

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Project 11-26-25 05:22 pm

Created on: 2025-11-26 17:22:32

Project Length: 00:55:39

Account Holder: [REDACTED]

File Name: GNRS_NOV26_ISH1_PT2.mp4

File Length: 00:55:39

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:07:16 - 00:00:08:01

Okay,

00:00:09:26 - 00:00:15:20

I think it's time to resume everybody. I'll just give them a minute to sit down.

00:00:20:20 - 00:00:52:08

Thank you. Okay, so the time is 4:08, and it's time for this hearing to resume. So I'm now going to move on, uh, to discuss the role and status of Ng plus. So moving on to Ng plus developments. We understand that these refer to environmental and socio economic enhancement works that are being offered as part of the Community Benefit Scheme. They would proceed only if the development proceeds, subject to any required planning permission being secured.

00:00:52:28 - 00:01:28:15

Their implementation is anticipated to take place post consent and reconstruction of the proposed development. However, these measures are being referred to as a community benefit and are listed as such. At paragraph 306 of the intrinsics of the planning statement, which is reference AWP 317. Noting that they would not be secured as part of the application, the examining authority would like to be clear about the applicant's position in relation to whether they can be afforded any material weight in decision making.

00:01:28:19 - 00:01:32:12

So I could just invite the applicant to comment on that, please. Thank you.

00:01:34:07 - 00:02:08:04

Thank you sir. Peter Nesbitt for the applicant. Um, I would just confirm that the analysis you gave at the beginning there was, was correct. Um, we are not they are not part of or any part of the DCO proposals. They do not feature in the works packages. Um, they're not in the description of development in the environmental statement. They are entirely separate and offered as a community benefit. Now there is an obvious linkage in that they don't proceed if the development doesn't proceed.

00:02:08:11 - 00:02:21:01

Um, which is something that we as an applicant have been, um, open about with members of the public. But your analysis is entirely correct.

00:02:22:28 - 00:02:23:19

Thank you.

00:02:29:11 - 00:02:50:22

Just going to come back on that particular point, Mr. Nesbitt. So is it really correct to, um, list the N+, um, elements as a community benefit against the development if they're not, um, formally attached to the application?

00:02:53:12 - 00:03:02:05

Peter Nesbitt for the applicant. Um, Madam. Is that is that again a reference to the the way in which it's framed in the planning statement?

00:03:02:07 - 00:03:05:27

Yeah. It's referred to as a community benefit in the planning statement.

00:03:06:23 - 00:03:38:25

Thank you. Um, I think on that basis, if there's if there's any lack of clarity there, um, that statement was intended to mean a community benefit. Um, as a completely independent aspect not associated with the scheme. Um, I think, um, to the extent that needs any further clarification, we're entirely open to, um, to making that clarification. But but that's certainly the intention that it it should not form. It should not form, um, any part of this scheme.

00:03:43:01 - 00:04:12:26

Okay. Thank you. I mean, I think the point is we're trying to understand, um, when it comes to, um, uh, the decision making process, that and the recommendation that we will make to the Secretary of State. It's whether or not the applicant is intending that any material weight can be attached to Ng plus. Plus, as part of the overall balancing of, of of um, uh, the different elements of the proposed development.

00:04:15:02 - 00:04:41:28

Peter Nesbitt for the applicant. Um, no, madam. The intention is that they're in an entirely separate offer. Um, as a community benefit offer in response to the government's expectations in relation to community benefits. We're not asking you to attach any weight to them. Um, and, um, they form no part of the, of the DCA proposals, and they're not secured by the DCO. So I don't think we could ask you to do that either.

00:04:44:08 - 00:04:59:00

Okay. I think in terms of any actions arising out of this particular point, I think we would like to ask the applicant to review how they've referred to Ng plus in the planning statement. So that we've got that that clarification please.

00:05:00:14 - 00:05:05:09

Peter Nesbitt for the applicant. Absolutely. We're more than happy to do that. And we can provide a note.

00:05:08:06 - 00:05:12:09

Um, I don't have any comments in the room. Yes, Mr. Northcote.

00:05:14:01 - 00:05:15:13

Um, thank you sir.

00:05:15:18 - 00:05:51:01

Obviously, we went over this point as a procedural matter. Um, I would draw attention to the fact there's actually three, um, elements that fall under this heading. There's the N+ proposals. There's the pre-existing flood alleviation proposals that have been referred to within documents as well, together with the proposals of the e.g. education and the E.g. Academy proposals. All of these were integral and referred to in documents produced throughout the consultation process by the applicant.

00:05:51:13 - 00:06:31:24

So we're back to the element I raised this morning on procedural matter. You know, if those are not part of this proposal, why have they been in all the documents and the consultation and documentation being put out? And that is misleading. On the issue, sir, of of what weight you should attach to it. We would certainly reiterate that it would be unlawful to give any weight to any of those matters on the basis of the Supreme Court case of R v Resilient Energy Seven Day Limited and Forest District Council 2017, which is cited in paragraph 25 of our relevant representation, which is RR hyphen 101, sir.

00:06:37:15 - 00:06:40:10

Thank you. Um, with the applicant. Like to come back on that, please?

00:06:42:11 - 00:07:08:08

Peter Nesbitt for the applicant. Um, only to say that, um, those matters that have been presented as community benefits. Um, we do not ask you to attach weight to us. There are other benefits within the application that are that are comprised within it and set out clearly, which we will ask you to attach weight to, to. To the extent that division needs to be made any clearer, we can we can address that in the note that we've discussed. Okay.

00:07:09:18 - 00:07:13:14

Thank you. Are there any further comments on this?

00:07:15:02 - 00:07:26:26

Okay. I don't see any hands up. Virtually. So in that case, I will now hand over to Doctor Brewer for agenda item 3.2, which concerns climate and sustainability. Thank you.

