

Determination of an Application for an Environmental Permit under the Environmental Permitting (England & Wales) Regulations 2016

Decision document recording our decision-making process

The Permit Number is: EPR/MP3235CC
The Operator is: JG Pears Power (O&M) Ltd
The Installation is located at: Marnham Road, Low Marnham, Newark, Notts NG23 6SP

What this document is about

This is a decision document, which accompanies a permit.

It explains how we have considered the Applicant's Application, and why we have included the specific conditions in the permit we are issuing to the Applicant. It is our record of our decision-making process, to show how we have taken into account all relevant factors in reaching our position. Unless the document explains otherwise, we have accepted the Applicant's proposals.

We try to explain our decision as accurately, comprehensively and plainly as possible. Achieving all three objectives is not always easy, and we would welcome any feedback as to how we might improve our decision documents in future. A lot of technical terms and acronyms are inevitable in a document of this nature: we provide a glossary of acronyms near the front of the document, for ease of reference.

Preliminary information and use of terms

We gave the application the reference number EPR/MP3235CC/A001. We refer to the application as "the **Application**" in this document in order to be consistent.

The number we have given to the permit is EPR/MP3235CC. We refer to the permit as "the **Permit**" in this document.

The Application was duly made on 30th November 2016.

The Applicant is JG Pears Power (O&M) Ltd. We refer to JG Pears Power (O&M) Ltd as "the **Applicant**" in this document. Where we are talking about what would happen after the Permit is granted (if that is our final decision), we call JG Pears Power (O&M) Ltd "the **Operator**".

JG Pears Power (O&M) Ltd's proposed facility is located at Marnham Road, Low Marnham, Newark, Nottinghamshire. We refer to this as "the **Installation**" in this document.

How this document is structured

- Glossary of acronyms
- Our proposed decision
- How we reached our decision
- The legal framework
- The Installation
 - Description of the Installation and general issues
 - The site and its protection
 - Operation of the Installation – general issues
- Minimising the installation's environmental impact
 - Assessment Methodology
 - Air Quality Assessment
 - Human health risk assessment
 - Impact on Habitats sites, SSSIs, non-statutory conservation sites etc.
 - Impact of abnormal operations
- Application of Best Available Techniques
 - Scope of Consideration
 - BAT and emissions control
 - BAT and global warming potential
 - BAT and POPs
 - Other Emissions to the Environment
 - Setting ELVs and other Permit conditions
 - Monitoring
 - Reporting
- Other legal requirements
 - The EPR 2010 (as amended) and related Directives
 - National primary legislation
 - National secondary legislation
 - Other relevant legal requirements
- Annexes
 - Application of the Industrial Emissions Directive
 - Pre-Operational Conditions
 - Improvement Conditions
 - Consultation Responses

Glossary of acronyms used in this document

(Please note that this glossary is standard for our decision documents and therefore not all these acronyms are necessarily used in this document.)

AAD	Ambient Air Directive (2008/50/EC)
APC	Air Pollution Control
AQS	Air Quality Strategy
BAT	Best Available Technique(s)
BAT-AEL	BAT Associated Emission Level
BREF	BAT Reference Note
CEM	Continuous emissions monitor
CFD	Computerised fluid dynamics
CHP	Combined heat and power
COMEAP	Committee on the Medical Effects of Air Pollutants
CROW	Countryside and rights of way Act 2000
CV	Calorific value
DAA	Directly associated activity – Additional activities necessary to be carried out to allow the principal activity to be carried out
DD	Decision document
EAL	Environmental assessment level
EIAD	Environmental Impact Assessment Directive (85/337/EEC)
ELV	Emission limit value
EMS	Environmental Management System
EPR	Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010 (SI 2010 No. 675) as amended
ES	Environmental standard
EWC	European waste catalogue
FSA	Food Standards Agency
GWP	Global Warming Potential
HHRAP	Human Health Risk Assessment Protocol
HRA	Human Rights Act 1998
IBA	Incinerator Bottom Ash
IED	Industrial Emissions Directive (2010/75/EU)
IPPCD	Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control Directive (2008/1/EC) – now superseded by IED
I-TEF	Toxic Equivalent Factors set out in Annex VI Part 2 of IED
LCV	Lower calorific value – also termed net calorific value

LADPH	Local Authority Director(s) of Public Health
LOI	Loss on Ignition
MSW	Municipal Solid Waste
MWI	Municipal waste incinerator
NOx	Oxides of nitrogen (NO plus NO ₂ expressed as NO ₂)
Opra	Operator Performance Risk Appraisal
PAH	Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons
PC	Process Contribution
PCB	Polychlorinated biphenyls
PEC	Predicted Environmental Concentration
PHE	Public Health England
POP(s)	Persistent organic pollutant(s)
PPS	Public participation statement
PR	Public register
PXDD	Poly-halogenated di-benzo-p-dioxins
PXB	Poly-halogenated biphenyls
PXDF	Poly-halogenated di-benzo furans
RGS	Regulatory Guidance Series
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SCR	Selective catalytic reduction
SGN	Sector guidance note
SHPI(s)	Site(s) of High Public Interest
SNCR	Selective non-catalytic reduction
SPA(s)	Special Protection Area(s)
SSSI(s)	Site(s) of Special Scientific Interest
SWMA	Specified waste management activity
TDI	Tolerable daily intake
TEF	Toxic Equivalent Factors
TGN	Technical guidance note
TOC	Total Organic Carbon
WFD	Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC)
WHO	World Health Organisation
WID	Waste Incineration Directive (2000/76/EC) – now superseded by IED

1 Our decision

We have decided to grant the Permit to the Applicant. This will allow it to operate the Installation, subject to the conditions in the Permit.

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

This Application is to operate an installation which is subject principally to the Industrial Emissions Directive (IED).

The Permit contains many conditions taken from our standard Environmental Permit template including the relevant Annexes. We developed these conditions in consultation with industry, having regard to the legal requirements of the Environmental Permitting Regulations and other relevant legislation. This document does not therefore include an explanation for these standard conditions. Where they are included in the permit, we have considered the Application and accepted the details are sufficient and satisfactory to make the standard condition appropriate. This document does, however, provide an explanation of our use of “tailor-made” or installation-specific conditions, or where our Permit template provides two or more options.

2 How we reached our decision

2.1 Receipt of Application

The Application was duly made on 30/11/2016. This means we considered it was in the correct form and contained sufficient information for us to begin our determination but not that it necessarily contained all the information we would need to complete that determination: see section 2.3 below.

Schedule 5 was issued on 02/03/2017 information received on 09/03/2017, 22/03/2017 and 10/04/2017.

- Impact on air quality associated with abnormal operating conditions
- Abnormal operating conditions and the use of CEMs; Control of Dioxins & Furans and Metals of emissions to Air; Alkaline reagent dosing control;
- Noise Risk Assessment & Modelling Files

The Applicant made no claim for commercial confidentiality. We have not received any information in relation to the Application that appears to be confidential in relation to any party.

2.2 Consultation on the Application

We carried out consultation on the Application in accordance with the EPR, our statutory PPS and our own internal guidance RGS Note 6 for Determinations involving Sites of High Public Interest. We consider that this process satisfies, and frequently goes beyond the requirements of the Aarhus Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, which are directly incorporated into the IED, which applies to the Installation and the Application. We have also taken into account our obligations under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (particularly Section 23). This requires us, where we consider it appropriate, to take such steps as we consider appropriate to secure the involvement of representatives of interested persons in the exercise of our functions, by providing them with information, consulting them or involving them in any other way. In this case, our consultation already satisfies the Act's requirements.

We advertised the Application by a notice placed on GOV.UK for the public from the 07/12/16 to 07/01/2017, which contained all the information required by the IED, including telling people where and when they could see a copy of the Application.

