

Environment Agency permitting decisions

Bespoke Variation

We have decided to issue the variation for A303 Recycling Facility operated by Raymond Brown Minerals & Recycling Ltd.

The variation number is EPR/ZP3698EQ/V008

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

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

Key issues of the decision

This variation includes:

A new activity has been added to the permit that will regulate the operation of an IBA facility under listed activity 5.4 A(1)b iii - recovery or a mix of recovery and disposal of non-hazardous waste with a capacity exceeding 75 tonnes per day involving treatment of slags and ashes.

The principal aim of IBA treatment is to improve ash quality in order to generate a material that has the potential for safe recovery (e.g. for use as a secondary aggregate material in road construction) and to mechanically separate and collect the ferrous and non-ferrous metal fractions for further recycling. The use of treated IBA as a secondary aggregate both reduces the use of virgin aggregates and reduces the amount of waste sent to landfill.

IBA is a coarse ash produced from the incineration of municipal solid waste. Depending on the waste burnt, IBA is likely to contain varying quantities of glass, ceramics, brick, concrete and metals in addition to clinker and ash.

This permit includes a listed activity for the processing of IBA which is received from off-site incineration plants; this is 5.4A(1)(b) iii recovery or a mix of recovery and disposal of non-hazardous waste with a capacity exceeding 75 tonnes per day involving treatment of slags and ashes.

For an installation of this kind, the principal emissions are:

- fugitive releases to air, i.e. dust;
- protection of surface water and groundwater from uncontrolled releases;
- the disposal of residues, which cannot be recovered, to landfill.

There are no point source emissions to air, water or land from the site.

A water management system is in place to capture rain water and surface water run-off, with opportunity for the water to be reused in the dust suppression system.

Dust is the main fugitive release; a dust management plan is in place which we consider to be satisfactory to manage these emissions. This includes measures such as keeping the IBA moist whilst being transported, using covered vehicles, using dust suppression (water sprays) during material handling and on-site traffic movements. There is also a dust monitoring system which will be employed to record any dust emissions from the boundary of the site to ensure the dust control system is being effective. This is a static system which monitors dust by collecting airborne particulate, during a standard monitoring period of 5-7 days.

IBA storage and processing is carried out on impermeable surfaces. Rain water and water used for damping down stored IBA is collected in a site drainage system which is connected to a lagoon.

The lagoon will be located on a sensitive aquifer, we have asked for further information to ensure lagoon construction and operation will not pose a risk to the groundwater. This information was requested through a Schedule 5 Notice. Whilst the operator's responses were generally deemed acceptable, two pre-operational conditions have been inserted into the permit that must be satisfied prior to the construction of the on-site lagoon.

The IBA facility is isolated from residential receptors and is surrounded by screening banks. As a result of the location and the noise controls in place, we consider it unlikely that the plant will result in a level of noise nuisance likely to give rise to complaint.

IBA ash treatment is an inherently non-odorous process and this is supported by the operator's Environmental Risk Assessment & Management Plan, which

deems the overall risk as not significant. Based upon the information in the application we are satisfied that appropriate measures will be in place to prevent and / or minimise odour, which will be regulated through permit conditions.

Currently, the site is permitted to import 125,000t per annum, which consists of inert waste for aggregate recycling and non-hazardous waste for transfer within the Materials Recycling Facility (MRF). As part of this permit variation, the permitted tonnage for the MRF activity that exists at the site at present, will increase from 125,000t to 170,000t per annum. The site has been given permission recently to operate extended opening hours, which has increased the capacity of the site. A risk assessment has also been provided which highlights that the proposed increase in throughput poses little environmental risk.

The site is also permitted to accept up to 5000t per annum of Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE).

The total waste accepted by the site will be no more than 300,000 tonnes per annum.

Pre-Operational measures:

It was felt appropriate to insert two pre-operational measures into the permit requesting a stability report detailing the expected settlement characteristics of the proposed lagoon and further information demonstrating that the materials used to construct the lagoon will not chemically react with the contents of the lagoon. This information was felt appropriate as the site sits above a principal aquifer. This information will be submitted to the Area Officer for approval prior to the commencement of commissioning.

