

Environment Agency permitting decisions

Variation

We have decided to issue the variation The Science Park for operated by Centec International Limited.

The variation number is EPR/BS3859IF/V003

This variation consolidates previous variations and upgrade the permit to the current template. The main changes as a result of the operator's application are as follows:

- Add activity 5.6 (A) (i) (a) to Table S1.1
- To add 5.3 A(1) a (x), as an amendment following the IED variation (EPR/BS3859IF/V002)
- to expand the Installation boundary after the expansion of the activity on site for additional bulk storage facilities
- and to add an updated site plan
- The variation also includes the addition of waste types under The List of Wastes (England) Regulations 2005
- To add Improvement conditions to Table 4.1.1 in relation to operator competence and technical ability, and for an updated management system that demonstrates technical management at the facility
- This variation also incorporates the changes required by the Industrial Emissions Directive as a result of up grading to the current template.

We consider in reaching that decision we have taken into account all relevant considerations and legal requirements and that the permit will ensure that the appropriate level of environmental protection is provided.

Purpose of this document

This decision document:

- explains how the application has been determined
- provides a record of the decision-making process
- shows how all relevant factors have been taken into account
- justifies the specific conditions in the permit other than those in our generic permit template.

Unless the decision document specifies otherwise we have accepted the applicant's proposals.

Structure of this document

- Annex 1 the decision checklist
- Annex 2 the consultation, web publicising advertising responses

Annex 1: decision checklist

This document should be read in conjunction with the Duly Making checklist, the application and supporting information and permit/ notice.

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met Yes
Consultation		
Scope of consultation	The consultation requirements were identified and implemented. The decision was taken in accordance with RGN 6 High Profile Sites, our Public Participation Statement and our Working Together Agreements.	✓
Responses to consultation, web publicising	<p>The web publicising, and consultation responses (Annex 2) were taken into account in the decision.</p> <p>The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance. The application was sent to the following Consultees.</p> <p>Local Authority Environmental Protection Department</p> <p>Health and Safety Executive</p> <p>Public Health England</p> <p>Local Fire Service</p> <p>We received responses from Environmental Protection (Cheshire East) Public Health England, details of which are given in Annex 2.</p>	✓
Operator		
Control of the facility	We are satisfied that the applicant (now the operator) is the person who will have control over the operation of the facility after the grant of the permit. The decision was taken in accordance with EPR RGN 1 Understanding the meaning of operator.	✓
The facility		
The regulated facility	<p>The extent/nature of the facilities taking place at the site required clarification.</p> <p>After the submission of further schedule 5 information we were able to agree on the installation boundary(as given in schedule 7 of the permit) with the operator.</p>	✓

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met
		Yes
	The decision on the facility was taken in accordance with RGN 2.	
European Directives		
Applicable directives	<p>All applicable European directives have been considered in the determination of the application..</p> <p>This variation incorporates conditions required by the Industrial Emissions Directive (IED)</p>	✓
The site		
Extent of the site of the facility	<p>The operator has provided a plan which we consider is satisfactory, showing the extent of the site of the facility. The Installation boundary has been defined as part of this variation, after the expansion of the activity on site for additional bulk storage facilities and to add an updated site plan.</p> <p>A plan is included in the permit and the operator is required to carry on the permitted activities within the site boundary.</p>	✓
Site condition report	<p>The operator has provided a description of the condition of the site extension.</p> <p>We consider this description is satisfactory. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on site condition reports and baseline reporting under IED– guidance and templates (H5).</p> <p>The original Site condition report was considered along with Site Condition Report (SCR) submitted 20/03/2014 as part of the duly making process, the report was prepared by Centec International Ltd (includes Soils Site Report prepared by Cranfield University).</p> <p>In the original application the SCR was assessed during the determination and was deemed satisfactory and appropriate for the environmental risk posed by the site. The operator has chosen not to supply baseline data for any of the site and as such we will assume zero contamination.</p> <p>The main consideration for this variation was the extension of the Installation boundary due to the expansion of the activity on site for additional bulk storage</p>	✓