00:07:27:24 - 00:07:28:09

All right.

00:07:28:11 - 00:07:30:18

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Hobbins.

00:07:30:20 - 00:07:31:08

Um.

00:07:31:28 - 00:08:03:07

So I'm sure we'd be pleased to hear that this is, I think, the last agenda item we'll deal with today. Um, um, and so I'm going to ask 1 or 2 questions about, um, the applicant's greenhouse gas assessment. And, um, I did hear and take some note of what Mr. Williams said earlier about, um, trying to talk about numbers in the hearing. Um, but I will use some numbers and we'll see. We'll see how it, um, see how it goes. Okay. Um, in fact, I'll start.

00:08:03:09 - 00:08:38:15

In fact, that's a good place to start, actually. Um, relevant 164, which I think is, um, forgive me, I get this one. Norwell solar farm steering group. That's that's who you represent, isn't it? Paul Williams, rural solar farm steering group. Thank you. Just just make sure I got the right organization. Um, and in that, I just quote a bit from that, um, under public benefit where it says. However, at this stage, it is already apparent that the applicant has again overstated the greenhouse gas emission savings that would be brought about if this project is allowed.

00:08:38:17 - 00:09:11:21

And it goes on to say, I think in conclusion, it will actually add to global warming by a significant amount. Um, so that's, uh, not the only relevant bit that's questioned some of this, but but it just I think it's sort of it's very succinct and it's very, very concise. So if I turn to the applicant, um, so on the aspect of savings and I'm not going to, I'm not going to try and go through the whole greenhouse gas assessment. I'm sure I'd be happy to hear that. Um, on the aspect of savings compared with other forms of power supply.

00:09:12:15 - 00:09:43:05

Um, could the applicant briefly, briefly explain their analysis of avoided emissions as presented in tables 15.7 and 15.8 of App 058, which is your, um, I think it's chapter 15 of the, um, the climate change chapter. Chapter 15 of Your escape 058 is the, uh, examination library reference.

00:09:45:06 - 00:09:53:29

And obviously, I'll just I'll address my question to Mr. Nesbit. But obviously, if you want to bring in somebody to answer that question, that's fine.

00:09:54:13 - 00:10:00:01

Uh, Peter Nesbit for the applicant. I think just to make that simple. That person is Mr. Phillips.

00:10:00:06 - 00:10:00:23

Excellent.

00:10:00:25 - 00:10:01:26

Okay. To my right.

00:10:01:28 - 00:10:03:27

Right. Good. Thank you. Sir. Thank you.

00:10:05:21 - 00:10:06:06

Thank you.

00:10:06:09 - 00:10:46:06

Paul Phillips for the applicant. Um, yes. Well, I've prepared some notes, uh, to describe this point in response to your agenda. So, um, I'll, I'll run through those. And, uh, if those don't answer the questions, perhaps we can pick those up afterwards. Um, so talk about carbon emission savings, uh, which is described in section 15.2 .1.2 of environmental statement, chapter 15. Uh, the applicant engaged with the Department for Energy Security and net zero in June 2024 and was advised to use the marginal long run carbon intensity for generation, including the projections of this for future years.

00:10:46:28 - 00:11:22:14

This is as published for use in the uh hmm Treasury Green Book appraisal process. This shows almost negligible emissions from, uh, from around 2035. For example, the long run marginal carbon intensity of generated electricity in 2035 is predicted to be just 12% of the 2025 value, showing how much it drops off over the next decade. This is because it assumes substantial implementation of renewable energy and other low carbon generation. It only shows grid averages, which are not split by baseload or peak times.

00:11:24:02 - 00:12:02:09

Our assessment assumes the development solar will displace electricity from the grid with emissions at a future projected grid carbon intensity, which decreases over time. This approach is consistent with the Stone Street Solar Revised approach, which they were requested to use during the their examination in April 2025, and differs from previous solar dsos which use present day or construction year carbon intensity from combined cycle gas turbine electricity generation, for which the carbon intensity is much higher to calculate their savings.

00:12:03:09 - 00:12:18:18

So the calculation emission savings from uh, from the export of the generation export of electricity from solar are approximately 0.7 million tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent. That's in table 15.8.

00:12:20:22 - 00:12:26:21

Table I think it's 50. Let me just check. 15.7.

00:12:28:22 - 00:13:00:08

Uh, presents the findings from alternative solar calculation assumptions that we made as a comparator. So the methods I've just described involve an element of circular argument in that the future projected grid carbon intensity can only be realized if substantial solar generation, such as the development, is implemented. If renewable and low carbon electricity generation projects were not granted consent, the future carbon intensity of the grid would be higher than its projected.

00:13:01:14 - 00:13:16:12

Section 15.4.1 of Environmental Statement. Chapter 15 provides alternative calculations for the development that used the grid average carbon intensity from 2024, which is a more factual report based on data rather than a future projection

00:13:17:29 - 00:13:57:06

that provides a carbon intensity, which is substantially more conservative than assuming a saving relative to combined cycle gas turbine electricity generation emissions, as have until recently been used by other solar DCO applications. Um, using these alternative assumptions shows greater savings than if future projected carbon intensity is assumed to be saved. The alternative calculated emission savings from solar relative to the grid average emissions would be approximately 6.5 million tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent.

00:13:57:25 - 00:14:02:27

As shown in environmental statement. Table 15.7.

00:14:08:21 - 00:14:42:07

Also shown in those tables are savings related to the export of electricity from the battery. So for context, the demand for electricity from the grid is not uniform, but has peaks in the morning and early evening. Generation of electricity which feeds the grid does not have the same peaks. Solar electricity generation typically peaks towards the middle of the day. Wind generated electricity peaks whenever there's good wind speed are the locations of the wind farms. Nuclear generated electricity cannot be quickly varied and provides a near constant base load.