Annex 1: decision checklist

This document should be read in conjunction with the application, supporting information and 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 and web publicising	The web publicising and consultation responses (Annex 2) were taken into account in the decision. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance.	✓
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.	✓
European Directives		
Applicable directives	All applicable European directives have been considered in the determination of the application. This activity is subject to the Industrial Emissions Directive (IED).	✓
The site		
Extent of the site of the facility	The operator has provided a plan which we consider is satisfactory, showing the extent of the site of the facility. A plan is included in the permit and the operator is required to carry on the permitted activities within the site boundary.	✓
Site condition report	The operator has provided a description of the condition of the site. We consider this description is satisfactory. The decision	✓

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met
		Yes
	was taken in accordance with our guidance on site condition reports and baseline reporting under IED–guidance and templates (H5).	
Biodiversity, Heritage, Landscape and Nature Conservation	<p>The application is within the relevant distance criteria of a site of heritage, landscape or nature conservation, and/or protected species or habitat .</p> <p>A full assessment of the application and its potential to affect the sites and species has been carried out as part of the permitting process. We consider that the application will not affect the features of the sites and species.</p> <p>The sites are: SSSI: Bradbury Common SSSI: River Test SSSI: East Ashton Common</p> <p>An Appendix 4 has been completed and saved on our records management system.</p> <p>We have not formally consulted on the application. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance.</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's risk assessment is satisfactory.</p>	✓
Operating techniques	<p>We have reviewed the techniques used by the operator and compared these with the relevant guidance notes.</p> <p>The operator will comply with our guidance on Storage and Treatment of IBA (384_12); and How to comply with your Environmental Permit (433_11).</p> <p>The operator has existing operating techniques in place for their waste transfer site.</p> <p>The proposed techniques are in line with our guidance and we consider them to represent appropriate techniques for the facility.</p>	✓

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met
		Yes
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. The new conditions have the same meaning as those in the previous permit.</p> <p>The operator has agreed that the new conditions are acceptable.</p>	✓
Waste types	<p>We have specified the permitted waste types, descriptions and quantities, which can be accepted at the regulated facility.</p> <p>We are satisfied that the operator can accept these wastes for the following reasons: With regards to the IBA operations on site, it is one waste type coming from known sources subject to processes also permitted under EPR.</p> <p>In addition to 19 01 12 (bottom ash and slag other than those mentioned in 19 01 11), the operator also applied to have 10 01 01 (bottom ash, slag and boiler dust (excluding boiler dust mentioned in 10 01 04)) and 10 01 15 (bottom ash, slag and boiler dust from co-incineration other than those mentioned in 10 01 14)) also. However, using the Environment Agency's quick guide on storing and treating incinerator bottom ash (384_12) it makes clear that IBA is ash produced from the incineration of municipal solid waste. Non-hazardous waste IBA is coded as 19 01 12. No other waste codes are required.</p> <p>10 01 15 and 10 01 01 are wastes from thermal processes and are not referred to in 384_12.</p> <p>There are no the new waste codes to be added to the materials recycling and WEEE recycling part of this permit as part of this variation.</p>	✓
Pre-operational conditions	<p>Based on the information in the application, we consider that we need to impose pre-operational conditions.</p> <p>There are two pre-operational conditions imposed</p>	✓

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met
		Yes
	requesting a stability report detailing the settlement characteristics of the proposed lagoon and a report demonstrating that the materials used to construct the lagoon will not chemically react with the contents of the lagoon.	
Incorporating the application	<p>We have specified that the applicant must operate the permit in accordance with descriptions in the application, including all additional information received as part of the determination process.</p> <p>These descriptions are specified in the Operating Techniques table in the permit.</p>	✓
Reporting	<p>We have specified reporting in the permit.</p> <p>Annual reporting of production / treatment of IBA is required.</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. The operator is a member of an agreed scheme.	✓
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 and the way in which we have taken these into account in the determination process. (Newspaper advertising is only carried out for certain application types, in line with our guidance.)

Response received from
Test Valley Borough Council, Environmental Protection Team, Housing and Environmental Health Service
Brief summary of issues raised
<p>The Council have not received any complaints alleging a noise nuisance within the last 3 years, nor are they aware of any action being taken by any party against present or previous operator about noise problems. The following question was asked in the consultation sent to the Environmental Health Department: Are there any specific points that the Council feel should be addressed in any permit issued by us?</p> <p>Test Valley Borough Council responded with the following answer:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Dust control. Although the site is quite isolated from houses, there are some other businesses in the area and I understand that a solar farm is also close by.2. Odour control.3. Protection of ground water – there are private water supplies in surrounding villages.
Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered
No action required. The 3 factors raised above were considered as part of the permit determination process. Conditions 2.3, 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 in the permit cover these aspects.

The application was also sent to the Health and Safety Executive (HSE). No representations were returned within the time frame.

The application was also advertised on our website. No representations were returned within the time frame.