

## Application SCR evaluation template **Information copied over from original evaluation checklist**

(To be completed by NPS, GWCL and EM/PPC officers).

Name of activity, address and NGR	The Maltings Organic Treatment Facility Turpin Lane Common Lane South Milford North Yorkshire LS25 5FP  450522, 431292
-----------------------------------	---

Document reference of application SCR	Site Condition Report MS1007/03
---------------------------------------	------------------------------------

Date and version of application SCR	Site Condition Report September 2009 MS1007/03
-------------------------------------	---

<b>1.0 Site details</b> To be completed by NPS (Source)	
<b>Has the applicant provided the following information as required by the application SCR template?</b>	<b>Response (Specify what information is needed from the applicant, if any)</b>
Site plans showing site layout, drainage, surfacing, receptors, sources of emissions/releases and monitoring points	Yes

<b>2.0 Condition of the land at permit issue</b> To be completed by GWCL officers (Receptor)	
<b>Has the applicant provided the following information as required by the application SCR template?</b>	<b>Response (Specify what information is needed from the applicant, if any)</b>
a) Environmental setting including geology, hydrogeology and surface waters b) Pollution history including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• pollution incidents that may have affected land</li> <li>• historical land-uses and associated contaminants</li> <li>• visual/olfactory evidence of existing contamination</li> <li>• evidence of damage to existing pollution prevention measures</li> </ul> c) Evidence of historic contamination (i.e. historical site investigation, assessment, remediation and verification reports (where available)) d) Has the applicant chosen to collect baseline reference data?	a) Yes b) Yes c) No d) No  The applicant has identified that previous uses of the site are likely to have caused contamination, but are not proposing to carry out a site investigation. It is in the applicant's best interest to do this as it may otherwise provide difficulty at surrender.

<b>3.0 Permitted activities</b> To be completed by NPS officers (Source)	
<b>Has the applicant provided the following information as required by the application SCR template?</b>	<b>Response (Specify what information is needed from the applicant, if any)</b>
a) Permitted activities b) Non-permitted activities undertaken at the site	a) Yes b) Yes

<b>3.0(a) Environmental Risk Assessment</b> To be completed by NPS officers (Source)	
The H1 environmental risk assessment should identify elements that could impact on land and waters, cross-referenced back to documents and plans provided as part of the wider permit application.	The risk assessment should include the risks associated with the presence of COMAH "dangerous substances"

<b>3.0(b) Will the pollution prevention measures protect land and groundwater?</b> To be completed by EM/PPC officers (Conceptual model)	
Are the activities likely to result in pollution of land? <i>(Information on pollution prevention measures will be in another part of the application – Part B)</i>	We have not answered this question as our team does not have the technical expertise to produce an appropriate answer. Please call if you have any queries.
For dangerous and/or hazardous substances only, are the pollution prevention measures for the relevant activities to a standard that is likely to prevent pollution of land? <i>(If the answer is no, briefly explain how you arrive at your conclusion)</i>	We have not answered this question as our team does not have the technical expertise to produce an appropriate answer. Please call if you have any queries.

<b>Application SCR decision summary</b> To be completed by GWCL officer and returned to NPS	<b>Tick relevant decision</b>
Sufficient information has been supplied to describe the condition of the site at permit issue; or	
<p><b>Missing information. The following information must to be obtained from the applicant <i>Information copied over from the response to a further information request received from the applicant (see text in italics).</i></b></p> <p>Further Information requested from Applicant:</p> <p><b>In the SCR you have highlighted that previous uses of the site are likely to have caused contamination but you are not proposing to carry out a site investigation. It is in your interest to do so as it may otherwise prove a very difficult site to surrender.</b></p> <p><i>From the desk study undertaken in order to inform the Site Condition Report (SCR), the historic pollution incidents within 250m of the site are listed. It is considered that due to the age, location and classification of severity, that these pollution incidents are unlikely to have affected the site. Whilst a statement is made within the SCR that there is a possibility of potential sources of pollution from the previous site use, no evidence of this has been uncovered during occupation of the site by the client. A borehole was installed 8 months ago on the site and no presence of contamination was noted. Civil engineering works undertaken within the vicinity of the proposed operations have shown approximately 600mm of made ground and sub-soils before the drift deposits of glacial clays which extended to over 5 metres in thickness. At no point was contamination evident during the works. The excavated material is still on site, so chemical testing could be undertaken if required.</i></p> <p><b>There are several abstraction boreholes located on the site, further information is required stating what will happen to these boreholes. Will the licences be traded to the new owner, will abstraction still take place? If not, will the boreholes be de-commissioned? Are the boreholes likely to cause a potential contaminant pathway to the underlying Principal aquifer from the new activity?</b></p>	✓