00:14:42:19 - 00:15:14:17

As a result, there are times, generally during the peak demand periods when there is insufficient electricity from these sources and topping up is required. Generally, at present, this is delivered by gas fired power stations as they can. These can respond very quickly to changes in demand unless and until carbon capture and storage technology is developed and implemented across the gas fired power station sector, and there is no clear timescale for this at present. The low carbon alternative is to store electricity in batteries and export that at peak times for the development.

00:15:14:19 - 00:15:50:03

The assessment assumes that the batteries will displace electricity generated by gas combustion. In other words, the topping up of the grid supply at peak times continues to be met by gas fired electricity generation. This assumption has been made because for future years, there is an absence of data about the sources of electricity supplying peak periods. All existing gas fired electricity generation plant is not carbon capture ready and carbon capture plants are not yet built, so calculated emission savings from batteries are approximately 3.2 million tonnes of CO₂ equivalent.

00:15:50:21 - 00:15:57:25

As shown in table 15.8 and also 15.7. The same numbers have been used.

00:16:00:13 - 00:16:05:25

I wasn't going to discuss particularly the contributions from land use change, which are much smaller in comparison.

00:16:05:27 - 00:16:06:19

I think that's fine.

00:16:06:21 - 00:16:08:23

Okay. What you what you've provided, though.

00:16:08:25 - 00:16:09:25

Is a good starting.

00:16:09:27 - 00:16:47:10

Point for me to sort of carry on for. So thank you. Thank you for that. So but just to recap, if I can, if I can just put mine in sort of summary. That's what I thought you were going to say, which I think is, um, reasonably seems reasonably reliable. So using your, um, scenario, your worst case, I think you called it where the grid decarbonise is substantially over the next. What we're talking five, five years, ten years. Um, the benefit, if you like, of solar PV is is is tends to drop a lot because because basically the grid is highly decarbonised and it's operating at times when the grid will be highly decarbonised because it will be using renewable sources.

00:16:47:19 - 00:17:12:00

Whereas by contrast, if you like, um, the batteries are just a bit further from the batteries. Wasn't the best. Yeah. Um, essentially stays the same because your assumption is that it will always displace, um, combined cycle gas turbine, um, peak shaving generation. That's your premise, isn't it? Really? Is that is that fair summary.

00:17:12:28 - 00:17:27:24

For the applicant? Um, yes, it's a fair summary. Probably worth noting that, uh, at some point in the future, the, um, the peak time, uh, supply of generation may be provided by other sources.

00:17:27:26 - 00:17:58:22

Maybe I'll take you there. Um, yes. I'm going to take you to the future a little bit. So we'll we'll we'll, um, just forgive me for interrupting, but, um. Yes, of the questions that follow up will start to explore that. So yeah, yeah, I'll give you a chance to talk about that as we go through. Okay. So um, now I'm going to put some numbers on. Numbers on it might just, just, just so I think you mentioned some numbers. Um, if I've got these right. So the, the saving from the batteries is 3.2 million and I've round it to 3.2 million rather than 3,246,690.

00:17:58:24 - 00:18:20:15

And these are so yeah. Yeah. Tons of CO2 equivalent. Yeah. Um, to give an overall forecast saving of 0.8 million tons and it's 789,000 over the project lifetime. Is that that's that's basically I'm just reading those figures off of your, um, uh, tables. Yeah. Okay. Um, and you mentioned the point that, um,

00:18:22:06 - 00:18:24:28

there are, um.

00:18:27:09 - 00:19:00:12

There's no data available. I think this is a quote and no data available to predict the rate at which the peak supply will be decarbonised. I think that's the words in the report. Um, so you've basically used the carbon intensity of, um, combined cycle gas turbines. I've written a number down to help me, 365g of CO2 equivalent per kilowatt hour for the whole life of the project. That's that's all collected. I'm just my understanding. Yeah. Um, so what does this. Okay. So what does that mean, then, in EIA terms, can you just sort of, um.

00:19:01:05 - 00:19:10:20

Okay. Let me. Okay. I think I'll answer my own question. So you describe that as significant. I think in the conclusion of the, of the chapter, this, this benefit is that is that.

00:19:11:28 - 00:19:17:17

Uh, Paul Phillips, the applicant. Yes. That's correct. In accordance with the aim of guidance that's identified a significant effect.

00:19:17:19 - 00:19:31:08

Yeah. Um, so positive. This might seem like a similar argument to the energy plus argument I'm going to come to next. Um, so how is that secured in the DCO or how do you intend to secure that benefit?

00:19:38:16 - 00:20:16:09

That's secured through the I mean, we've taken a worst case assessment based on the maximum parameters. So it's the, uh, the securing of the maximum parameters in the concept design Parameters and Principles document, um, sets out the, the, uh, the basis that we've used for assessing the embodied carbon emissions. Uh, the savings obviously are not in our control because they are, uh, a result of the electricity that the Great North Road development would displace or compared against in the baseline scenario.

00:20:18:13 - 00:20:27:01

Can I just sort of play that back to you? Just as I understood it, you started it started to start with you was saying we'll secure. And then by the time you finished, you sounded like it.

00:20:28:17 - 00:20:30:05

Um, so.

00:20:32:06 - 00:20:34:12

okay, let me ask my next question then. I mean,

00:20:36:07 - 00:20:51:05

so would the applicant accept such a requirement for example? You know, that said the bachelors only export when they're displacing alternative generation above say, 350. Would you accept that as a requirement?