We made a copy of the Application and all other documents relevant to our determination (see below) available to view on our Public Register at The Environment Agency, Trentside Office, Scarrington Road, Nottingham, NG2 5FA. Anyone wishing to see these documents could do so and arrange for copies to be made. We also made available electronic copies of the application on our Environment Agency's online consultation hub.

We sent a link to copies of the Application on our online consultation hub to the following bodies, which includes those with whom we have "Working Together Agreements":

- Director of Public Health
- Health and Safety Executive
- Foods Standards Agency
- Local Authority
- Public Health England
- Severn Trent

These are bodies whose expertise, democratic accountability and/or local knowledge make it appropriate for us to seek their views directly. Note under our Working Together Agreement with Natural England, we only inform Natural England of the results of our assessment of the impact of the installation on designated Habitats sites.

A summary of consultation comments and our response to the representations we received can be found in Annex 4. We have taken all relevant representations into consideration in reaching our determination.

2.3 Requests for Further Information

Although we were able to consider the Application duly made, we did in fact need more information in order to determine it, and issued an information notices on. A copy of the information notice was placed on our public register.

In addition to our information notices, we received additional information during the determination from:

- Email received on 25/05/2017 revised Fire Prevention Plan & use of waste heat and Article 14 of the Energy Efficiency Directive
- Email received on 5/06/17 regarding choice of reagent for SCR – NOx reduction.
- Email of 07/05/17 containing revised JG Pears OMP - Low Marnham v5 - May 17 final.pdf; Biofilter check and sheets.pdf; RTO checks.pdf; ETP Daily checksheet.pdf; MM1 - Odour-.pdf; MM2 - Odour response.pdf; OC1 - Odour Abatement Sys - issue 4.pdf
- Email received on 10/07/17 containing revised Fire Prevention Plan (V4 July 2017)
- Email received on 10/07/17 containing a revised Odour Management Plan (V.8.2 July 2017) and
- Email received on 12/07/17 containing revised Noise Management Plan (V0.4 July 2017)

We made a copy of this information available to the public in the same way as the responses to our information notices.

3 The legal framework

The Permit will be granted, if appropriate, under Regulation 13 of the EPR. The Environmental Permitting regime is a legal vehicle which delivers most of the relevant legal requirements for activities falling within its scope. In particular, the regulated facility is:

- an *installation* and a *waste co-incineration plant* as described by the IED;
- an *operation* covered by the WFD, and
- subject to aspects of other relevant legislation which also have to be addressed.

We address some of the major legal requirements directly where relevant in the body of this document. Other requirements are covered in a section towards the end of this document.

We consider that, in granting the Permit, it will ensure that the operation of the Installation complies with all relevant legal requirements and that a high level of protection will be delivered for the environment and human health.

We explain how we have addressed specific statutory requirements more fully in the rest of this document.

4 The Installation

4.1 Description of the Installation and related issues

4.1.1 The permitted activities

The Installation is subject to the EPR because it carries out an activity listed in Part 1 of Schedule 1 to the EPR:

- Section 5.1 Part A(1)(b) – incineration of non-hazardous waste in a waste incineration plant or waste co-incineration plant with a capacity of 3 tonnes or more per hour.

The IED definition of “waste incineration plants” and “waste co-incineration plants” says that it includes:

“all incineration lines or co-incineration lines, waste reception, storage, on-site pre-treatment facilities, waste, fuel and air supply systems, boilers, facilities for the treatment of waste gases, on-site facilities for treatment or storage of residues and waste water, stacks, devices for controlling incineration or co-incineration operations, recording and monitoring incineration or co-incineration conditions.”

Many activities which would normally be categorised as “directly associated activities” for EPR purposes (see below), such as air pollution control plant, and the ash storage bunker, are therefore included in the listed activity description.

An installation may also comprise “directly associated activities”, which at this Installation includes the generation of electricity using a steam turbine and a back up electricity generator for emergencies. These activities comprise one installation, because the incineration plant and the steam turbine are successive steps in an integrated activity.

Together, these listed and directly associated activities comprise the Installation.

4.1.2 The Site


The Applicant submitted a plan which we consider is satisfactory, showing the site of the Installation and its extent. A plan is included in Schedule 7 to the Permit, and the Operator is required to carry on the permitted activities within the site boundary.

Further information on the site is addressed below at 4.3.

4.1.3 What the Installation does

The Applicant has described the facility as combined heat and power plant. Our view is that for the purposes of IED (in particular Chapter IV) and EPR, the installation is a waste co-incineration plant because:

Notwithstanding the fact that waste will be thermally treated by the process; the process is never the less 'co-incineration' because it is considered that main purpose of this plant is the generation of energy, heat and steam for the adjacent Animal Rendering Facility.



The key features of the Installation can be summarised in the Table 1 below.

Waste throughput, Tonnes/line	Max 85,000 tonnes /annum	Nominal 9.5 tonnes /hour
Waste processed	Meat and Bone Meal (MBM) and wood pellets	
Number of lines	1	
Furnace technology	Travelling Grate Spreader	
Auxiliary Fuel	LPG/LNG	
Acid gas abatement	Dry	sodium bicarbonate
NOx abatement	SCR after the bag filter	Ammonia
Reagent consumption	Auxiliary Fuel up to 50000 te/annum Ammonia : 260 te/annum	

	NaHCO ₃ : 2080 te/annum Process water: 10,660 te/annum	
Flue gas recirculation	Yes	
Dioxin abatement	No additional measures	
Stack	Grid Reference 480359, 369199	
	Height, 50 m	Diameter, 1.45 m
Flue gas	Flow, 15.16 Nm ³ /s	Velocity, 14.59 m/s
	Temperature 131°C	
Electricity generated	7.9 MWe	19.3 MWth
Electricity exported to grid	3.8 MWe	Rising to 11MWe at weekends
Electricity exported to Animal rendering factory	3.0 MWe	
Steam conditions	Temperature, 482 °C	Pressure, 102 bara/MPa
Steam exported	55 tonnes/hour	high pressure superheated steam
	Temperature, 482 °C	
Waste heat use	Electrical energy and steam are provided to the adjacent animal rendering facility	

- Solid fuels are delivered to the plant by road and stored in purpose built fuel storage silos for MBM and wood pellets. Additional storage of MBM is provided inside the fuel reception building.
- Fuel is feed from the silos to the fuel dosing bin where it is then pneumatically blown into the furnace.
- Hot gases from the combustion furnace are passed through a boiler to raise steam. The steam is then passed to a steam turbine to generate electricity for export to the National Grid.
- Heat from the CHP plant will be supplied to the adjacent rendering plant.
- The furnace and boiler design will fulfil the requirements for 850 °C in more than 2 seconds as specified in the Industrial Emissions Directive (Directive 2010/75/EU).
- Ash from the grate is removed by a system of enclosed conveyors to a silo. Ash from the bag filtration system is removed by an enclosed system to a separate silo. Ash from both sources can be disposed of separately or in mixed form. The ash will be wetted to 12% moisture for ease of handling. The intention is to use the ash as an agricultural fertiliser.
- Combustion gases are cleaned in a flue gas treatment plant, including the injection of solid alkali sorbent to remove acid gases and the use of a fabric filtration system.
- Emissions of nitrogen oxides and carbon monoxide are controlled by the use of controlled combustion and flue gas recirculation. Additional mitigation of nitrogen oxides is achieved by SCR techniques
- The cleaned gases are released to atmosphere via 50 meter high stack.

4.1.4 Key Issues in the Determination

The key issues arising during this determination were air quality, fire prevention, noise and energy we therefore describe how we determined these issues in most detail in this document.

4.2 The site and its protection

4.2.1 Site setting, layout and history

The CHP plant is designed to replace the existing boiler plant to supply the animal rendering facility (with both steam and electricity and any surplus electricity being exported to the Grid. The CHP plant will have a 42 MW thermal input, using meat and bone meal (MBM) as its primary fuel source with wood pellets as a supporting secondary source as required. Auxiliary boilers will be required as a standby when maintenance is carried out on the CHP Plant.

