

Review of an Environmental Permit under the Environmental Permitting (England & Wales) Regulations 2016 (“EPR”)

Decision document recording our decision-making process

We have decided to vary the Permit for Sharneyford Works operated by Brosters Environmental Limited as a result of an application made by the Operator.

The Permit number is EPR/DB3107XR.

The Variation notice number is EPR/DB3107XR/V002.

What this document is about

This is a decision document, which accompanies a variation notice.

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.

Preliminary information and use of terms

We refer to the Permit (both existing and as varied) as “the **Permit**” in this document; and to the variation of the Permit as “the **Variation**”.

The Operator of the Installation is Brosters Environmental Limited: we call Brosters Environmental Limited “the **Operator**” in this document. We refer to Brosters Environmental Limited’s Sharneyford Works as “the **Installation**”.

The Application was duly made on 17/09/2014.

How this document is structured

- Our decision
- The legal framework
- How we took our decision
- Key issues in the determination
- Annex 1 – the decision checklist

Our decision

We have issued a Variation, which will allow the Operator to operate their facility as an Installation, subject to the conditions in the varied Permit.

This Variation does several different things:

- **First**, it gives effect to our decisions following the identification of the Operator as undertaking a “newly prescribed activity” (NPA) under the Industrial Emissions Directive (IED);
- **Second**, it takes the opportunity to bring earlier variations into an up-to-date, consolidated Permit. The consolidated Permit should be easier to understand and use; and
- **Third**, it modernises the entire Permit to reflect our current template. The template reflects our modern regulatory permitting philosophy and was introduced because of a change in the governing legislation. This took place when the Pollution Prevention and Control (England and Wales) Regulations 2000 (“PPC”) were replaced in 2008 by a new statutory regime under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2007 (now the 2016 version).

The introduction of new template conditions makes the Permit consistent with our current general approach and philosophy. Although the wording of some conditions has changed, while others have disappeared because of the new regulatory approach, it does not affect the level of environmental protection achieved by the Permit in any way.

We consider that, in reaching our decision, we have taken into account all relevant considerations and legal requirements and that the Permit will continue to ensure that a high level of protection is provided for the environment and human health.

The original Permit, issued on 29/03/2007, ensured that the facility, would be operated in a manner which would ensure the protection of the environment specified in the existing Guidance at the time. To the extent that we have substantively altered the Permit as a result of this variation, the new requirements will deliver a higher level of protection to that which was previously achieved.

As we explained above, we do not address changes to the Permit in this document, to the extent that they give effect to either the consolidation of earlier variations, or introduce new template conditions.

The legal framework

The original Permit was granted on 29/03/2007 under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and regulated under the Waste Management Licensing Regulations 1994.

The Installation will be subject to the requirements of the Industrial Emissions Directive (IED) 2010/75/EU and regulated under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016). The IED was transposed in England and Wales by the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales)(Amendment) Regulations 2013 on 27 February 2013.

The IED seeks to achieve a high level of protection for the environment taken as a whole from harmful effects of industrial activities. It does so by requiring each of the industrial installations to have a permit from the competent authority (in England, the Environment Agency, or for smaller Installations, the relevant Local Authority). The IED has increased the number of activities that require an Installations permit. These are predominantly regulated as “waste operations” and include (when exceeding specific thresholds described in IED):

- hazardous waste treatment for recovery;
- hazardous waste storage;
- biowaste treatment – recovery and/or disposal;
- treatment of slags and ashes
- metals shredding;
- pre-treatment of waste for incineration/co-incineration;
- biological production of chemicals; and
- independently operated wastewater treatment works serving only industrial activities subject to the Directive

Article 11 of the IED requires the relevant authority (the Environment Agency in this case) to ensure that the Installation is operated in such a way that all the appropriate preventative measures are taken against pollution, in particular through the application of Best Available Techniques (BAT). Under Article 15(2), the Permit must contain emission limit values (ELVs) (or equivalent parameters or technical measures) for any pollutants likely to be emitted from the Installation in significant quantities. These ELVs are to be based on BAT, but also on local factors and EU Environmental Quality Standards. The overarching requirement is to ensure a high level of protection for the environment and human health.

We are required by Article 13 of the IED to keep abreast of developments in BAT. In addition, Article 13 requires us to carry out a periodic review of the permit’s conditions, and to update them if necessary.