00:20:53:27 - 00:21:13:16

Uh, Paul Phillips for the applicant, I might defer to planning colleagues on this on the basis that I'm not sure that's, um, uh, what's the right word? But I don't think it's possible to prove what electricity is

displaced because it's not like it's not the case that one thing switched off for another thing to be switched on.

00:21:14:10 - 00:21:16:00

So that sounds like a no to me.

00:21:17:07 - 00:21:17:28

I'm.

00:21:20:04 - 00:21:56:27

Peter Nesbitt for the applicant. Um, I your question is, would we secure the GHG benefits. I do not think directly. Um, as a, as a sort of minimum requirement. Um, or anything like that. I think the project has been designed to operate in a particular way at a particular capacity to meet the grid connection. Um, how it then and what's presented in the chapter is an assessment of, of that design effectively.

00:21:57:09 - 00:22:16:19

Yeah. Okay. I won't labour at this point, but I hear what you say. Um, so presumably sitting behind information around the operation of the best, um, and other things we've touched on. Um, all the assumptions, all the details that you've been sitting behind that have. Has any of that or has that been independently checked or verified?

00:22:22:19 - 00:22:23:06

The.

00:22:25:09 - 00:22:45:04

Yes, in a sense, because the, sources we've used for, um, embodied carbon emissions come from a range, a range of well respected, uh, peer reviewed sources. So, uh, peer review involves independent verification. So in that sense, yes.

00:22:46:02 - 00:22:53:22

So all your all your workings, if you like, all your detailed assumptions have been scrutinized by people outside of your organization.

00:22:57:13 - 00:23:09:01

We haven't requested a third party to scrutinize our, uh, we've got a wide range of skills within the team. We haven't requested a third party review. Okay.

00:23:09:14 - 00:23:11:03

Okay. Um,

00:23:12:26 - 00:23:47:08

so so just moving on then. So we, I think we call it the first point there. Um, within the, within the lifespan of the project, as you've noted. Um, and I'm going to use the word other dispatchable sources, um, are likely to become available to meet peak demand, as detailed in the Government's Clean Power 2030 Action Plan. For example, I think he mentioned carbon capture storage, um, enabled or

operational power stations. Um, I don't know if you mentioned hydrogen powered power stations or biomass or pumped storage, but they're obviously on the list of possibilities and future scenarios.

00:23:47:10 - 00:23:58:04

Yeah. Um, in addition, though, doesn't that document also outline demand side changes that would smooth the so-called T time peak?

00:24:03:04 - 00:24:12:20

Um, in terms of incentives to charge it? Sorry. Paul Phillips, the applicant, in terms of incentives to charge at night and electric vehicle charging at night and so on.

00:24:12:25 - 00:24:43:10

Well, I'm really I'm really getting to this point of saying, um, or about this almost where we are now, isn't it, in the next couple of hours, if you like, where the where the commercial demand carries on, but the residential demand starts to pick up. Pick up. There has been a well-established peak demand during those number of hours, and your position essentially is during those peak periods under the current sort of operating grid operation regime, the batteries would be displacing, um, gas turbines.

00:24:43:18 - 00:25:07:17

Um, but in the future scenario, the the power, the power, the 2030 Clean Power Plan talks about demand side things that will happen, forecast to happen. Assumptions that the government are making that will certainly start to happen during the lifetime of the project. So have you looked at those and addressed those considered those in any way?

00:25:10:02 - 00:25:14:09

Paul Phillips applicant uh, no. Not specifically.

00:25:20:04 - 00:25:25:20

Um, so so going back to the numbers then, I'm just going to take you out to the numbers. Um.

00:25:28:05 - 00:25:43:23

So if the applicant lost, I'm going to say 25% of the best benefit. Wouldn't the whole life benefit disappear? So I'm just doing a 0.8 over 3.2 just for the just for the calculation. Is that is that reasonable comment?

00:25:45:27 - 00:25:48:15

Yes. That's how the numbers are at the moment.

00:25:51:15 - 00:25:56:29

So that will then change your conclusion in terms of the EIA assessment using the guidance.

00:25:59:03 - 00:25:59:23

Yes that's correct.

00:26:00:02 - 00:26:01:18

And so what would that become.

00:26:04:21 - 00:26:10:17

Uh it would be um, I'd have to go back and look at the, uh, the criteria and so on.

00:26:10:20 - 00:26:16:05

Okay. I'm not I'm not going to test them. Yeah, yeah. Are you in the guidelines? Um.

00:26:18:17 - 00:26:51:00

Right. Let me just move on then. So just touching on, um. Relevant rep. 163 I don't I don't think that here this is, um, parish councils understanding is I'll quote you from 163. Okay. Just this is relevant bit 163. The parish council is understanding Norma Parish Council. I think this is sorry. Um, government figures is that at the time of writing, there are already 52 gigawatt hours of best projects that have been approved or under construction. The government's 2035 best target is 28.7GW hours.

00:26:51:25 - 00:27:07:18

Um, now, I'm not going to ask you to comment on that, whether it's whether you agree with it or recognise it, but as a matter of general principle, I think, um, wouldn't that mean that the applicant's best would, in effect be competing with others? Hence the full cost savings may not be realized.

00:27:09:28 - 00:27:11:03

Also, for the applicant,

00:27:12:28 - 00:27:31:00

as of 2023, something like I can't remember the exact figures. So over 40% of electricity generation was from fossil fuel sources. So we're a long way off getting to a point where at peak times there would be a zero carbon or low carbon supply.

00:27:32:05 - 00:27:35:03

Okay, okay, I'll move on. I think, um.

00:27:37:19 - 00:27:44:14

As the applicant undertaken any sensitivity testing to put forward a reasonable worst case, best export scenario.

00:27:48:25 - 00:27:54:20

Uh, Paul Phillips, the applicant know clearly the numbers are there in the tables.