4.2.2 Proposed site design: potentially polluting substances and prevention measures

Under Article 22(2) of the IED the Applicant is required to provide a baseline report containing at least the information set out in paragraphs (a) and (b) of the Article before starting operation.

The site comprises a number of buildings and storage areas. All operational areas will be concreted and impermeable.

All external storage tanks will be located away from vehicle manoeuvring areas and will be fitted with secondary containment bunds.

Rainwater from the building roof will be captured in a holding tank as part of the sites rainwater capture system before being released with the effluent treatment site outflow to the River Trent.

Surface water collected from all hardstanding and road areas will be collected and diverted via oil and silt interceptors to the ETP operated by J G Pears (Newark) Ltd

The liquid effluent streams from the CHP plant will also be contained at all times and piped to the ETP.

There will be a comprehensive programme of inspection and maintenance to ensure signs of deterioration are identified and repaired and this forms part of the environmental management system for the site.

The Applicant has submitted a site condition report which includes a report on the baseline conditions as required by Article 22. We have reviewed that report and consider that it adequately describes the condition of the soil and groundwater prior to the start of operations.

The baseline report is an important reference document in the assessment of contamination that might arise during the operational lifetime of the installation and at cessation of activities at the installation

4.2.3 Closure and decommissioning

Having considered the information submitted in the Application, we are satisfied that the appropriate measures will be in place for the closure and decommissioning of the Installation, as referred to in section 16 of the Supporting Information for IPPC Application for Combined Heat & Power Plant JG Pears Power (O&M) Ltd of the Application. Pre-operational condition PO1 requires the Operator to have an Environmental Management System in place before the Installation is operational, and this will include a site closure plan.

At the definitive cessation of activities, the Operator has to satisfy us that the necessary measures have been taken so that the site ceases to pose a risk to soil or groundwater, taking into accounts both the baseline conditions and the site's current or approved future use. To do this, the Operator will apply to us for surrender of the permit, which we will not grant unless and until we are satisfied that these requirements have been met.

4.3 Operation of the Installation – general issues

4.3.1 Administrative issues

This is a multi-Operator Installation, providing electrical energy and steam to the adjacent animal rendering facility operated by J G Pears (Newark) Limited. Permit Reference EPR/AP3436DG

We are satisfied that the Applicant is the person who will have control over the operation of the Installation after the granting of the Permit; and that the Applicant will be able to operate the Installation so as to comply with the conditions included in the Permit.

The co-incineration of waste is not a specified waste management activity (SWMA). The Environment Agency has considered whether any of the other activities taking place at the Installation are SWMAs and is satisfied that none are taking place.

We are satisfied that the Applicant's submitted Opra profile is accurate.

The Opra score will be used as the basis for subsistence and other charging, in accordance with our Charging Scheme. Opra is the Environment Agency's method of ensuring application and subsistence fees are appropriate and proportionate for the level of regulation required.

4.3.2 Management

The Applicant has stated in the Application that they will implement an Environmental Management System (EMS) that will be certified under ISO14001. A pre-operational condition (PO1) is included requiring the Operator to provide a summary of the EMS prior to commissioning of the plant and to make available for inspection all EMS documentation. The Environment Agency recognises that certification of the EMS cannot take place until the Installation is operational. An improvement condition (IC1) is included requiring the Operator to report progress towards gaining accreditation of its EMS.

We are satisfied that appropriate management systems and management structures will be in place for this Installation, and that sufficient resources are available to the Operator to ensure compliance with all the Permit conditions.

4.3.3 Site security

Having considered the information submitted in the Application, we are satisfied that appropriate infrastructure and procedures will be in place to ensure that the site remains secure.

4.3.4 Accident management

The Applicant has submitted an Accident Management Plan. Having considered the Plan and other information submitted in the Application, we are satisfied that appropriate measures will be in place to ensure that accidents that may cause pollution are prevented but that, if they should occur, their consequences are minimised. An Accident Management Plan will form part of the Environmental Management System and must be in place prior to commissioning as required by a pre-operational condition (PO1).

The Applicant submitted a Fire Prevention Plan (FPP). We asked the operator to provide a revised FPP that demonstrates the site has measures in place to ensure the meets the 3 objectives and the minimum standards that are laid out in 'Fire prevention plans: environmental permits, Published 29 July 2016 within the Schedule 5.

The operator supplied information on 22/03/2017 and 10/04/2017 by providing a revised fire prevention plan document JG Pears CHP & Rendering facility – Fire Prevention Plan (Updated March 2017). Further clarification was sought on the 25/05/17 by email on the handling of MBM inside fuel reception building and dealing with any fires that may arise within the building. A revised Fire Prevention Plan (V4 July 2017) was received by email on 10/07/17.

We have reviewed and approved the Fire Prevention Plan. We consider that it complies with the requirements of our guidance and have included the response within Operating Techniques table S1.2.

4.3.5 Off-site conditions

We do not consider that any off-site conditions are necessary.

4.3.6 Operating techniques

We have specified that the Applicant must operate the Installation in accordance with the following documents contained in the Application:

Description	Parts Included	Justification
The Application	Responses to question 3a in the Part B3 application form. The Support Document dated July 2016	The responses to these sections of the application form set out the technical standards to which the facility will be operated. The Support Document includes a description of the operations and equipment to be used at the site and the pollution prevention and minimisation measures to be used, including the abatement of flue gases
Response to Schedule 5 Notice dated 22/03/2017	Impact on air quality associated with abnormal operating conditions	Response demonstrates that compliance with article 45(1)(f) of IED and the maximum permissible period of unavoidable stoppages, disturbances or failures of the purification devices or the measurement devices, during which the emissions into the air exceed the prescribed emission limit values.
Email received on 13/04/17	Hiring of portable CEMS units specifically designed for flue gas stream analysis until the fixed units were repaired or replaced	It explains the measures to be in place for achieving the directive requirements.

Email received 05/06/2017	All	Justification for using ammonia as reagent in SCR and meeting Article 14 Energy Directive in the use of all available waste heat from operation of CHP plant
Email received dated 10/07/2017	Fire Prevention Plan (V.4 July 2017)	Details on suppression of MBM fire inside fuel reception building, MCERTS, FPP applies to wood pellets and details the techniques to be used to prevent fire arising at the site.
Email received dated 10/07/2017	Revised Odour Management Plan V4 July	The responses details the techniques to be used to prevent and minimise odour pollution
Email received dated 12/07/2017	Noise Management Plan v0.4 July 2017 2016	The responses include clarification and further detail regarding the techniques to be used to prevent and minimise noise pollution

The details set out above describe the techniques that will be used for the operation of the Installation that have been assessed by the Environment Agency as BAT; they form part of the Permit through Permit condition 2.3.1 and Table S1.2 in the Permit Schedules.

We have also specified the following limits and controls on the use of raw materials and fuels:

Raw Material or Fuel	Specifications	Justification
Fuel Oil LNG/LPG	< 0.1% sulphur content	As required by Sulphur Content of Liquid Fuels Regulations.
Wood pellets	Biomass quality standard EN ISO 17225-2, classes I1-I3 (pellets for industrial use).	Specification is known

Article 45(1) of the IED requires that the Permit must include a list of all types of waste which may be treated using at least the types of waste set out in the European Waste List established by Decision 2005/532/EC, EC, if possible,

and containing information on the quantity of each type of waste, where appropriate. The Application contains a list of those wastes classified as Meat and Bone Meal, categorised under the Animal By-products Regulations as Category 3 material and coded by the European Waste Catalogue (EWC) number, which the Applicant will accept in the waste streams entering the plant and which the plant is capable of burning in an environmentally acceptable way. We have specified the permitted waste types, descriptions and where appropriate quantities which can be accepted at the installation in Table S2.2.