<p><i>These Boreholes are in service and will play a role in full site operations, as was the case during the site's previous use. The boreholes will provide service water for the site's offices and welfare block, the other borehole will be used as a source of water for the process. These licences are in the name of D. Carrie, one of the Directors of The Maltings Organic Treatment Limited.</i></p> <p><b>The permitted area appears to be covering a pond. What is happening to the pond and how? And does this have any drainage implications?</b></p> <p><i>The pond / lagoon feature was constructed and utilized as part of the previous site usage, where it provided storage for water used in the process, and as a source of emergency water in the event of a fire. The pond has been reduced in size to accommodate the development of the facility, and these works were undertaken in conjunction with Natural England.</i></p> <p>Note: I note the applicant has a certificate of lawfulness for the site. I would have expected a planning permission would have been necessary because of change of use from a brewery to a composting site (?) The reason I question this is because had a planning permission been submitted, we would have requested investigation of the 'historic contamination' at site. Without this, we have no power to encourage clean-up of the site (if it's necessary) through the permitting regime.</p>	
<p>Pollution of land and water is unlikely; or <i>(Pollution prevention measures just need to be reviewed during operation of the site)</i></p>	
<p><b>Pollution of land likely</b></p> <p>Additional information regarding the boreholes on site is required before an assessment can be made.</p> <p><i>(Advise the permitting team on what additional controls/checks may be necessary)</i></p>	✓
<p>Date and name of reviewer SHThomas 18/12/09</p>	

## Operational phase SCR evaluation template

(To be completed by EM/PPC and GWCL officers).

Sections 4.0. to 7.0 may be completed annually in line with normal record checks.

<b>4.0 Changes to the activities</b> To be completed by EM/PPC officers (Source)	
<b>Have there been any changes to the following during the operation of the site?</b>	<b>Response (Specify what information is needed from the applicant, if any)</b>
a) Activity boundaries b) Permitted activities c) "Dangerous substances" used or produced	See comments from EM officers in surrender checklist below.

<b>5.0 Measures taken to protect land</b> To be completed by EM/PPC officers (Pathway)	
Has the applicant provided evidence from records collated during the lifetime of the permit, to show that the pollution prevention measures have worked?	See comments from EM officers in surrender checklist below.

<b>6.0 Pollution incidents that may have impacted on land and their remediation</b> To be completed by EM/PPC officers (Sources)	
Has the applicant provided evidence to show that any pollution incidents which have taken place during the life of the permit and which may have impacted on land or water have been investigated and remediated (where necessary)?	See comments from EM officers in surrender checklist below.

<b>7.0 Soil gas and water quality monitoring (where relevant)</b> To be completed by GWCL officers	
Where soil gas and/or water quality monitoring has been undertaken, does this demonstrate that there has been no change in the condition of the land? Has any change that has occurred been investigated and remediated?	<b>If no, specify why</b>

## **Surrender SCR Evaluation Template**

If you haven't already completed previous sections 4.0 to 7.0, do so now before assessing the surrender.

### **8.0 Decommissioning and removal of pollution risk**

To be completed by EM/PPC officers

Has the applicant demonstrated that decommissioning works have been undertaken and that all pollution risks associated with the site have been removed? Has any contamination of land that has occurred during these activities been investigated and remediated?

Low Risk Surrender - Rejected

A low risk surrender was submitted and rejected in April 2016 (see email from Tim Huntley): Report No: MO1010/SSR, dated: February 2016

Surrender SCR provided with this application

Surrender SCR - Report No.: MO1010/SSR(v2), Version 2, September 2016

Update from Area

Tom Longhorn (Environment Officer, Waste Team, Yorkshire) provided an update from two technical officers who have had dealings with this site:

Matthew Woollins –

During the time in which the area proposed for surrender was used for waste management activities only part of the area was actually used. The strip pond being used to collect contaminated surface water and the north western area was used to store green waste derived compost. The compost was primarily stored on concrete and was removed from site some years ago. The silos and the northern and eastern areas of the highlighted area were not used.

The majority of the area proposed for partial surrender has been cleared during the development of the AB Agri Anaerobic Digester (AD). (A permit has been issued for the AD plant EPR/VP3533DP). This included the demolition of the former grain silos and the emptying and removal of the strip pond. The civil engineering works included the excavation and removal of a significant depth of soil from the area. Given all of the above we are satisfied that any contamination of the area associated with the former waste management activities has been removed and have no objection to the application for a partial surrender.

Martin Flack –

- We need to ensure that The Maltings' SCR submitted with this application and the AB Agri SCR (SLR Ref: 404.04723.00002.010, version No.1, March 2016), (EPR/VP3533DP, EDRM 9277838) submitted last year are consistent.
- The AB Agri SCR suggests some contamination at the site. The question we need to answer is whether this contamination is as a result of The Maltings' operation on site during the lifetime of the permit they are now trying to part-surrender. If we feel it is then we should not accept the part-surrender.
- The Maltings' have been a persistent Opra band DEF site – the main issues being odour nuisance off site and storage of material on site inappropriately (including contaminated composts outdoors – though not sure if they were stored in the area now being surrendered).