00:27:55:08 - 00:27:56:14

Okay. Okay.

00:27:58:00 - 00:28:23:25

Um, I'll turn to my colleagues if anybody wants to ask me. Um, so I think it's time for me to open it up to the floor just to, um, invite comments from interested parties who wish to comment on this. Um, just a matter of protocol. If you if you've got a question for the applicant, can you can you address your question and comment to myself and then I will prefer it as I think appropriate.

00:28:27:27 - 00:28:39:00

I think Mr. Williams has his hand up. Yes. Paul Williams, Laurel Solar Farm steering group. Um, might just preface my comments by saying we hadn't.

00:28:39:02 - 00:28:40:02

Really intended.

00:28:40:04 - 00:29:21:24

To speak about this because we felt the evidence is best presented in writing, as I said before. Having said that, with with yourselves highlighting greenhouse gases generation, all these issues has been quite important at the is one we thought it's important one IP turned up to talk about it. So I'm just going to briefly might be able to help you on some of these issues that you've discussed with Mr. Phillips and I perhaps should say, having had the benefit of reading other NCP applications around the country Trait and their attitude towards lifecycle analysis.

00:29:22:12 - 00:29:58:02

Some credit must be given to the applicant. But now, having made two brave attempts at it, the first one was horrendously out of sync with reality. And that's that's the point of attestation consultation. And they've changed their position. So fair dues. Unfortunately, the calculations are still riddled with errors. Some of them mathematical, some of them logical. So it will come as no surprise to the essay that our figures are slightly different to theirs.

00:29:58:15 - 00:30:35:29

And Mr. Phillips and I do discuss this when we meet in a very amicable way. Um, on the point of the potential condition that the 354 figure use as a DCO requirement, I just don't think that's achievable either. Um, firstly, because if we're talking at 2028, that figure would already be out of date already by then. There doesn't appear to be a real time method of measuring that on a national basis. Um, so I have some sympathy for that, but I don't have sympathy with the adoption of the 354 figure for the next 40 years.

00:30:36:16 - 00:30:45:02

Um, as you will be aware, Mr. Justice Sullivan at, uh, in Rochdale, uh, the Planning Inspectorate of all said, does not support a.

00:30:45:08 - 00:30:45:27

Point of detail.

00:30:45:29 - 00:31:17:08

Your three, five, four figure was that when I was saying 365, it's just it's just the real. It's just it's just me being a little bit, um, picky over the number. So is it three? Yeah, it could be three, six, five would be the carbon intensity of gas. Uh, two, as I know, as actually, quite rightly, these things will change. But in terms of an accepted kind of industry or generation, figure three, six, five I think is what the applicant has used. I think in there, just a minor point, but I just don't want to get confusion in the future about anything.

00:31:17:10 - 00:31:53:22

So valid point. I mean, I actually wrote three, five, four down when someone else said it in the room about 20 quarter an hour ago. I put that up. I don't think I said it, but somebody else might have. Yes. Anyway, sorry to interrupt. No problem. Uh, in terms of the best capacity. You made the valid point about the pipeline. Um, according to the renewable energy planning database by the government, the current best capacity, current and planned as of July 2025 is 100 gigawatt hours.

00:31:55:08 - 00:32:27:19

Uh, that's more than 260% for the 2030 target and 240% for the 2035 target. So you make a valid point in terms of there's going to be a lot of BS around. Um, I've looked at what's in scoping, and the last figure I got was 351 gigawatt hours of best in scoping at the moment. It is massive. And of course, in this area we already have consented 940 megawatt hours just in the air and stove, stove, Thorpe area.

00:32:29:13 - 00:33:09:04

Um, I'll let you read with joy our written submissions. Um, but perhaps at this stage we have tried to adopt, um, something you asked Mr. Phillips about future case scenarios, not believing that the 365 figure, um, should remain for 40 years. Ten years past net zero. Uh, so we've created a scenario which is more pessimistic than the Green Book. Uh, and then we've also used the Department of Energy Security and net zero projections for the next 40 years and modifying them to reflect peak carbon intensity gas.

00:33:10:00 - 00:33:11:29

Um, we've also

00:33:13:17 - 00:33:21:05

just coming on to production emissions later while we're doing that now. We're not going to go much further, I think. Right. That goes then what?

00:33:21:07 - 00:33:21:28

What I'll let.

00:33:22:00 - 00:33:24:03

You finish and I'll give other people a chance to, to.

00:33:24:05 - 00:33:24:22

Contribute.

00:33:25:07 - 00:33:39:01

Um, and then I'll give the applicant a chance to respond to what you've said, and then I'll kind of give you my proposal for how we take this forward. Right. Just to give you sort of a navigation. Yeah. Right. So headline news, um,

00:33:40:18 - 00:33:52:13

using the applicants, we would say highly unlikely scenario with pegged intensity. The overall project would be responsible for 1,000,099.

00:33:54:18 - 00:34:33:27

Thousand. So 1,009,961. Oh, I think that's why we don't talk figures in these here. Oh, no. 1099611 tonnes of carbon. Um, more than it would save. In our scenario that goes up to 2.24 million and then it's 2.7 billion. Using the Department of Energy Security in net zero doesn't mean it's not renewable. Um, we also mentioned earlier on we looked at what would the picture be like with the best gone and the panels going straight to grid.

00:34:34:10 - 00:34:58:24

And that was the that was the least worst of the three scenarios. Um, at one point, the net increase of 1.5 million tonnes of CO2. We couldn't find any solution where there was a net saving of CO2, and we're in scope of millions of tons. I'm not going to rub it on anymore. No, that's that's that's helpful. Thank you. I thought you would have something to.

00:34:58:26 - 00:34:59:11

Say on.