We are satisfied that the Applicant can accept the wastes contained in Table S2.2 of the Permit because:

- (i) the wastes are all categorised as non-hazardous in the European Waste Catalogue and are capable of being safely burnt at the installation.
- (ii) these wastes are likely to be within the design calorific value (CV) range for the plant;
- (iii) these wastes are unlikely to contain harmful components that cannot be safely processed at the Installation.

We have limited the capacity of the Installation to 85,000 tonnes per annum. This is based on the installation operating approximately 8,000 hours per year at a nominal capacity of 9.5 tonnes per hour.

The Installation will be designed, constructed and operated using BAT for the incineration of the permitted wastes. We are satisfied that the operating and abatement techniques are BAT for incinerating these types of waste. Our assessment of BAT is set out later in this document.

4.3.7 Energy efficiency

(i) Consideration of energy efficiency

We have considered the issue of energy efficiency in the following ways:

1. The use of energy within, and generated by, the Installation which are normal aspects of all EPR permit determinations. This issue is dealt with in this section.
2. The extent to which the Installation meets the requirements of Article 50(5) of the IED, which requires “*the heat generated during the incineration and co-incineration process is recovered as far as practicable through the generation of heat, steam or power*”. This issue is covered in this section.
3. The combustion efficiency and energy utilisation of different design options for the Installation are relevant considerations in the determination of BAT for the Installation, including the Global Warming

Potential of the different options. This aspect is covered in the BAT assessment in section 6 of this Decision Document.

4. The extent to which the Installation meets the requirement of Article 14(5) of the Energy Efficiency Directive which requires new thermal electricity generation installations with a total thermal input exceeding 20 MW to carry out a cost-benefit assessment to “*assess the cost and benefits of providing for the operation of the installation as a high-efficiency cogeneration installation*”.

Cogeneration means the simultaneous generation in one process of thermal energy and electrical or mechanical energy and is also known as combined heat and power (CHP).

High-efficiency co-generation is cogeneration which achieves at least 10% savings in primary energy usage compared to the separate generation of heat and power – see Annex II of the Energy Efficiency Directive for detail on how to calculate this.

(ii) Use of energy within the Installation

Having considered the information submitted in the Application, we are satisfied that appropriate measures will be in place to ensure that energy is used efficiently within the Installation.

The Application details a number of measures that will be implemented at the Installation in order to increase its energy efficiency,

- Use of steam from the boiler for off-site application in the adjacent rendering facility
- Combustion air will be pre-heated
- Effective furnace insulation and construction employed to retain heat
- Effective maintenance of heat exchangers and boiler tubes by automatic soot blowing and de-clogging to maintain high heat transfer
- Use of high efficiency turbine design
- Variable speed drives on all major motors, and on large proportion of smaller motors.
- Use of high-efficiency electrical motors
- Combustion with low excess air ratio, meaning higher boiler efficiency (due to low flue gas loss) and low parasitic load on combustion air/ID fans.

The Application states that the specific energy consumption, a measure of total energy consumed per unit of waste processed, will be 115 kWhe/t, or 414 MJe/t. The installation capacity is up to 85,000 t/a.

Data from the BREF for Municipal Waste Incinerators shows that the range of specific energy consumptions is as in the table below.

MSWI plant size range (t/yr)	Process energy demand (kWh/t waste input)
Up to 150,000	300 – 700
150,000 – 250,000	150 – 500
More than 250,000	60 – 200

The BREF says that it is BAT to reduce the average installation electrical demand to generally below 150 kWh/tonne of waste with an LCV of 10.4 MJ/kg. The LCV in this case is expected to be 12 MJ/kg. Taking account of the difference in LCV, the specific energy consumption in the Application is in line with that set out above.

(iii) Generation of energy within the Installation - Compliance with Article 50(5) of the IED

Article 50(5) of the IED requires that *“the heat generated during the incineration and co-incineration process is recovered as far as practicable”*.

Our CHP Ready Guidance - February 2013 considers that BAT for energy efficiency for Energy from Waste (EfW) plant is the use of CHP in circumstances where there are technically and economically viable opportunities for the supply of heat from the outset.

The term CHP in this context represents a plant which also provides a supply of heat from the electrical power generation process to either a district heating network or to an industrial / commercial building or process. However, it is recognised that opportunities for the supply of heat do not always exist from the outset (i.e. when a plant is first consented, constructed and commissioned).

In cases where there are no immediate opportunities for the supply of heat from the outset, the Environment Agency considers that BAT is to build the plant to be CHP Ready (CHP-R) to a degree which is dictated by the likely future opportunities which are technically viable and which may, in time, also become economically viable.

The BREF says that where a plant generates electricity only, it is BAT to recover 0.4 – 0.65 MWh/ tonne of waste (based on LCV of 10.4 MJ/kg) for raw waste inputs. Our technical guidance note, SGN EPR S5.01, states that where electricity only is generated, 5-9 MW of electricity should be recoverable per 100,000 tonnes/annum of waste (which equates to 0.4 – 0.72 MWh/tonne of waste).

The purpose of this CHP plant is to replace the existing boiler plant at the animal rendering factory to supply the factory with both heat, steam and electricity, along with surplus electricity being exported to the Grid. The CHP plant produces up to 45 t/h of process steam factory from a bleed on the turbine to the adjacent rendering plant and up to 7.9 MW electrical power.

The SGN and Chapter IV of the IED both require that, as well as maximising the primary use of heat to generate electricity; waste heat should be

recovered as far as practicable. As mentioned earlier the purpose of the CHP is to provide heat and steam to the adjacent Animal Rendering Facility. We asked the applicant via an email to demonstrate that all waste heat was being fully utilised by animal rendering factory and whether low grade steam may be extracted for district heating steam.

The applicant responded on 1st June 2017 by providing an assessment of the potential for operating the installation as a high-efficiency cogeneration installation and concluded that with the exception of heat at the air cooled condenser for the low pressure turbine exhaust all other opportunities were already being utilised. The applicant maintains that as this is not a consistent source of heat and is around 75 mbar absolute pressure, which corresponds to a temperature of around 40°C, cost efficient utilisation of this steam is technically not feasible. District heating schemes in the UK will generally require waste heat at a temperature of 65°C or more and given the rural location of the facility we accept that there are no further opportunities for this heat to be used. We agree with the applicant's assessment and have not required a cost benefit assessment.

We consider that, within the constraints of the location of the Installation explained above, the Installation will recover heat as far as practicable, and therefore that the requirements of Article 50(5) are met.

(iv) R1 Calculation and the DEFRA Good Quality CHP Scheme

The R1 calculation and / or gaining accreditation under the DEFRA Good Quality CHP Scheme does not form part of the matters relevant to our determination. They are however a general indicators that the installation is achieving a high level of energy recovery.

The Applicant has not presented an R1 calculation with this application, nor have we received a separate application for a determination on whether the installation is a recovery or disposal facility.

The Operator is also seeking accreditation under the DEFRA Good Quality CHP Scheme. This process does not form part of the matters relevant to our determination, but forms part of financial aspects of the project drawing down funding through Renewable Obligation Credits (ROCs). Gaining accreditation under the scheme is however an indication of achieving a high level of energy recovery. Our consideration of energy recovery is described in the preceding paragraphs and we are satisfied that the level of recovery being achieved meets all the statutory requirements.

Note that the availability or non-availability of financial incentives for renewable energy such as the ROC and RHI schemes is not a consideration in determining this application.

(v) Choice of Steam Turbine

The Applicant has chosen the steam cycle turbine as the system is highly flexible and steam can be raised by many combinations and or auxiliary firing if required. This is well proven technology and when maintained correctly gives good reliability.

The boiler will produce up to 45 tonne per hour of high pressure steam to the turbine. The existing factory peak steam raising capacity is 44 tonne per hour.