The IED also requires the European Commission to organise an exchange of information between EU Member States so that what are known as BAT reference documents (or BREF notes) can be published, creating a level playing field across the EU, providing a consistent set of standards for new plant, to which regulatory authorities in the Member States can then have

reference. These BREF notes are the basis for our own national sector technical guidance. The Commission is also required to update BREF notes on a regular basis. The waste treatment BREF notes are currently being reviewed and a final issue date is anticipated in 2016. Under the IED, all permits will be subject to review within four years of the publication of revised BREF notes. This means that we will need to do a further review against any new standards in the BREF notes at some time in the future.

The IED is to be implemented over several years commencing from 7 January 2013. For existing installations operating “newly prescribed activities”, the relevant date for implementation was 7 July 2015.

How we reached our decision

It is the Operators responsibility to ensure they are correctly regulated for the activities they are carrying out. Following adoption of the IED, the Environment Agency has engaged in a range of briefings and communications with the waste industry sector to raise awareness of the implications of the Directive and the need to ensure their facilities are correctly regulated (particularly after the implementation date of 7 July 2015 for newly prescribed activities).

Early in 2014, the Environment Agency provided further briefings to industry trade bodies and wrote to operators we believed may be implicated by these changes. We provided detailed information sheets that described the implications and the process operators should follow if they decided to have their activities permitted as Installations.

We confirmed that most facilities fell into one of two groups:

- Facilities permitted from April 2007
When these facilities were permitted, a thorough assessment would have been carried out to confirm whether the proposed activities were using “appropriate measures” as a standard to protect the environment.

This standard of protection is the same standards that would have been assessed against had the facilities applied as an Installation activity (i.e. BAT). The permit would have also been issued with modern conditions that ensured protection of the environment.

We consider that these facilities are effectively ‘IED-compliant’ in terms of the technical standard of the facility with the exception of the “newly prescribed activity”. For these facilities, we consider that, in general, no further technical assessment is required, so administrative variations are an appropriate mechanism to show the activities as Installation activities. The administrative variation is a necessary route for the Operator to formally ask for this activity to be included in their permit and for us to advertise that request on our Public Register.

It is understood that the Environment Agency granted permits for new waste activities under the Waste Management Licensing Regulations

1994 beyond April 2007. Where a facility falls into this group, the Environment Agency shall determine whether or not the application was assessed using “appropriate measures”. Where it is determined that the application was assessed using “appropriate measures”, the application will be designated as an “administrative variation”.

- Facilities permitted before April 2007
For these facilities, a “normal” or “substantial” variation is appropriate because a detailed technical assessment is required on aspects of the Application in addition to the administrative changes. Substantial variations will only be relevant where the newly prescribed activity is being added to an existing installation permit.

This Variation

The original Permit was granted on 29/03/2007 and subsequently varied on 13/09/2007, 16/07/2008, 16/06/2010 and transferred on 25/06/2015. We have reviewed the documentation submitted in support of the original permit and subsequent variation applications in this determination. We are not satisfied that the standard of protection was assessed using appropriate measures. We have determined this Application as a normal variation. As the Variation will not have any negative effects on the environment, it is not a substantial variation and so does not require consulting on.

Key issues in the determination

The original Permit was granted on 29 March 2007 and issued under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 as a Waste Management Licence. The activities were not assessed against BAT/Appropriate measures, therefore we requested that the appropriate assessment should be carried out to address the following:

- pre-acceptance of waste
- acceptance of waste
- storage and handling of waste
- process (treatment) description
- fugitive emissions to air
- fugitive emissions to surface and groundwater (secondary containment, site drainage plan)
- odour management
- point source emissions to air, water or land (where relevant)
- monitoring
- accidents

The following standards needed to be met:

- IPPC S5.06 – Guidance for the Treatment of Hazardous and Non-Hazardous Waste.

Waste types

We have added the following waste code at the request of the operator:
19 12 12 - other wastes (including mixtures of materials) from mechanical treatment of wastes other than those mentioned in 19 12 11 (and only including wastes types listed in this table)

This waste code has been deemed suitable for in-vessel composting.