00:34:59:13 - 00:35:13:18

This. So that's given you a chance to, you know. Thank you. Um, before I ask the applicant to respond to any of that, I just want to give anybody else a chance to Contribute to this under this, um, item, and I'm scanning the room.

00:35:17:00 - 00:35:18:06

Go ahead. Yes, please. Thank you.

00:35:18:21 - 00:35:19:15

Simon Betts.

00:35:19:17 - 00:35:20:02

Newark and.

00:35:20:04 - 00:36:26:04

District council, sir. I will divert from diving into, uh, calculations. I just wanted to make a wider point. If I, if I may, a sort of more high level point that reflects our relevant representations around this general issue. I suppose if you split it down in basic terms between the construction and operational stages, we've got a much of the benefit operational stage, some impacts construction stage, and then an overall net benefit in simple terms, in terms of carbon carbon savings, I suppose what we're seeking to try and push the applicant to do is commit to some of the benefits that might be, um, delivered as part of the construction phase, because obviously the ES chapter follows a worst case scenario assessment of equipment coming from China being shipped across from afar, being produced by a, you know, fossil fuel powered, um, you know, power stations, etc..

00:36:26:06 - 00:36:59:06

I think what we're just seeking to try and, uh, see if we can pull forward is some of those benefits that perhaps the applicant can commit to in terms of local manufacturing and whether that can I think from, from some of the, some of the sort of responses I've seen so far, they have referred to the fact

that they can't commit to this, and it's a detailed design matter, but I think we're looking to see if we can draw some of those points forward, particularly where there's local economic benefits that might result for for either our district or the region.

00:36:59:08 - 00:37:02:25

So those are the sort of overarching points I just wanted to make. Thank you.

00:37:04:24 - 00:37:05:27

Thank thank you very much for that.

00:37:06:03 - 00:37:07:10

Anybody else in.

00:37:07:12 - 00:37:09:02

The room would like to?

00:37:10:26 - 00:37:35:03

Online. I don't think we've got anybody online. Um, okay. Um, I'm still scanning. I can't see anything. Um, I think I'd, um. Could I ask the applicant to respond to the council's point first, and then the, uh, Mr. Williams's points second, if that's possible.

00:37:37:11 - 00:38:13:16

Thank you, sir. Peter Nesbitt for the applicant. Um, in terms of the the benefits, um, that were mentioned there, there wasn't a, um, a list or or, um, they weren't specified, but in terms of, um, sourcing construction locally, um, there's, um, it's difficult to, um, secure those benefits in a DCO, Um, in terms of agreeing in advance precisely how you're going to construct a scheme and where you're going to source, um, resources from.

00:38:13:24 - 00:38:37:17

Um, so that, that that isn't proposed as a requirement. There is, um, at um, requirement 17, a skills supply chain and employment plan that needs to be submitted. Um, which will, which will capture certain benefits. Um, but but if it's locking in a particular supplier for a technology or something like that, that's not going to be something that we're able to do.

00:38:38:18 - 00:38:50:09

Okay. I think I understand your position on that. That's clear enough. Um, do you want to go on and say something in response to Mr. Williams? Um, or, you know, the assessment and so on and so forth and the.

00:38:50:27 - 00:38:55:00

Yes. Um, Matthew Sharp, on behalf of the applicant.

00:38:55:05 - 00:39:30:15

Um, so I just wanted to come back on the point that sort of alluding to, um, the need for bears. Um, and particularly in the context or need of a battery to use your, uh, sort of terms. Um, it's been alluded to that the pipeline suggests that we are comfortably meeting what's required to to hit Clean Power

2030. Um, I suppose our position would be that that's not consistent with the government's, um, um, you know, clean power, um, 2030 action plan.

00:39:30:17 - 00:40:01:11

It's inconsistent with the, um, the draft NPS, which makes it clear that we are behind where we should be in terms of delivery of both renewable energy and also supporting infrastructure, which would include the necessary component of battery storage. Um, I think that's sort of, you know, clear both in policy support, but also, um, in that sort of, um, position set out within Clean Power 2030.

00:40:01:16 - 00:40:34:24

You know, we're currently in a situation where we've got around 4.5GW of installed battery capacity. There's a need to deliver between 23 and 27GW by 2030. What's in the pipeline doesn't reflect what can be built within that timescale. So, you know, certainly from our position, um, the inclusion of battery is wholly consistent with what government policy says. And we are in a sort of unique position in terms of trying to hit that, um, urgent and nationally important requirement.

00:40:35:08 - 00:40:36:01

Thank you.

00:40:36:09 - 00:40:41:13

Thank you. Thank you. Anything else on the, um, the assessment aspects.

00:40:42:21 - 00:40:52:01

For the applicant? Yes. Thank you. Um, yeah. Three points really, which I think are relevant to the the general discussion, um, that we've had here, um.

00:40:52:19 - 00:41:00:25

Are consistent with what government policy says. And we are in a sort of unique position in terms of trying to hit that, um, urgent and.

00:41:00:27 - 00:41:01:12

National.

00:41:01:14 - 00:41:31:22

As it stands. Numbers as they are shows savings of carbon overall of around 790,000 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent. These are lower per unit of electricity generated than for previous solar dsos. Um uh, a equivalent to approximately 0.02 tonnes of CO2 per megawatt hour. Uh, for for for the development compared to around. So that was 0.02 compared to around 0.3.

00:41:32:13 - 00:42:06:03

So an order of magnitude higher for previous solar dsos. Uh, and I've done the calculations for four of those because of the assumption that emissions at the future, particularly carbon intensity of the grid, would be saved by the development, which differs from that of previous solar dsos if the same assumptions we use for this development as for previous solar dsos, i.e. combined cycle gas turbine uh emissions, the saving would be uh, from from a great north road would be 0.28 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent per megawatt hour, which is extremely similar to previous decades.

