

Application SCR evaluation template

Name of activity, address and NGR	Tata Chemicals Europe Limited. Winnington Site, Winnington Lane, Northwich, CW8 4DT. Ordinance Survey SJ683742
-----------------------------------	--

Document reference of application SCR	Brunner Mond (UK) Limited Application Site Report.
---------------------------------------	--

Date and version of application SCR	May 2005.
-------------------------------------	-----------

1.0 Site details	
To be completed by NPS officers (Source)	
Has the applicant provided the following information as required by the application SCR template?	
Site plans showing site layout, drainage, surfacing, receptors, sources of emissions/releases and monitoring points	
Yes. See Previously submitted and Pre-application discussion documents	

2.0 Condition of the land at permit issue	
To be completed by GWCL officers (Receptor)	
Has the applicant provided the following information as required by the application SCR template?	
a) Environmental setting including:	
Geology	
Yes. See section 5.2 of SCR.	
Based on the information provided and published geological mapping the site (Wallerscote Island) appears to be underlain by made ground, typically comprised of spent lime, ash, clinker and concrete, drift deposits comprised of fluivo-glacial deposits (sand and gravel) designated a Secondary A aquifer and bedrock comprised of Mercia Mudstone designated a Secondary B aquifer.	
Hydrogeology an Hydrology	
Yes. See sections 5.3 and 5.4 of original SCR.	
Based on the information provided and our records the site (Wallerscote Island) appears to be underlain by a laterally discontinuous perched groundwater body within the made ground deposits which is likely to be in hydraulic continuity with the shallow groundwater in the underlying fluvio-glacial deposits. Given the inferred groundwater flow direction is west / north west it is likely that the shallow groundwater will be hydraulic continuity with the Weaver Navigation channel located adjacent to the northern site boundary.	
The Weaver Navigation and River Weaver are located adjacent to the north and south of the site, respectively.	
b) Pollution history including:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pollution incidents that may have affected land 	
Yes. See section 2.3.12 of site reconnaissance report included with original permit application	
No specific pollution incidents were reported to have occurred on the site (Wallerscote Island).	

2.0 Condition of the land at permit issue

To be completed by GWCL officers
(Receptor)

Has the applicant provided the following information as required by the application SCR template?

- historical land-uses and associated contaminants

Yes. See section 6.2.2 of SCR submitted with original application.

In summary, the site (Wallerscote Island) was part of the larger Wallerscote works which commenced operations as a soda ash works in the 1920s. Potentially contaminative land uses which are reported to have occurred prior to issue of the permit are the presence of former railway sidings previously located in the north part of the site and a small polythene manufacturing plant and testing facility for fire extinguishers and an above ground fuel storage tank previously located in the southern part of the site. Associated contaminants are likely to have included hydrocarbons, metals and volatile organic compounds.

- visual/olfactory evidence of existing contamination

Yes. See section 2.3.8 of site reconnaissance report included with original permit application.

No record of visual / olfactory evidence of contamination was noted during the site walkover of Wallerscote Island (referred to as Zone 1).

- evidence of damage to existing pollution prevention measures

Yes. See section 2.3.3 of site reconnaissance report included with original permit application.

No evidence of damage to existing pollution prevention measures was noted during the site walkover of Wallerscote Island (referred to as Zone 1). Relevant infrastructure and activities taking place at Wallerscote Island included soda ash off-loading, 5 x storage silo's, soda ash tanker loading facilities and a soda ash bicarb recovery plant.

c) Evidence of historic contamination (i.e. historical site investigation, assessment, remediation and verification reports (where available))

Yes. See section 10 of SCR.

Section 10 made reference to three previous reports which had been completed to assess the condition of the soil and groundwater beneath the site.

d) Has the applicant chosen to collect baseline reference data?

No. Given the activities for Zone 1 were limited to the storage and handling of soda ash the Operator choose not to establish baseline reference data.

3.0 Permitted activities

To be completed by NPS officers
(Source)

Has the applicant provided the following information as required by the application SCR template?