Low pressure steam for supply to the factory will be released from a nozzle on the turbine at a rate of up to 32 tonnes per hour. The returning condensate at 10 bar will be flashed by pressure reduction to enable efficient energy recovery from it. This will be achieved by directing the flash steam back to the turbine system for energy recovery and returning the remaining hot condensate to the boiler feed water loop and thermal cycle.

(vi) Choice of Cooling System

The plant will operate an Air Cooled Condenser (ACC) to condense the steam output from the turbine to allow return of the condensate to the boiler. The Applicant has considered the type of cooling technology in their application with the two main alternatives to an ACC being a water cooled condenser or an evaporative condenser. All three options can be considered BAT depending on the situation, as set out in our Sector Guidance Note EPR 5.01, The Incineration of Waste. Water cooled condensers use a re-circulating water supply to condense the steam, while an evaporative condenser uses water which is evaporated directly from the condenser surface and lost to the atmosphere to provide the required cooling.

The main advantage of both of these water based systems is that they provide improved cooling and are not susceptible to condenser efficiency fluctuation with changing air temperature. High air temperatures in the summer with an ACC for example, can result in insufficient condensing power and subsequently reduce the efficiency of the generating turbine. Another advantage of a water cooled condensing system is the reduction in noise in comparison to the noise generated by the fans in an air cooled condenser system. The disadvantage of the water cooled systems is the significant volume of water required. Chemical additives are also needed which means there is potentially a significant effluent flow to be managed and discharged. In winter there is also the risk of freezing, while maintenance costs are generally higher due to the wet nature of the technology. In the case of evaporative condensers there is also the significant potential for visual impacts through the release of water vapour plumes. They therefore consider an Air Cooled Condenser to represent BAT for the installation.

(vii) Compliance with Article 14(5) of the Energy Efficiency Directive

Article 14 requires operators of new or substantially refurbished combustion plants more than 20MW aggregated net thermal input to carry out a cost benefit assessment (CBA) for combined heat and power (CHP) or district heating opportunities, unless under article 14(5)(c) all the available waste heat is already being recovered for use within the installation.

In the initial application documents submitted it was not clear that all waste heat was being utilised. On the 1st June 2017 the applicant provided additional information namely a boiler heat and mass balance schematic of the heat generation and reuse of the steam in the various economisers and preheaters in the CHP to show that the full recovery heat for the plant and associated animal by-products processing facility. Analysis shows that with the exception of heat at the air cooled condenser for the LP turbine exhaust all other opportunities are being used. The applicant maintains that as this is not a consistent source of heat and is around 75 mbar absolute pressure, with corresponds to a temperature of around 40°C, which makes cost efficient utilisation difficult. District heating schemes in the UK will generally require waste heat at a temperature of 65 °C or more and given the rural location of the facility we accept that there are no further opportunities for this heat to be used. We agree with the applicant's assessment. Therefore no cost benefit assessment is required.

(viii) Permit conditions concerning energy efficiency

The Operator is required to report energy usage and energy generated under condition 4.2 and Schedule 5. The following parameters are required to be reported: total electrical energy generated; electrical energy exported; total energy usage and energy exported as heat (if any). Together with the total MSW burned per year, this will enable the Environment Agency to monitor energy recovery efficiency at the Installation and take action if at any stage the energy recovery efficiency is less than proposed.

There are no site-specific considerations that require the imposition of standards beyond indicative BAT, and so the Environment Agency accepts that the Applicant's proposals represent BAT for this Installation.

4.3.8 Efficient use of raw materials

Having considered the information submitted in the Application, we are satisfied that the appropriate measures will be in place to ensure the efficient use of raw materials and water.

The Operator is required to report with respect to raw material usage under condition 4.2 and Schedule 5, including consumption of sodium bicarbonate and ammonia used per tonne of waste burned. This will enable the Environment Agency to assess whether there have been any changes in the efficiency of the air pollution control plant, and the operation of the SCR to abate NO_x. These are the most significant raw materials that will be used at

the Installation, other than the waste feed itself (addressed elsewhere). The efficiency of the use of auxiliary fuel will be tracked separately as part of the energy reporting requirement under condition 4.2.2. Optimising reagent dosage for air abatement systems and minimising the use of auxiliary fuels is further considered in the section on BAT.

4.3.9 Avoidance, recovery or disposal with minimal environmental impact of wastes produced by the activities

This requirement addresses wastes produced at the Installation and does not apply to the waste being treated there. The principal waste streams the Installation will produce are bottom ash and air pollution control residues.

The first objective is to avoid producing waste at all. Waste production will be avoided by achieving a high degree of burnout of the ash in the furnace, which results in a material that is both reduced in volume and in chemical reactivity. Condition 3.1.4 and associated Table S3.4 specify limits for total organic carbon (TOC) of <3% in bottom ash. Compliance with this limit will demonstrate that good combustion control and waste burnout is being achieved in the furnaces and waste generation is being avoided where practicable.

Incinerator bottom ash (IBA) will normally be classified as non-hazardous waste. However, IBA is classified on the European List of Wastes as a “mirror entry”, which means IBA is a hazardous waste if it possesses a hazardous property relating to the content of dangerous substances. Monitoring of incinerator ash will be carried out in accordance with the requirements of Article 53(3) of IED. Classification of IBA for its subsequent use or disposal is controlled by other legislation and so is not duplicated within the permit.

Air pollution control (APC) residues from flue gas treatment are generally hazardous waste and therefore must be sent for disposal to a landfill site permitted to accept hazardous waste, or to an appropriately permitted facility for hazardous waste treatment. The amount of APC residues is minimised through optimising the performance of the air emissions abatement plant.

In order to ensure that the IBA and APC residues are adequately characterised, pre-operational condition PO2 requires the Operator to provide a written plan for approval detailing the ash sampling protocols. Table S3.4 requires the Operator to carry out an ongoing programme of monitoring.

The application states ash content of MBM is between 20 to 25% MBM and is rich in phosphorous. The recovered ash is to be sold as a fertiliser to be used on agricultural land subject to meeting the Quality Protocol for poultry litter (PLA) or the ash will be transported to a suitable recycling facility, from where it could be re-used in the fertiliser production industry as a secondary phosphate.

Having considered the information submitted in the Application, we are satisfied that the waste hierarchy referred to in Article 4 of the WFD will be applied to the generation of waste and that any waste generated will be treated in accordance with this Article.

We are satisfied that waste from the Installation that cannot be recovered will be disposed of using a method that minimises any impact on the environment. Standard condition 1.4.1 will ensure that this position is maintained.

5. Minimising the Installation's environmental impact

Regulated activities can present different types of risk to the environment, these include odour, noise and vibration; accidents, fugitive emissions to air and water; as well as point source releases to air, discharges to ground or groundwater, global warming potential and generation of waste and other environmental impacts. Consideration may also have to be given to the effect of emissions being subsequently deposited onto land (where there are ecological receptors). All these factors are discussed in this and other sections of this document.

For an installation of this kind, the principal emissions are those to air, although we also consider those to land and water.

The next sections of this document explain how we have approached the critical issue of assessing the likely impact of the emissions to air from the Installation on human health and the environment and what measures we are requiring to ensure a high level of protection.

5.1 Assessment Methodology

5.1.1 Application of Environment Agency guidance 'risk assessments for your environmental permit'

A methodology for risk assessment of point source emissions to air, which we use to assess the risk of applications we receive for permits, is set out in our guidance 'Air emissions risk assessment for your environmental permit' and has the following steps:

- Describe emissions and receptors
- Calculate process contributions
- Screen out insignificant emissions that do not warrant further investigation
- Decide if detailed air modelling is needed
- Assess emissions against relevant standards
- Summarise the effects of emissions

The methodology uses a concept of “process contribution (PC)”, which is the estimated concentration of emitted substances after dispersion into the receiving environmental media at the point where the magnitude of the concentration is greatest. The methodology provides a simple method of calculating PC primarily for screening purposes and for estimating process contributions where environmental consequences are relatively low. It is based on using dispersion factors. These factors assume worst case dispersion conditions with no allowance made for thermal or momentum plume rise and so the process contributions calculated are likely to be an overestimate of the actual maximum concentrations. More accurate calculation of process contributions can be achieved by mathematical dispersion models, which take into account relevant parameters of the release and surrounding conditions, including local meteorology – these techniques are expensive but normally lead to a lower prediction of PC.

