

# Permitting decisions

## Bespoke permit

---

We have decided to grant the permit for Heywood Oil Recovery operated by Crown Oil (Environmental) Limited.

The permit number is EPR/TP3732WR.

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 provides a record of the decision making process. It summarises the decision making process in the decision checklist to show how all relevant factors have been taken in to account.

This decision document provides a record of the decision making process. It:

- highlights key issues in the determination
- summarises the decision making process in the decision checklist to show how all relevant factors have been taken into account
- shows how we have considered the consultation responses.

Unless the decision document specifies otherwise we have accepted the applicant's proposals.

Read the permitting decisions in conjunction with the environmental permit. The introductory note summarises what the permit covers.

## Decision checklist

Aspect considered	Decision
<b>Receipt of application</b>	
Confidential information	A claim for commercial or industrial confidentiality has not been made. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on confidentiality.
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 confidentiality.
<b>Consultation</b>	
Consultation	The consultation requirements were identified in accordance with the Environmental Permitting Regulations and our public participation statement. The application was publicised on the GOV.UK website. We consulted the following organisations: United Utilities plc Canal & River Trust Food Standards Agency Manchester Fire Service Health & Safety Executive Public Health England Department for Public Health/Local Authority The comments and our responses are summarised in the <a href="#">consultation section</a> .
<b>Operator</b>	
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 our guidance on legal operator for environmental permits.
<b>The facility</b>	
The regulated facility	We considered the extent and nature of the facility at the site in accordance with RGN2 'Understanding the meaning of regulated facility', Appendix 2 of RGN 2 'Defining the scope of the installation', Appendix 1 of RGN 2 'Interpretation of Schedule 1', guidance on waste recovery plans and permits. The extent of the facility is defined in the site plan and in the permit. The activities are defined in table S1.1 of the permit.

Aspect considered	Decision
<b>The site</b>	
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 including the discharge points and the location of the installation to which this permit applies. The plan is included in the permit.
Site condition report	The operator has provided a description of the condition of the site, which we consider is satisfactory. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on site condition reports and baseline reporting under the Industrial Emissions Directive.
Biodiversity, heritage, landscape and nature conservation	<p>The application is within the relevant distance criteria of a nature conservation site and protected habitat.</p> <p>We have assessed the application and its potential to affect all known sites of nature conservation and protected habitat identified in the nature conservation screening report as part of the permitting process.</p> <p>We consider that the application will not affect any sites of nature conservation and protected habitat identified.</p> <p>We have not consulted Natural England on the application. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance.</p>
<b>Environmental risk assessment</b>	
Environmental risk	<p>We have reviewed the operator's assessment of the environmental risk from the facility.</p> <p>The operator's risk assessment is satisfactory.</p>
<b>Operating techniques</b>	
General operating techniques	<p>We have reviewed the techniques used by the operator and compared these with the relevant guidance notes and we consider them to represent appropriate techniques for the facility.</p> <p>The operating techniques that the applicant must use are specified in table S1.2 in the environmental permit.</p>
Operating techniques for emissions that screen out as insignificant	<p>Emissions have been screened out as insignificant, and so we agree that the applicant's proposed techniques are BAT for the installation.</p> <p>We consider that any emission limits included in the installation permit reflect the BAT for the sector.</p>
<b>Permit conditions</b>	
Use of conditions other than those from the template	Based on the information in the application, we consider that we do not need to impose conditions other than those in our permit template.
Waste types	We have specified the permitted waste types, descriptions and quantities, which can be accepted at the regulated facility.

Aspect considered	Decision
	<p>We are satisfied that the operator can accept these wastes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• they are suitable for the proposed activities</li> <li>• the proposed infrastructure is appropriate</li> <li>• the environmental risk assessment is acceptable.</li> </ul> <p>We made these decisions with respect to waste types in accordance with Sector Guidance Note S5.06.</p>
Pre-operational conditions	<p>Based on the information in the application, we consider that we need to impose pre-operational conditions.</p> <p>The conditions relate to the implementation of an Environmental Management System and presence of a qualified (HNC or equivalent) site based chemist in accord with Best Available Techniques (BAT).</p>
Improvement programme	<p>Based on the information in the application, we consider that we need to impose an improvement programme.</p> <p>We have imposed an improvement programme to ensure that: WAMITAB is obtained as stated by the operator in their application and that all bunding meets the relevant and appropriate standard to ensure BAT is upheld on site.</p>
Emission limits	We have decided that emission limits are not required in the permit.
Monitoring	We have decided that monitoring does not need to be carried out.
Reporting	We have specified reporting in the permit.
<b>Operator competence</b>	
Management system	<p>There is no known reason to consider that the operator will not have the management system to enable it to comply with the permit conditions.</p> <p>The decision was taken in accordance with the guidance on operator competence and how to develop a management system for environmental permits.</p>
Technical competence	We are satisfied that the operator is technically competent.
Relevant convictions	No relevant convictions were found. The operator satisfies the criteria in our guidance on operator competence.
Financial competence	There is no known reason to consider that the operator will not be financially able to comply with the permit conditions.

# Consultation

The following summarises the responses to consultation with other organisations, our notice on GOV.UK for the public and the way in which we have considered these in the determination process.

## Responses from organisations listed in the consultation section

<b>Response received from</b>
Public Health England
<b>Brief summary of issues raised</b>
<p>We recommend that any Environmental Permit issued for this site should contain conditions to ensure that the following potential emissions do not impact upon public health: emissions to air.</p> <p>Based solely on the information contained in the application provided, PHE has no significant concerns regarding risk to health of the local population from this proposed activity, providing that the applicant takes all appropriate measures to prevent or control pollution, in accordance with the relevant sector technical guidance or industry best practice.</p>
<b>Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered</b>
<p>We have reviewed the applicant's submission including assessment of emissions, agreeing with the conclusion that emissions can be deemed to be insignificant from the activities undertaken on site.</p> <p>We have included provision of process monitoring to ensure that the bio-filters are regularly checked and monitored to ensure optimal performance is maintained.</p>

<b>Response received from</b>
Greater Manchester Fire & Rescue Service
<b>Brief summary of issues raised</b>
Incomplete action plan from fire risk assessment.
<b>Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered</b>
The points raised within the fire risk assessment fall outside of our remit. The operator has satisfactorily provided a risk assessment and procedures for instances of fire on site which the Environment Agency has reviewed and included within the operating techniques table S2.1.

<b>Response received from</b>
Canal & River Trust.
<b>Brief summary of issues raised</b>
No concerns.
<b>Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered</b>
N/A