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met Yes
	<p>facilities.</p> <p>There has only been one incident on site which resulted in a spill. This issue was raised by GW&CL in their consultation response. The contaminated land was removed the area has been sealed with concrete to prevent any future spills causing pollution again.</p>	
Environmental Risk Assessment and operating techniques		
Environmental risk	<p>We have reviewed the operator's assessment of the environmental risk from the facility.</p> <p>The Operator has confirmed that the process operations of the site has not changed and that the environmental risk assessment is still relevant. However they have provided a risk assessment for the new tank farm . The new tanks will not be storing any new materials and will follow BAT as described below.</p> <p>No specific emission limits are required for the storage tanks, however emissions will still be controlled via permit condition 3.2 that the Operator is required to notify the Environment Agency that the activities are giving rise to pollution, submit to the Environment Agency for approval within the period specified, an emissions management plan which identifies and minimises the risks of pollution from emissions of substances not controlled by emission limits.</p>	✓
Operating techniques	<p>We have reviewed the techniques used by the operator and compared these with the relevant guidance notes. The Operator has installed storage tanks, the bunding base is reinforced concrete, and the internal walls are sealed with fibreglass and resin lining.</p> <p>In addition they are fitted with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ a atmospheric vent with a flame trap to act as a breather during filling or discharge, preventing fugitive emission releases of vapours. They also will provide for any volatile solvent by using vapour recovery and pressure balance lines to prevent fugitive releases to atmosphere. ➤ The levels in the tanks will be controlled by visual electronic level probes with the addition of measures of audible and visual high level 	✓

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met Yes
	<p>alarms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The bunds have a capacity of 110%. ➤ Valves will be capped or double valves will be fitted. The bunds will be divided with half-height internal walls to give four 'sub-bunds', to contain spillages. ➤ In terms of Indicative BAT requirements for control of fugitive emissions to Water ; bunds are on impermeable surface, and have a capacity greater than 110 percent of the largest tank and are subject to regular visual inspection. ➤ Tertiary containment is provided by the site drains which flow to an effluent pit. <p>These measures are in accordance with Guidance 4.02 , 2.2 , Indicative BAT 1 -3 . Fugitive emissions , Indicative BAT 1 – 6.</p> <p>TGN 'How to comply with your Environmental Permit' and Guidance for recovery and Disposal of Hazardous and Non Hazardous waste S5.06, outline the measures needed to meet Indicative BAT for requirements for control of fugitive emissions to air, in relation to VOCs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The Operator has mitigated against pressure fluctuations, by installing Pressure/vacuum valves. ➤ Segregation of different categories of chemical will be undertaken in line with HSG 176. <p>The proposed techniques/ emission levels for priorities for control are in line with the benchmark levels contained in the TGN and we consider them to represent appropriate techniques for the facility.</p>	
The permit conditions		
Updating permit conditions during consolidation	<p>We have updated previous permit conditions to those in the new generic permit template as part of permit consolidation.</p> <p>The operator has agreed that the new conditions are acceptable.</p>	✓

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met
		Yes
Improvement conditions	<p>Based on the information on the application, we consider that we need to impose improvement conditions.</p> <p>We have imposed improvement conditions to ensure that: The has Operator has the appropriate certificate of technical competence to manage the specified waste management activities.</p> <p>The competency must be a relevant qualification from one of the following industry schemes: Chartered Institute of Wastes Management/Waste Management Industry Training and Advisory Board (CIWM/WAMITAB) scheme; or Environmental Services Association/Energy and Utility Skills (ESA/EUskills) scheme</p>	✓
Operator Competence		
Environment management system	There is no known reason to consider that the operator will not have the management systems to enable it to comply with the permit conditions. The decision was taken in accordance with RGN 5 on Operator Competence.	✓
Technical competence	Technical competency is required for activities permitted. As the operator is already carrying out these activities an improvement condition has been incorporated into the application that requires the Operator to submit an appropriate certificate of technical competence to the Environment Agency for approval within 12 months of the permit being issued.	✓
Financial provision	There is no known reason to consider that the operator will not be financially able to comply with the permit conditions. The decision was taken in accordance with RGN 5 on Operator Competence.	✓

Annex 2: Consultation, web publicising responses

Summary of responses to consultation, web publication advertising and the way in which we have taken these into account in the determination process.

Response received from Environmental Protection (Cheshire East)
8 th April 2014
Brief summary of issues raised
Proforma indicating that there haven't been any issues raised regarding this site.
Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered
n/a

Response received from Public Health England
25 th April 2014
Brief summary of issues raised
We recommend that any Environmental Permit issued for this site should contain conditions to ensure that the following: potential emissions do not impact upon public health: fugitive emissions to air from the bulk storage facilities from the tank farm in the bulk storage facilities.
Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered
Condition 3.2 limits emissions, and addresses the issues raised in the consultation response. As discussed in the tables above, we consider that the applicant will apply BAT for the control of fugitive emissions, and the techniques are incorporated into the permit via condition S2.3.1 and table S.1.2. The information received from the Operator in relation to emissions did not have any material effect in relation to emissions.