Comments were provided from the Groundwater & Contaminated Land team on the Site Condition Report prior to the installation permit (EPR/VP3533DP) being issued for the AD plant on site:

*We are satisfied with the level of information provided to us from the site condition report, the risk assessment and the baseline reports.*

*We agree with the analysis of the environmental setting of the site and the description of the site's history.*

*The applicant has collected groundwater quality data from both the perched water within the superficial drifts and from groundwater within the principal limestone aquifer. The quality data can be used as the baseline data for the condition of groundwater underneath this site.*

*We believe that sufficient information has been submitted to describe the existing condition of the hydrogeology site.*


*The site's ground and groundwater was recorded having some historic contamination issues, which have been taken into consideration when assessing this permit. There is low likelihood of risks to groundwater within the principal aquifer from this activity.*

<b>10.0 Statement of site condition</b> To be completed by EM/PPC officers	
Has the applicant provided a statement, backed up with evidence, confirming that the permitted activities have ceased, decommissioning works are complete and that pollution risk has been removed and that the land and waters at the site are in a satisfactory state?	This section should be used if the operator is relying solely on records obtained during the operational phase of the activity. If no, specify why  See comments above

<b>9.0 Reference data and remediation (where relevant)</b> To be completed by GWCL officers	
Has the applicant provided details of any surrender reference data that they have collected and any remediation that they have undertaken?  (Reference data for soils must meet the requirements of policy 307_03 Chemical test data on contaminated soils – quantification requirements). If the surrender reference data shows that the condition of the land has changed as a result of the permitted activities, the applicant will need to undertake remediation to return the condition of the land back to that at permit issue. You should not require remediation of historic contamination or contamination arising from non-permitted activities as part of the permit surrender.	Where surrender reference data is needed, applicants will only need to collect this for the measures/areas where they can't show that there has been no change in the condition of the land using the information collected during the life of the permit. Refer to Sections 3 & 4 above.  When assessing whether any baseline reference data is relevant, you must consider whether it relates to the appropriate media (e.g. soil, groundwater, gas) substances and area of the site.

<b>10.0 Statement of site condition</b> To be completed by GWCL officers	
Has the applicant provided a statement, backed up with evidence, confirming that the permitted activities have ceased, decommissioning works are complete and that pollution risk has been removed and that the land and waters at the site are in a satisfactory state?	If no, specify why

<b>Surrender SCR decision summary</b> To be completed by GWCL officers and returned to NPS	Tick relevant decision
Sufficient information has been supplied to show that pollution risk has been removed and that the site is in a satisfactory state – accept the application to surrender the permit; or	
<p><b>Consultant Response E-mail from 10<sup>th</sup> February</b></p> <p><b>1.1 Please confirm whether the samples taken outside of the surrender area and still within the permitted area are suitable for comparison as outlined above.</b></p> <p><b>Response:</b> Samples used to represent soil concentrations outside of the area of surrender are taken from operational areas in which the integrity of the impermeable concrete pavement have been maintained throughout the operational life of the permitted facility. Similarly, based on borehole records the upper boundary of the underlying till deposits falls to the north. The condition of the soils beneath the southern area of the site is therefore unlikely to have been influenced by any waste operations permitted at the site since 2009. It is therefore considered that the samples from outside the surrender area are suitable for comparison against the results of samples taken from within the surrender area.</p>	

<p><b>1.2 Please confirm if the storage of treated wood chip and compost occurred outside of the surrender area where the soil samples were taken.</b></p> <p><b>Response:</b> Any storage and treatment on areas to the west and south of the surrender area have only been carried out over impermeable surfacing.</p> <p><b>2 Please provide additional information on the fines material to indicate whether this material has been impacted by contamination, e.g. was it derived from the waste material or from the made ground that could have been impacted from the waste material.</b></p> <p><b>Response:</b> All waste/compost materials deposited over the surface of the madeground deposits were removed prior to the excavation of the underlying madeground materials and redeposited on other operational areas of the main Maltings facility comprising engineered concrete pavement.</p> <p><b>3 Please confirm the purpose of the installation of the GCL.</b></p> <p><b>Response:</b> The concentrations of contaminants within the site soils (made ground or clays) were not in exceedance of Soil Guideline Values (or appropriate equivalent thresholds/standards) for commercial land use. Consequently, no remedial measures were necessary to enable safe use of the land due to contamination. The GCL has been installed as part of the engineered containment and drainage infrastructure of the AD facility only, in accordance with the requirements of the Environmental Permitting Regulations only. The stabilisation operations were carried out to improve the geotechnical characteristics of the site-won materials only.</p> <p><b><u>Groundwater Response 27<sup>th</sup> February</u></b></p> <p>We requested confirmation that the fine material used had not been impacted by contamination. It is noted that this query was not answered in the response. Therefore there is the potential that the site doesn't meet the terms of the surrender.</p> <p>The site was used commercially prior to the permit being issued. Therefore there is the potential for historic activities to have impacted the ground historically. The site setting also indicates that there is a clay layer overlying the principal aquifer which will create a protective barrier. Therefore it is unlikely that there will be an impact on the underlying aquifer.</p> <p>We have adopted a site specific risk based approach for this surrender application and in this instance, we have no objection to this partial surrender. All future applications should be submitted in lines with our guidance and met the terms of the surrender.</p>	
<p>Date and name of reviewer JLear 27.02.2017</p>	