00:42:06:09 - 00:42:47:22

This works best as a table to explain the basis of the calculations, and I'd be happy to submit that in writing if that would help. What that what that show is, though, is that in carbon terms, there's nothing fundamentally different for Great North Road than there is for previous solid echoes. What's changed is the, um, accepted approach to the baseline. Um, so that was one point. Uh, another point is there's two more points. One I mentioned to me was, um, in relation to, um, the overarching national policy statement for energy, and one in paragraph 2.3.7 of N-1.

00:42:47:25 - 00:43:24:23

Uh, it sets out the need for an increase in electricity generation to support an increasing population, uh, and increased electricity use per capita arising from the increase in electric vehicles and heat pumps, amongst other things, with perhaps a doubling in the required electricity by 2050. It requires that this electricity generation is low carbon. It doesn't require a net saving of carbon to be made compared to an alternative scenario. If the electricity generated by the development of solar PV is additional rather than displacing other electricity, then the emission saving would be relative to other generation capacity that would need to be installed or operated instead.

00:43:25:18 - 00:43:57:26

Regardless of the assumptions in the calculations that the development is low carbon and therefore meet policy tests. One other point I thought might be of interest to you is the specific point made in the Stonestreet examination, um, following which the applicant for that, that project, uh, provided a comparison of the long run carbon intensity for generation for the whole grid with that for the Stonestreet development during its operational phase.

00:43:58:16 - 00:44:01:21

For the years covered by the government's published carbon budgets.

00:44:03:15 - 00:44:27:22

We have in advance of this examination made a comparison of the Department for Energy Security and net zero projected long run marginal carbon electricity generation factors with the operational carbon intensity for the development in its opening and construction years, which sits within the forthcoming budget, and over the fifth and sixth carbon budget periods. Again, those comparisons are best laid out in the table, which I'm happy to provide in writing.

00:44:29:15 - 00:44:50:03

This shows that the operational carbon intensity of the development will be more than 100 times lower than the Department for Energy and Energy Security. Net zero long term projections of grid electricity generation in the opening years and over the fifth and sixth carbon budgets. So I'd be happy if that was the same information that Stonestreet submitted, so I'd be happy to submit that if that would help.

00:44:51:23 - 00:45:22:29

Okay, fine. So let me just try and, um, that now before I do. Um, I lost my colleagues. If they want to do anything. Okay. Um, so I think I heard it's quite difficult once you start talking detailed numbers and so on, um, that you that I think you said that that you, you would be offering, uh, or taking an

action to provide further information by way of a note that would that would clarify those points in writing, as you say, you do need to obviously see them. Um, I think, um, on the screen.

00:45:23:11 - 00:45:32:11

Um, so that would be. Yeah, by presumably by deadline one, we don't I assume we those are the deadline we're working to for these things. Um,

00:45:33:27 - 00:45:35:17

that was that. Um.

00:45:37:28 - 00:46:12:11

So I think what I would like to see. Right. To sort of try not to not to have an endless, endless game of ping pong by detailed notes and numbers. Is is having listened to the comments from Mr. Williams and comments from yourself and the fact that you obviously do already have a hopefully constructive dialogue on some of these points. Um, is that with regard to greenhouse gas assessments, I'm trying to keep quite narrow focus. Um, would be that actually you draw up a statement of common ground with, with, um, the organization Mr.

00:46:12:13 - 00:46:21:14

Williams represents. Um, uh, I'm so I'm kind of assuming you're going to lead. You would be that lead person. Is that fair?

00:46:22:18 - 00:46:23:07

Paul Williams.

00:46:23:09 - 00:46:23:26

Daryl.

00:46:23:29 - 00:46:27:17

Uh, more than likely, my colleagues are sitting behind me.

00:46:29:05 - 00:47:00:18

On the first organisation rather than individual. But in terms of an organisation, um, but on this specific point, um, that basically, yeah, you could have a you could have a, you could actually develop a statement of common ground. So it's very clear what you do agree on in relation to the application before us and what you don't agree on. And then clearly then we can we can follow up as it progresses, and we can ask further questions, and the examination will unfold in the usual way. I'll let you have.

00:47:00:20 - 00:47:33:06

Okay, Mr. Williams. I'm drawing this to a close, but, um, if you do make a comment, I'll give them a reply. No, it's just a clarification. What's the timescale on that? Oh, well, I should have covered. So the statement of common ground would be, would be initiated by the applicant and then will be updated at each deadline in accordance with what we what we've said in time, in the timetable basically. So it would, it would. So if you're unfamiliar with these, with these methods which you may or may not be, um, but um, the aim, of course, is to agree.

00:47:33:14 - 00:47:52:24

As the word suggests, the statement of common ground is things you agree on, but it also identifies things you don't agree on. Maybe starting from the point of not agreeing on very much at all. And hopefully every time you start to agree on things and then we can see that unfold at each deadline and we can see what progress is being made towards resolving it. Does that? Does that or does that respond to your question?

00:47:53:07 - 00:47:54:16

I'm grateful. Thank you.

00:47:54:27 - 00:47:56:16

You're welcome. Um,

00:47:58:13 - 00:48:03:15

I don't think he's come back on that. Uh, do you need to come back on that applicant? That's all on that.

00:48:16:21 - 00:48:22:02

Do you need to spend on that, on that process? I was familiar with, so I didn't think it would be.

00:48:22:04 - 00:48:36:07

Peter knows a bit for the applicant. Um. Sorry, sir, I was just, um, taking some instructions there on the process of agreeing that statement of common ground, um, when we might see the representations that might help to inform that document. And this one point I.