Response
(Specify what information is needed from the applicant, if any)

a) Permitted activities

b) Non-permitted activities undertaken at the site

The submitted Site Condition Report information includes 3 scheduled activities
S3.1A(1)(b) Producing lime or magnesium oxide in Kilns with a production capacity of more than 50 tonnes a day'.
4.2A(1)(a) 'Producing inorganic chemicals such as (iv) salts...
5.4A(1)(a) Disposal of non-hazardous waste with a capacity exceeding 50 tonnes per day (or 100 tonnes per day if the only waste treatment in anaerobic digestion) involving one or more of the following

3.0 Permitted activities To be completed by NPS officers (Source)	
Has the applicant provided the following information as required by the application SCR template?	Response (Specify what information is needed from the applicant, if any)
<p>activities, and excluding activities covered by Council Directive 91/271/EEC concerning urban waste-water treatment- (ii) Physico-chemical treatment. And a number of directly associated activities for storage and integrated operation of the Solvay/ammonia-soda process.</p> <p>There are no significant non-permitted activities.</p>	

3.0(a) Environmental Risk Assessment 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.	
<p>The pollution history of the site was provided in the application site report. Improvement Conditions were added to the permit to require:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • submission of a Site Protection and Monitoring Plan • a review of environmentally critical stock tanks and bunds • various investigations into measures to prevent releases to water • investigations into the techniques required to ensure that releases from the Installation shall not cause a failure of the designated stretches of the River Weaver downstream of the Installation 	

3.0(b) Will the pollution prevention measures protect land and groundwater? To be completed by EM/PPC officers (Conceptual model)	
Are the activities likely to result in pollution of land? No	
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?	N/A

Application SCR decision summary To be completed by GWCL officer and returned to NPS	Tick relevant decision
Sufficient information has been supplied to describe the condition of the site at permit issue	X
Information is missing- the following information must be obtained from the applicant	
Pollution of land and water is unlikely; or	X
Pollution of land and water is likely	
Historical contamination is present- advise operator that collection of background data may be appropriate	
Date and name of reviewer:	<i>14th August 2015</i>

Lindsey Berends

Operational phase SCR evaluation template

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

4.0 Changes to the activities (Source)	
Have there been any changes to the following during the operation of the site?	Response (Specify what information is needed from the applicant, if any)
a) Activity boundaries b) Permitted activities c) "Dangerous substances" used or produced	
No .	

5.0 Measures taken to protect land 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?
Maintenance measures and operational procedures have been described

6.0 Pollution incidents that may have impacted on land and their remediation 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)?
Yes. Incident log extract provided showing only 1 relevant minor incident with investigation and recommendation to prevent recurrence.

7.0 Soil gas and water quality monitoring (where relevant)
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?
No soil gas or water quality monitoring has been undertaken in this area.

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?
<p>There is no change to the activities table in the permit from the partial surrender of Wallerscote island.</p> <p>The Wallerscote Island site has been decontaminated and sources of pollution removed EXCEPT for approx 775 tonnes of residual sodium carbonate adhering strongly to the inner walls of 4 of the 5 storage silos. .</p> <p>The applicant claims that this material was present before and throughout the time of the EPR (and IPPC) permit and therefore should be classed as historical and not liable to clean up before partial surrender of this permit.</p>

9.0 Reference data and remediation (where relevant)
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?
<p>(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.</p>
<p>No. When the site was originally zoned it was concluded that Zone 1 (Wallerscote Island) did not pose a reasonable possibility of pollution therefore no baseline reference data was established. Given the permitted activities were restricted to the handling and storage of soda ash and evidence has been provided within sections 4.0 – 7.0 to demonstrate that the condition of the soil and/or groundwater is unlikely to have deteriorated during the life of permit including decommissioning activities we do not require the applicant to collect surrender intrusive reference data.</p>

10.0a Statement of site condition
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?
<p>Yes. All permitted activities have ceased. The Wallerscote Island site has been decontaminated and sources of pollution removed EXCEPT for approx 775 tonnes of residual sodium carbonate adhering strongly to the inner walls of 4 of the 5 storage silos. .</p> <p>The applicant claims that this material was present before and throughout the time of the EPR (and IPPC) permit and therefore should be classed as historical and not liable to clean up before partial surrender of this permit.</p>

10.0b Statement of site condition
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?

Yes. See section of 5 of surrender SCR.

Having reviewed the information provided we are satisfied that all sources of pollution risk have been removed and the site is in a satisfactory state to be surrendered. However, as documented within section 5.6 of the surrender SCR ~775 tonnes of historical residual sodium carbonate is still present within silo's 2 – 5 on Wallerscote Island. Given this material pre-dates issue of the permit we cannot hold the Operator responsible for the removal of these residues during the determination of this partial surrender. It is likely that other historical contamination is present on site given the previous uses of the site and this will be addressed along with the removal of the residual material within the tanks during the re-development of the wider site which is currently on-going.

Surrender SCR decision summary 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	X
Insufficient information has been supplied to show that pollution risk has been removed or that the site is in a satisfactory state – do not accept the application to surrender the permit. The following information must to be obtained from the applicant before the permit is determined:	
Date and name of reviewer <i>Lindsey Berends 14th August 2015</i>	