5.1.2 Use of Air Dispersion Modelling

For incineration applications, we normally require the Applicant to submit a full air dispersion model as part of their application. Air dispersion modelling enables the process contribution to be predicted at any environmental receptor that might be impacted by the plant.

Once short-term and long-term PCs have been calculated in this way, they are compared with Environmental Standards (ES).

Where an Ambient Air Directive (AAD) Limit Value exists, the relevant standard is the AAD Limit Value. Where an AAD Limit Value does not exist, AAD target values, UK Air Quality Strategy (AQS) Objectives or Environmental Assessment Levels (EALs) are used. Our web guide sets out EALs which have been derived to provide a similar level of protection to Human Health and the Environment as the AAD limit values, AAD target and AQS objectives. In a very small number of cases, e.g. for emissions of lead, the AQS objective is more stringent than the AAD value. In such cases, we use the AQS objective for our assessment.

AAD target values, AQS objectives and EALs do not have the same legal status as AAD limit values, and there is no explicit requirement to impose stricter conditions than BAT in order to comply with them. However, they are a standard for harm and any significant contribution to a breach is likely to be unacceptable.

PCs are considered **Insignificant** if:

- the **long-term** process contribution is less than **1%** of the relevant ES; and
- the **short-term** process contribution is less than **10%** of the relevant ES.

The **long term** 1% process contribution insignificance threshold is based on the judgements that:

- It is unlikely that an emission at this level will make a significant contribution to air quality;
- The threshold provides a substantial safety margin to protect health and the environment.

The **short term** 10% process contribution insignificance threshold is based on the judgements that:

- spatial and temporal conditions mean that short term process contributions are transient and limited in comparison with long term process contributions;
- the threshold provides a substantial safety margin to protect health and the environment.

Where an emission is screened out in this way, we would normally consider that the Applicant's proposals for the prevention and control of the emission to be BAT. That is because if the impact of the emission is already insignificant, it follows that any further reduction in this emission will also be insignificant.

However, where an emission cannot be screened out as insignificant, it does not mean it will necessarily be significant.

For those pollutants which do not screen out as insignificant, we determine whether exceedences of the relevant ES are likely. This is done through detailed audit and review of the Applicant's air dispersion modelling taking background concentrations and modelling uncertainties into account. Where an exceedance of an AAD limit value is identified, we may require the Applicant to go beyond what would normally be considered BAT for the Installation or we may refuse the application if the applicant is unable to provide suitable proposals. Whether or not exceedences are considered likely, the application is subject to the requirement to operate in accordance with BAT.

This is not the end of the risk assessment, because we also take into account local factors (for example, particularly sensitive receptors nearby such as a SSSIs, SACs or SPAs). These additional factors may also lead us to include more stringent conditions than BAT.

If, as a result of reviewing of the risk assessment and taking account of any additional techniques that could be applied to limit emissions, we consider that emissions **would cause significant pollution**, we would refuse the Application.

5.2 Assessment of Impact on Air Quality

The Applicant's assessment of the impact of air quality is set out in two documents "Newark 42MWth CHP - Air Quality Assessment" and "J G PEARS NEWARK CHP ABNORMAL EMISSIONS ASSESSMENT of the Application. The assessment comprises:

- Dispersion modelling of emissions to air from the operation of the incinerator.
- A study of the impact of emissions on nearby sensitive non statutory conservation sites.
- Dispersion modelling of odour impacts when the co-incinerator is shut down.

This section of the decision document deals primarily with the dispersion modelling of emissions to air from the incinerator chimney and its impact on local air quality. The impact on conservation sites is considered in section 5.4 and potential odour impacts including those during plant shutdowns are considered in section 5.6.

The Applicant has assessed the Installation's potential emissions to air against the relevant air quality standards, and the potential impact upon local conservation and habitat sites and human health. These assessments predict the potential effects on local air quality from the Installation's stack emissions using the ADMS 5.1 dispersion model, which is a commonly used computer model for regulatory dispersion modelling. The model used 5 years of meteorological data collected from the weather station at RAF Waddington for between 2011 and 2015. RAF Waddington is approximately 18km to the south-east of the CHP Plant and the closest weather station. The impact of the terrain surrounding the site upon plume dispersion was considered in the dispersion modelling.

The air impact assessments, and the dispersion modelling upon which they were based, employed the following assumptions.

- First, they assumed that the ELVs in the Permit would be the maximum permitted by Article 46(2) and Annex VI of the IED. These substances are:
 - Oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), expressed as NO₂
 - Total dust
 - Carbon monoxide (CO)
 - Sulphur dioxide (SO₂)
 - Hydrogen chloride (HCl)
 - Hydrogen fluoride (HF)
 - Metals (Cadmium, Thallium, Mercury, Antimony, Arsenic, Lead, Chromium, Cobalt, Copper, Manganese, Nickel and Vanadium)
 - Polychlorinated dibenzo-para-dioxins and polychlorinated dibenzo furans (referred to as dioxins and furans)
 - Gaseous and vaporous organic substances, expressed as Total Organic Carbon (TOC)
- Second, they assumed that the Installation operates continuously at the relevant long-term or short-term ELVs, i.e. the maximum permitted emission rate (except for emissions of arsenic, chromium and nickel, which are considered in section 5.2.3 of this decision document).

- Third, the model also considered emissions of pollutants not covered by Annex VI of IED, specifically ammonia (NH₃), polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) and Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). Emission rates used in the modelling have been drawn from data in the Waste Incineration BREF and are considered further in section 5.2.5.

We are in agreement with this approach. The assumptions underpinning the model have been checked and are reasonably precautionary.

The applicant drawn background pollutant concentrations from a variety of data sources: Defra modelled background maps; rural heavy metals and polycyclic aromatics networks, acid gas and aerosol network and toxic organic micro pollutants network. This data is summarised in the Application and has been used by the Applicant to establish the background (or existing) air quality against which to measure the potential impact of the incinerator.

As well as calculating the peak ground level concentration, the Applicant has modelled the concentration of key pollutants at a number of specified locations within the surrounding area.

The way in which the Applicant used dispersion models, its selection of input data, use of background data and the assumptions it made have been reviewed by the Environment Agency's modelling specialists to establish the robustness of the Applicant's air impact assessment. The output from the model has then been used to inform further assessment of health impacts and impact on habitats and conservation sites.

Our review of the Applicant's assessment leads us to agree with the Applicant's conclusions. We have also audited the air quality and human health impact assessment and similarly agree that the conclusions drawn in the reports were acceptable.

The Applicant's modelling predictions are summarised in the following sections.

5.2.1 Assessment of Air Dispersion Modelling Outputs

The Applicant's modelling predictions are summarised in the tables below.

The Applicant's modelling predicted peak ground level exposure to pollutants in ambient air and at discreet receptors. The tables below show predicted peak ground level

Whilst we have used the Applicant's modelling predictions in the table below, we have made our own simple verification calculation of the percentage process contribution and predicted environmental concentration. These are the numbers shown in the tables below and so may be very slightly different to those shown in the Application. Any such minor discrepancies do not materially impact on our conclusions.