00:48:36:09 - 00:49:00:05

Missed one point out. Sorry. Thank you. Um, my colleagues reminded me, Mr. Williams, who did mention reports on this. Um, we'd be happy if the examination would be happy to receive those by said line one or anything else you want to put in writing to help to inform us all of this for deadline one. So don't feel you have to wait until deadline one I think that's that's that's the point.

00:49:01:10 - 00:49:03:21

Uh, Paul Williams funeral. Um, as.

00:49:03:23 - 00:49:05:27

Soon as the website allows me to upload.

00:49:05:29 - 00:49:06:14

Them.

00:49:06:17 - 00:49:11:00

I'll do so. But last time I checked, it still won't allow it.

00:49:12:11 - 00:49:27:26

Um, that's a matter you could. You could take up with the case team. If there's some issues with that, there's nothing to stop you. As far as I'm aware of actually providing those reports directly to the applicant. But what we don't want to do is, is we want to make sure your evidence is clear on in the capture by the explanation.

00:49:29:27 - 00:50:02:15

If it's possible to make a suggestion, um, Matthew Sharpe, on behalf of the applicant, um, if those written reps were shared with us directly, we can use that as the basis of a first draft of the statement of common ground. And so, um, that would avoid So we can share it sort of as part of a bilateral conversation on the topic, and have a template for the statement of common ground prepared on the basis of the reps, and for those to be submitted in the same way as we're doing it with the other parties.

00:50:02:27 - 00:50:08:06

Um, which is trying to sort of front load it as much as possible, if that would be helpful in that way. I think that.

00:50:08:08 - 00:50:18:29

Sounds like somewhere to start, isn't it really? Yes. Okay. Yeah. Yeah. So thank you. Well, thank you very much for your, um, contributions on that. Um.

00:50:21:26 - 00:50:28:11

So I think that's clear where we're where we're going. Um, and I'll hand back to, uh, doctor McGinn at this point. Thank you.

00:50:30:17 - 00:50:43:03

Thank you. So, um, having concluded item 3.2, we're going to. Sorry. Yes. With more. Would you like to make a comment? Please wait until the, um, the microphone is with you.

00:50:46:11 - 00:50:47:00

Thank you.

00:50:47:02 - 00:51:36:16

Janet Scott, local resident. Um, I heard Simon Betts from. And you can share with district council. Ask for further clarification from the applicant with regard to the benefits with regard to manufacturing and sort of and, you know, the and what would what would be advantageous for the local community? I just wanted to add, um, asking what are the benefits with regard to household bills? I know that's a key benefit as outlined in the website, and it would be good to understand from the applicant, um, how, you know, where is the reduction in household bills, given that, um, you know, the price of electricity continues to go up currently.

00:51:37:15 - 00:51:38:09

Thank you.

00:51:39:05 - 00:51:49:15

Okay. Thank you. Um, uh, whilst it's not strictly an item for the the agenda today. I'm happy if the applicant wants to give a brief response to that.

00:52:00:12 - 00:52:08:21

I don't think that, sir. Sorry. Peter Nesbitt for the applicant. I don't think that's a commitment from the project. That's not something we can really comment on.

00:52:08:23 - 00:52:47:13

Understood. And obviously it's a, it's a, it's a, um, something that local people are interested in. And then they'll probably make a similar point at the the open floor hearing tomorrow. So, um, if the applicant can, um, maybe give some consideration and respond to those points when they're made at that time, that will be helpful. Thank you. So I am going to just draw the afternoon's proceedings to a close for now. And obviously we're adjourning and not closing this hearing because we're going to resume again at 10:00 tomorrow morning. Um, so I'm just going to, um, Just give a brief summary of the actions that have been identified so far.

00:52:48:02 - 00:53:31:08

Um, so we've got around 7 or 8 of these. So just just briefly then. Um, so the applicant has agreed to provide a note of, of how the figures relating to the number of homes that would be supplied by the, the, um, the, the energy generated. Um, a note of how that, that those figures have been derived. Um, the applicant was going to provide some further information on the design process in terms of how the principles of good design have informed the evolution of the proposed development, including, for example, whether or not a design champion has been involved, and also in relation to design, how good design would inform the implementation of the scheme post consent.

00:53:33:00 - 00:53:49:04

Um, there are then a couple of points in relation to the alternatives that have been considered. Firstly, in relation to whether the proposed development would be viable without a base. And then secondly, in relation to whether a small modular reactor would be a reasonable alternative technology.

00:53:50:27 - 00:54:03:01

Um, there's then some further clarification on how the base would operate and the advantages of operating and of operating it, noting the presence of the consented beds and the SS beds.

00:54:05:15 - 00:54:16:20

There was then a point about providing further detail of micro siting in relation to BMV Land and Natural England's comments about the effects of woodland planting on BMV land.

00:54:18:26 - 00:54:37:10

Uh, then a further point, then a point of clarification about the status of the various community benefits that are referred to, um, and in terms of their, um, their status, um, and the weight that should be attached to them. And that includes updating the planning statement.

00:54:39:10 - 00:55:10:20

Uh, and then lastly, we've been talking about a note to review the points made in relation to the greenhouse gas emission savings, um, including, I think, comparisons with other permitted solar

schemes. Um, and a table showing the calculation of the figures for carbon savings. And then finally, we've been talking about a statement of common ground on greenhouse gas emissions with the Nola Farm steering group. I think that's it.

00:55:10:25 - 00:55:14:00

My colleagues want to. Okay.

00:55:17:13 - 00:55:34:08

So, um, it remains for me to thank you all for your contributions this afternoon. The time is now 5:03. Um, we will adjourn for the afternoon and resume again at 10:00 tomorrow morning. Thank you very much, everyone.