

Environment Agency permitting decisions

Surrender

We have decided to accept the surrender of the permit for **Edmonton Clinical Waste Treatment Centre** operated by LondonWaste Limited.

The permit number is EPR/UP3233FR.

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

Structure of this document

- Key issues
- Annex 1 the decision checklist.

Key issues

We are satisfied that the permit may be surrendered and that any pollution found at a future date can be considered for remediation as part of the planning permission.

We were unable to fully establish if the site has been returned to the same state as it was prior to the clinical waste operations commencing. The activities at the site date back to late 1960's and the Site Protection and Monitoring Plan (SPMP) produced for the PPC permit in 2007/8, identified no reason to collect reference (baseline) data. Therefore no data was available to ascertain if any deterioration may have occurred during operation of the clinical waste facility.

To demonstrate that the operation has not lead to deterioration of the land the operator showed that the operations were undertaken in a building, on concrete pad outside the building and the only underground structures were sewer and surface water drains. In addition a geological and site investigation undertaken for the adjacent Energy from Waste plant did not find pollution in the groundwater in the sample location close to the installation boundary (report LWL108).

The operator's drain survey showed that some of the pipes were damaged or disconnected. As no site investigation fully characterises the site and not all of the site area was accessible during the investigations to date, as a precautionary measure the Environment Agency advised that all the drains be secured. The operator as a result has investigated the drains and has repaired areas of concern in agreement with the Environment Agency. The repair reports indicated that the drainage infrastructure associated with the installation activities have been emptied, and purged, but not removed.

The drain repair report demonstrated that by repairing the drains the operator has treated or immobilised previous contamination remedying any harm the contamination may have caused. Therefore, the operator has mitigated the effects of any harm by sealing the cracks in the drains thus further infiltration and percolation should reduce the leaching and flushing of contaminants that are sorbed on the unsaturated soils beneath the drains.

It has not been possible to reinstate the site back to its original condition before the facility was put into operation due to the lack of a baseline information. However based on the information provided - the soil and groundwater data would not warrant actions under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in its current state due to the current land use. Should the conceptual model change however, (for example a proposed change in land use, infrastructure, or deterioration of current infrastructure and concrete hardstanding) remediation may be required. For example, if a planning application was submitted for the site, based on the information provided, the Environment Agency would recommend the use of the land affected by contamination conditions to be used on the planning consent.

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
Receipt of submission		
Confidential information	A claim for commercial or industrial confidentiality has not been made.	✓
Identifying confidential information	We have not identified information provided as part of the application that we consider to be confidential. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on commercial confidentiality.	✓
The site		
Extent of the surrender application	The operator has provided a plan showing the extent of the site of the facility that is to be surrendered. We consider this plan to be satisfactory.	✓
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. Given the lack of baseline data, we have taken a risk based decision to allow the permit may be surrendered; any pollution identified at a future date can be considered for remediation as part of the planning permission.	✓
Satisfactory state	Based on the limited knowledge of the site history and having considered the risks, we are able to accept the surrender of the permit for the regulated facility and allow any future identified contamination to be rectified as part of the planning permission.	✓