Table 1: Predicted emissions to air excluding metals-							
Pollutant	EQS / EAL		Back-ground	Process Contribution (PC)		Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC)	
	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	Notes		$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	% of EAL	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$
NO ₂	40	1	18.6	1.83	4.58	20.4	51.1
	200	2	37.2	10.34	5.2	47.54	23.8
PM ₁₀	40	1	22.2	0.13	0.33	22.3	55.8
	50	3	44.4	0.38	0.76	44.78	89.6
PM _{2.5}	25	1	13.2	0.13	0.52	13.33	53.3
SO ₂	50	1		0.51	1.02	0.51	1.0
	266	4	11.8	4.02	1.5	15.82	5.9
	350	5	11.8	7.26	2.07	19.06	5.4
	125	6	11.8	8.77	7.0	20.57	16.5
HCl	750	7	1.44	1.99	0.27	3.4	0.46
HF	16	8	2.35	0.01	0.06	2.360	14.75
	160	7	4.7	0.2	0.125	4.90	3.1
CO	10000	9	526	5.7	0.06	532	5.3
TOC	2.25	1	0.1	0.13	5.78	0.230	10.22
VOC	5	1	0.3	0.13	2.60	0.430	8.60
PAH	2.50E-04	1	2.00E-03	2.60E-06	1.04	0.002	801.0
NH ₃	180	1	3.6	0.13	0.07	3.73	2.07
	2500	10	7.2	1.99	0.08	9.19	0.4
PCBs	0.2	1	0.00014	0.00007	0.04	0.00021	0.11
	6	10	0.00088	0.0012	0.02	0.00208	0.0347
Dioxins			2.28E-08	8.70E-10		2.37E-08	

Notes

TOC as 1,3 butadiene

PAH as benzo[a]pyrene

- 1 Annual Mean
- 2 99.79th %ile of 1-hour means
- 3 90.41st %ile of 24-hour means
- 4 99.9th ile of 15-min means
- 5 99.73rd %ile of 1-hour means
- 6 99.18th %ile of 24-hour means
- 7 1-hour average
- 8 Monthly average
- 9 Maximum daily running 8-hour mean
- 10 1-hour maximum

Table 2 – Predicted emissions of metal emissions to air							
Pollutant	EQS / EAL		Back-ground	Process Contribution		Predicted Environmental Concentration	
	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$			$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	% of EAL	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$
Cd	0.005	1	1.70E-04	4.30E-04	8.6	0.00060	12.0
		2	0.00034	0.0064		0.00674	
Hg	0.25	1	0.00035	4.30E-04	0.17	0.00078	0.31
	7.5	2	0.0007	0.00664	0.09	0.00734	0.098
Sb	5	1		0.00452	0.09	0.00452	0.09
	150	2	0.00074	7.99E-02	0.05	0.08063	0.054
Pb	0.25	1	0.0076	0.00452	1.81	0.01212	4.85
Co				7.99E-02		0.07989	
Cu	10	1	7.60E-03	0.00452	0.05	0.01212	0.121
	200	2	1.52E-02	7.99E-02	0.04	0.09509	0.048
Mn	0.15	1	6.89E-03	0.00452	3.01	0.01141	7.61
	1500	2	1.38E-02	7.99E-02	0.01	0.09367	0.0062
V	5	1	1.28E-03	0.00452	0.09	0.0058	0.12
	1	3	0.00068	7.99E-02	7.99	0.08057	8.06
As	0.003	1	8.20E-04	0.00452	150.67	0.00534	178.0
Cr (II)(III)	5	1	0.00052	0.00452	0.09	0.00504	0.101
	150	2	0.00052	7.99E-02	0.05	0.08041	0.0536
Cr (VI)	0.0002	1	0.00089	0.00452	2260.00	0.00541	2705.0
Ni	0.02	1	6.22E-03	0.00452	22.60	0.01074	53.7

- 1 Annual Mean
2 1-hr Maximum
3 24-hr Maximum

(i) Screening out emissions which are insignificant

From the tables above the following emissions can be screened out as insignificant in that the process contribution is < 1% of the long term ES and <10% of the short term ES. These are:

- Sulphur dioxide (short term)
- Nitrogen dioxide (short term)
- Carbon Monoxide
- Hydrogen Chloride
- Ammonia
- Hydrogen Fluoride
- PM10
- PM2.5

- Mercury
- Antimony
- Copper
- Vanadium
- Chromium(II)(III)

Therefore we consider the Applicant's proposals for preventing and minimising the emissions of these substances to be BAT for the Installation subject to the detailed audit referred to below.

(ii) Emissions unlikely to give rise to significant pollution

Also from the tables above the following emissions (which were not screened out as insignificant) have been assessed as being unlikely to give rise to significant pollution in that the predicted environmental concentration is less than 100% (taking expected modelling uncertainties into account) of both the long term and short term ES:

- NO₂ (long term)
- TOC
- VOC
- PAH
- Cadmium, Cd
- Lead, Pb
- Manganese, MN
- Nickel, Ni

For these emissions, we have carefully scrutinised the Applicant's proposals to ensure that they are applying the Best Available Techniques to prevent and minimise emissions of these substances. This is reported in section 6 of this document.

(iii) Emissions requiring further assessment

Finally from the tables above the following emissions are considered to have the potential to give rise to pollution in that the Predicted Environmental Concentration exceeds 100% of the long term ES:

- Arsenic
- Chromium (VI)

In the previous tables the predicted concentrations of metals used in the assessment have been based on the assumption that each metal is emitted at 100% of the EAL. In accordance with our "Guidance to applicants on impact assessment for group 3 metal stack emissions, version 4" the Applicant has assumed that arsenic and chromium VI each comprise 11% of the EAL for the total Group 3 metals. The results are shown in the table below.

Table 3: Step 2 assessment of metals						
Pollutant	EQS / EAL	Back-ground	Process Contribution (PC)		Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC)	
	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	% of EAL	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	% of EAL
As	0.003	0.00082	0.0005	16.73	0.00132	44.07
Cr (VI)	0.0002	0.00089	0.0005	250.99	0.00139	694.99

Because the PEC is less than 100% of the EAL, it is considered that emissions of Arsenic are unlikely to give rise to significant pollution and no further assessment is required.

For Chromium VI, the Applicant has followed Step 3 of the metals assessment guidance and has based the emission concentration of chromium VI on the mean percentage of the EAL as determined from the emissions from a number of municipal waste incinerators and as detailed in Appendix A of the guidance. A mean limit of 2.2% of the EAL has been used as the emission concentration and the predicted results are detailed in the table below.

Table 4: Step 3 assessment of metals						
Pollutant	EQS / EAL	Back-ground	Process Contribution (PC)		Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC)	
	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	% of EAL	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	% of EAL
Cr (VI)	0.0002	0.00089	0.00000117	0.59%	-	-

Since the predicted process contribution is less than 1% of the EAL, it is considered that emissions of chromium VI are unlikely to give rise to significant pollution and no further assessment is required.

For the assessment of metals the Applicant used version 3 of our guidance. We have carried out a sensitivity analysis of the predictions using version 4 of our guidance and we have been able to replicate the emissions data.

5.2.2 Consideration of key pollutants

(i) Nitrogen dioxide (NO₂)

The impact on air quality from NO₂ emissions has been assessed against the ES of 40 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ as a long term annual average and a short term hourly average of 200 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. The model assumes a 70% NO_x to NO₂ conversion for the long term and 35% for the short term assessment in line with Environment Agency guidance on the use of air dispersion modelling.

The above tables show that the peak long term PC is greater than 1% of the ES and therefore cannot be screened out as insignificant. Even so, from the table above, the emission is not expected to result in the ES being exceeded. The peak short term PC is screens out as insignificant (>10% of the ES).

(ii) Particulate matter PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}

The impact on air quality from particulate emissions has been assessed against the ES for PM₁₀ (particles of 10 microns and smaller) and PM_{2.5} (particles of 2.5 microns and smaller). For PM₁₀, the ES are a long term annual average of 40 µg/m³ and a short term daily average of 50 µg/m³. For PM_{2.5} the ES of 25 µg/m³ as a long-term annual average to be achieved by 2010 as a Target Value and by 2015 as a Limit Value has been used.

