Environment Agency permitting decisions

Variation

We have decided to issue the variation for Coventry Di-isocyanate operated by Notedome Ltd.

The variation number is EPR/QP3139LG/V002

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 and web publicising responses

Key issues of the decision

The Operator has applied for a variation to extend the installation boundary to include a new facility that shares a border with the current site. The existing production plant will be moved in stages to the new facility. This variation permits both existing and proposed operations. The operator has stated that the current facility will eventually become redundant in favour of the new plant.

The varied permit allows operation of 4 release points into air, two existing and two new emission points. This will allow the Operator the flexibility to move equipment, as described in the application, without any increase in overall emissions from the installation.

The site condition report (SCR) has been reviewed and found to be satisfactory. We have also reviewed the SCR included in the original application dated 20/01/2006 and consulted the current and previous site inspectors. Although the original SCR was for the current site, since the

extended boundary includes land adjacent to the original site, we believe it is still relevant.
The Operator has said there is no requirement to collect baseline data and we agree.

The regulated facility now has two addresses until such time as the Operator decides the final fate of the original site at 34 and 52 Herald Way.

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 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.	✓
The facility		
The regulated facility	The extent/nature of the facilities taking place at the site required clarification. The decision on the facility was taken in accordance with RGN 2 (understanding the meaning of regulated facility). The regulated facility is an installation which comprises the following activity listed in Part 2 of Schedule 1 to the Environmental Permitting Regulations. • 4.1A(1)(d) – batch poly-isocyanate reactions involving the use, in any 12 month period, of one tonne or more of toluene di-isocyanate and other di-isocyanates of comparable volatility.	✓
European Directives		
Applicable directives	All applicable European directives have been considered in the determination of the application.	✓
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.	✓

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met Yes
Environmental Risk Assessment and operating techniques		
Environmental risk	We have reviewed the operator's assessment of the environmental risk from the facility. The operator's risk assessment is satisfactory. The assessment shows that, applying the conservative criteria in our guidance on Environmental Risk Assessment [or similar methodology supplied by the operator and reviewed by ourselves], all emissions may be categorised as environmentally insignificant.	✓
Operating techniques	We have reviewed the techniques used by the operator and compared these with the relevant guidance notes. We consider that the emission limits included in the permit reflect the BAT for the installation.	✓
Pre-operational conditions	Based on the information in the application, we consider that we need to impose pre-operational conditions. To maintain the integrity of the bund. At present the yard in the existing factory essentially acts as a bund. However when the new unit is operational we believe the wall between the existing and new units will be removed. Area has asked the Operator to ensure that the integrity of the bund is maintained.	✓
Improvement conditions	Based on the information on the application, we consider that we need to impose improvement conditions. We have imposed an improvement condition to carry out MCERTS accredited monitoring (minimum of three test results as advised by our monitoring colleagues) of the new emission points following successful commissioning. This is expected to be a one off exercise.	✓
Incorporating the application	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. These descriptions are specified in the Operating Techniques table in the permit.	✓
Emission limits	We have decided that the emission limits set in the original permit should be removed. This is with area agreement.	✓

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met Yes
	The original permit application (and variation application) offers H1 data that indicates emissions are likely to have an insignificant impact. Monitoring data received since issue of the current permit indicates isocyanate levels of between 0.004 and 0.007 mg/m3 against the permit limit of 0.1 mg/m3	
Monitoring	We have decided that the current monitoring requirements should be removed (with area agreement) for the reasons mentioned above. This is in line with our current policy to remove regulation burden on Industry where there is no clear environmental benefit. However we have included an improvement condition to monitor the new emission points when satisfactorily commissioned to ensure they are within current and quoted (in application) limits.	✓
Reporting	We have modified reporting in the varied permit taking account of the monitoring comments above.	✓
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.	✓

Annex 2: web publicising and consultation responses

Summary of responses to web publication and consultation 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
None
Brief summary of issues raised
N/A
Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered
N/A