

00:57:28:18 - 00:57:49:25

Um, so sorry. Sorry can and this may not be something that you did agree, but I was just wondering. Uh. Sorry, Edgar. So, um, are you going to provide us, um, further information in terms of the impracticality or difficulties of connecting at 11 kV at the Riverside one, Riverside two so that we can have a look at that?

00:57:50:23 - 00:58:08:27

I think it's, um, we were told by Mr. Cross that there'd been a detailed study. Um, so, um, he said from our detailed review, it's impractical. And that's the detailed review we don't have. So I think Mr. Fox said that, um, when we spoke outside, that you could provide that next deadline.

00:58:10:02 - 00:58:13:20

I think I thought what I meant by that was the response to the report and all the issues.

00:58:13:25 - 00:58:14:10

Made.

00:58:14:23 - 00:58:15:11

In response to.

00:58:15:29 - 00:58:33:27

No, no, that's that's not what I'm asking for. We're asking as Doctor Edgar says, we're asking for the detailed review that has been carried out of connection, uh, into Riverside one. Riverside two, which underpins Mr. Cross and Mr. Rothery is evidence that that's not practical.

00:58:37:25 - 00:58:41:05

And I think we can make submissions on that.

00:58:43:02 - 00:58:58:23

It's not a submission. It's. We were told today that there'd been a detailed review of the ability to connect. At 11 kV within Riverside one and Riverside two. We will need to see that as soon as possible, but certainly by the next deadline.

00:59:03:09 - 00:59:04:19

Yeah. Yeah. Yep. Yeah. Okay.

00:59:06:21 - 00:59:12:18

Yeah. Mr. cross. I'm just. I'm just trying to find my my notes on that particular, uh, point.

00:59:14:09 - 00:59:16:11

Um.

00:59:22:15 - 01:00:03:26

Yeah. I mean, just just because I think you did say it provides some more information on that, didn't you? Sandy cross on behalf of Corey. Yes. We've produced a detailed review. The intention is that that would be. Well, that's been written up. It can be submitted at the next deadline, which includes photos, extracts from the 3D models that might appear to show why we believe it's impractical. Thank you. Thank you. Um, and again, uh, you know, I would encourage, uh, the applicants to continue to exchange information and to help sort of narrow down, uh, issue issues, even if, uh, perhaps they're still seems to be, uh, you know, quite, uh, quite, quite big, uh, matches between between the parties.

01:00:03:28 - 01:00:19:00

So, uh, I'd encourage both, uh, both both parties to continue to do so, uh, and exchange information. Um, it sounds like you already have in terms of the report that was, uh, that was discussed earlier. So that that will be helpful to help narrow down the issues.

01:00:20:02 - 01:00:34:22

That may not seem like we are engaging quite, uh, fruitfully. Um, and we do repeat the offer that we made to give assistance to in relocation for land, sell and gather. That offer remains on the table as well.

01:00:35:19 - 01:00:36:19

Thank you.

01:00:36:21 - 01:00:43:01

So, would you like me to send these to the case officer? I beg your pardon? Would you like me to send that list to the case officer to help?

01:00:43:12 - 01:01:16:23

Yes. That would be very, very helpful. Thank you, Mr. Fox. So in that case, I think that's, uh, that's that's covered everything. Um, so thank you very much to, uh, Mrs. Norris and Mr. Hurley from the from the case team. Mr. Hurley's been, uh, dealing with our online, uh, participants and also to the to the AV company. Thank you to everybody for their contributions today. Um, I'll just reiterate that if there are points that, uh, they wanted to make, there is the opportunity to make those, uh, those in writing.

01:01:16:27 - 01:01:20:24

And the compulsory acquisition hearing is now closed. Thank you very much.