

Environment Agency permitting decisions

Part surrender

We have decided to accept the surrender of part of the permit for Stocksbridge Site, Stocksbridge Works operated by Tata Steel UK Limited.

The permit number is EPR/UP3130FF

We are satisfied that the necessary measures have been taken to avoid any pollution risk and to return the site to a satisfactory state.

We consider in reaching that decision we have taken into account all relevant considerations and legal requirements.

Purpose of this document

This decision document:

- explains how the operator's 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 as a result of the partial surrender

Structure of this document

- Key issues
- Annex 1 the decision checklist

Key issues of the decision

The application for this partial surrender was originally submitted as EPR/UP3130FF/S005 in September 2013 to include some variation arising from the surrender. During determination it was found that some of the variation changes would be required to allow the partial surrender to take place so a linked variation was raised as V005 (issued in December 2013). The surrender completion was then delayed at the operator. After issue of two unrelated variations this partial surrender was renumbered as S008 for completion of determination.

The applicant originally submitted a report detailing the historical use of the part of the site to be surrendered and the results of recent intrusive sampling. We have reviewed the report and conclude that the soil contaminants at elevated levels in two locations are bound into the soil matrix and are unlikely to impact on the surrounding environment and are at concentrations within the normal range for background at urban/industrial sites. It should be noted that this review has been based on the site in an industrial setting and makes no assumptions about the future use of the area to be surrendered.

In April 2015 the applicant submitted further evidence and confirmation that no further contamination of the area of the installation to be surrendered had occurred in the period since September 2013.

Only minor oil leaks from burst hydraulic hoses were reported in this area during the time between the 2013 application and operations finally ceasing in November 2014. Evidence of this is provided through a summary printout of environmental incidents for the Low Yard (Incidents in Low Yard between Jan 2013 and Dec 2014). No damage to the surface was recorded and no remedial repairs required. The original risk assessment is therefore still valid. Photographs of the area are included.

The new Outlet 21 plant was finally fully commissioned and signed off in March 2015.

The Area Officer has confirmed the situation is acceptable.

Annex 1: decision checklist

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

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met
		Yes
Receipt of submission		
Confidential information	A claim for commercial or industrial confidentiality has not been made.	✓
The facility		
The regulated facility	<p>The permitted regulated facilities have changed as a result of the partial surrender.</p> <p>No permitted activities have changed as a result of this partial surrender.</p> <p>However, the relocation of the W9 (outlet 21) for emissions to water is confirmed by removal of reference to use of the old alternative position W9a which was permitted during the relocation period.</p>	✓
The permit conditions		
Changes to permit conditions	<p>The permit conditions have not changed as a result of the partial surrender.</p> <p>Site changes to allow the partial surrender were permitted under Variation EPR/UP3130FF/V005 in December 2013.</p>	✓
The site		
Extent of the surrender application	<p>The operator has provided a plan showing the extent of the site of the facility that is to be surrendered.</p> <p>After a request for confirmation of the extent of the area to be surrendered to the West of Hunshelf road, we consider this plan to be satisfactory.</p>	✓
Pollution risk	We are satisfied that the necessary measures have been taken to avoid a pollution risk resulting from the operation of the regulated facility.	✓
Satisfactory state	<p>We are satisfied that the necessary measures have been taken to return the site of the regulated facility to a satisfactory state.</p> <p>In coming to this decision we have had regard to the state of the site before the facility was put into operation and the factors described in our regulatory guidance note RGN9.</p>	✓