Removal of waste activity

We have removed the following waste operation – storage of end-of-life tyres that comply with PAS 108 – as it was included unnecessarily as a waste operation. The tyres meet end of waste criteria - they are a PAS product – and so are outside of our regulatory control. Furthermore, it is not an on-going activity – it was carried out once in order to make the embankment around the biofilter. Any further upkeep will involve the use of pre-formed concrete slabs.

Annex 1 – decision checklist

This document should be read in conjunction with the Duly Making checklist, the application and supporting information and 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.	✓
Consultation		
Responses to web publicising	The application was published on the internet. We did not receive any responses.	✓
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.	✓
The facility		
The regulated facility	<p>The extent/nature of the facilities taking place at the site required clarification.</p> <p>S5.4 A(1) (b) (i) Recovery or a mix of recovery and disposal of non-hazardous waste with a capacity exceeding 75 tonnes per day involving biological treatment.</p> <p>Directly Associated Activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Storage of waste pending recovery or disposal • Physical treatment for the purposed of recycling • Raw material storage • Compost storage • Process water collection, storage and disposal 	✓
European Directives		
Applicable Directives	All applicable European Directives have been considered in the determination of the application.	✓

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met
		Yes
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.	✓
Biodiversity, Heritage, Landscape and Nature Conservation	The application is within the relevant distance criteria of a site of heritage, landscape or nature conservation, and/or protected species or habitat. There are no changes to the activities taking place on site. We have not formally consulted on the application. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance.	✓
The permit conditions		
Updating permit conditions during consolidation	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(s).	✓
Raw materials	We have specified limits and controls on the use of raw materials and fuels.	✓
Waste types	We have specified the permitted waste types, descriptions and quantities, which can be accepted at the regulated facility. We are satisfied that the operator can accept these wastes because they have the necessary infrastructure, operating systems and technical capability to manage these wastes in an appropriate manner. We have added the following waste code at the request of the operator: 19 12 12 - other wastes (including mixtures of materials) from mechanical treatment of wastes other than those mentioned in 19 12 11 (and only including wastes types listed in this table) This had been deemed suitable for in-vessel composting. We have removed the following waste code - 16 01 03. This is because the end-of-life tyres comply with PAS and so are not considered to be waste.	✓

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met
		Yes
Incorporating the application	We have specified that the operator 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 emission limits should be set for the parameters listed in the permit. The following bioaerosols - Total bacteria and Aspergillus fumigatus have been identified as being emitted in significant quantities and ELV's and/or equivalent parameters or technical measures based on BAT have been set for these substances and others.	✓
Monitoring	We have decided that monitoring should be carried out for the parameters listed in the permit, using the methods detailed and to the frequencies specified. These monitoring requirements have been imposed in order to demonstrate compliance with the conditions of the permit for operations requiring the management of bioaerosols emissions. We made these decisions in accordance with Technical Guidance Note M9 – Environmental monitoring of bioaerosols at regulated facilities. Based on the information in the application we are satisfied that the operator's techniques, personnel and equipment have either MCERTS certification or MCERTS accreditation as appropriate.	✓
Reporting	We have specified reporting in the permit.	✓
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.	✓
Growth Duty		
Section 108 Deregulation Act 2015 – Growth duty	We have considered our duty to have regard to the desirability of promoting economic growth set out in section 108(1) of the Deregulation Act 2015 and the	✓

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met
		Yes
	<p>guidance issued under section 110 of that Act in deciding whether to vary this permit.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.3 of the guidance says:</p> <p>“The primary role of regulators, in delivering regulation, is to achieve the regulatory outcomes for which they are responsible. For a number of regulators, these regulatory outcomes include an explicit reference to development or growth. The growth duty establishes economic growth as a factor that all specified regulators should have regard to, alongside the delivery of the protections set out in the relevant legislation.”</p> <p>We have addressed the legislative requirements and environmental standards to be set for this operation in the body of the decision document above. The guidance is clear at paragraph 1.5 that the growth duty does not legitimise non-compliance and its purpose is not to achieve or pursue economic growth at the expense of necessary protections.</p> <p>We consider the requirements and standards we have set in this permit are reasonable and necessary to avoid a risk of an unacceptable level of pollution. This also promotes growth amongst legitimate operators because the standards applied to the operator are consistent across businesses in this sector and have been set to achieve the required legislative standards.</p>	