The Applicant's predicted impact of the Installation against these ESs is shown in the tables above. The assessment assumes that **all** particulate emissions are present as PM₁₀ for the PM₁₀ assessment and that **all** particulate emissions are present as PM_{2.5} for the PM_{2.5} assessment.

The above assessment is considered to represent a worst case assessment in that: -

- It assumes that the plant emits particulates continuously at the IED Annex VI limit for total dust, whereas actual emissions from similar plant are normally lower.
- It assumes all particulates emitted are below either 10 microns (PM₁₀) or 2.5 microns (PM_{2.5}), when some are expected to be larger.

We have reviewed the Applicant's particulate matter impact assessment and are satisfied in the robustness of the Applicant's conclusions.

The above assessment shows that the predicted process contribution for emissions of PM₁₀ is below 1% of the long term ES and below 10% of the short term ES and so can be screened out as insignificant. Therefore we consider the Applicant's proposals for preventing and minimising the emissions of particulates to be BAT for the Installation.

The above assessment also shows that the predicted process contribution for emissions of PM_{2.5} is also below 1% of the ES. Therefore the Environment Agency concludes that particulate emissions from the installation, including emissions of PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5}, will not give rise to significant pollution.

There is currently no emission limit prescribed nor any continuous emissions monitor for particulate matter specifically in the PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5} fraction. Whilst the Environment Agency is confident that current monitoring techniques will capture the fine particle fraction (PM_{2.5}) for inclusion in the measurement of total particulate matter, an improvement condition (IC2) has been included that will require a full analysis of particle size distribution in the flue gas, and hence determine the ratio of fine to coarse particles. In the light of current knowledge and available data however the Environment Agency is satisfied

that the health of the public would not be put at risk by such emissions, as explained in section 5.3.3.

(iii) Acid gases, SO₂, HCl and HF

From the tables above, emissions of HCl and HF can be screened out as insignificant in that the process contribution is <10% of the short term ES. There is no long term ES for HCl. HF has 2 assessment criteria – a 1-hr ES and a monthly EAL – the process contribution is <1% of the monthly EAL and so the emission screens out as insignificant if the monthly ES is interpreted as representing a long term ES.

There is no long term EAL for SO₂ for the protection of human health. Protection of ecological receptors from SO₂ for which there is a long term ES is considered in section 5.4.

Emissions of SO₂ can also be screened out as insignificant in that the short term process contribution is also <10% of each of the three short term ES values. Therefore we consider the Applicant's proposals for preventing and minimising the emissions of these substances to be BAT for the Installation.

(iv) Emissions to Air of CO, VOCs, PAHs, PCBs, Dioxins and NH₃

The above tables show that for CO emissions, the peak long term PC is less than 1% of the ES and the peak short term PC is less than 10% of the ES and so can be screened out as insignificant. Therefore we consider the Applicant's proposals for preventing and minimising the emissions of these substances to be BAT for the Installation.

The above tables show that for VOC emissions, the peak long term PC is greater than 1% of the ES and therefore cannot be screened out as insignificant. Even so, from the table above, the emission is not expected to result in the ES being exceeded.

The Applicant has used the ES for 1,3 butadiene for their assessment of the impact of VOC. This is based on 1,3 butadiene having the lowest ES of organic species likely to be present in VOC (other than PAH, PCBs, dioxins and furans).

The above tables show that for PCB emissions, the peak long term PC is less than 1% of the ES and the peak short term PC is less than 10% of the ES for PCBs and so can be screened out as insignificant. Therefore we consider the Applicant's proposals for preventing and minimising the emissions of these substances to be BAT for the Installation.

The above tables show that for PAH emissions, the peak long term PC is greater than 1% of the ES and therefore cannot be screened out as insignificant. Even so, from the table above, the emission is not expected to result in the ES being exceeded.

The Applicant has also used the ES for benzo[a]pyrene (BaP) for their assessment of the impact of PAH. We agree that the use of the BaP ES is sufficiently precautionary.

There is no ES for dioxins and furans as the principal exposure route for these substances is by ingestion and the risk to human health is through the accumulation of these substances in the body over an extended period of time. This issue is considered in more detail in section 5.3

The ammonia emission is based on a release concentration of 10 mg/m³. We are satisfied that this level of emission is consistent with the operation of a well-controlled SCR NO_x abatement system.

Whilst all emissions cannot be screened out as insignificant, the Applicant's modelling shows that the installation is unlikely to result in a breach of the EAL. The Applicant is required to prevent, minimise and control PAH and VOC emissions using BAT, this is considered further in Section 6. We are satisfied that PAH and VOC emissions will not result in significant pollution.

(v) Summary

For the above emissions to air, for those emissions that do not screen out, we have carefully scrutinised the Applicant's proposals to ensure that they are applying the BAT to prevent and minimise emissions of these substances. This is reported in section 6 of this document. Therefore we consider the Applicant's proposals for preventing and minimising emissions to be BAT for the Installation. Dioxins and furans are considered further in section 5.3.2.

5.2.3 Assessment of Emission of Metals

The Applicant has assessed the impact of metal emissions to air, as previously described.

Annex VI of IED sets three limits for metal emissions:

- An emission limit value of 0.05 mg/m³ for mercury and its compounds (formerly WID group 1 metals).
- An aggregate emission limit value of 0.05 mg/m³ for cadmium and thallium and their compounds (formerly WID group 2 metals).
- An aggregate emission limit of 0.5 mg/m³ for antimony, arsenic, lead, chromium, cobalt, copper, manganese, nickel and vanadium and their compounds (formerly WID group 3 metals).

In addition the UK is a Party to the Heavy Metals Protocol within the framework of the UN-ECE Convention on long-range trans-boundary air pollution. Compliance with the IED Annex VI emission limits for metals along with the Application of BAT also ensures that these requirements are met.

In section 5.2.1 above, the following emissions of metals were screened out as insignificant:

- Mercury
- Antimony
- Copper
- Vanadium
- Chromium(II)(III)

Also in section 5.2.1, the following emissions of metals whilst not screened out as insignificant were assessed as being unlikely to give rise to significant pollution:

- Cadmium
- Arsenic
- Chromium(IV)
- Lead
- Manganese
- Nickel

This left emissions of Arsenic and Chromium VI requiring further assessment. For all other metals, the Applicant has concluded that exceedences of the EAL for all metals are not likely to occur.

Where Annex VI of the IED sets an aggregate limit, the Applicant's assessment assumes that each metal is emitted individually at the relevant aggregate emission limit value. This is something which can never actually occur in practice as it would inevitably result in a breach of the said limit, and so represents a very much worst case scenario.

For arsenic and chromium VI the Applicant used representative emissions from other municipal waste incinerators using our guidance note. Please refer to "Guidance to Applicants on Impact Assessment for Group 3 Metals Stack Releases – version 4".

Based on the above, the following emissions of metals were screened out as insignificant:

- Arsenic

The following emissions of metals whilst not screened out as insignificant were assessed as being unlikely to give rise to significant pollution:

- Chromium VI

This left emissions of Cr(VI) requiring further assessment. For all other metals, the Applicant has concluded that exceedences of the EAL for all metals are not likely to occur.

The 2009 report of the Expert Panel on Air Quality Standards (EPAQS) – "Guidelines for Metal and Metalloids in Ambient Air for the Protection of Human Health", sets non statutory ambient air quality guidelines for Arsenic,

Nickel and Chromium (VI). These guidelines have been incorporated as ESs in our guidance 'Air emissions risk assessment for your environmental permit'

Chromium (VI) is not specifically referenced in Annex VI of IED, which includes only total Chromium as one of the nine Group 3 metals, the impact of which has been assessed above. The EPAQS guidelines refer only to that portion of the metal emissions contained within PM₁₀ in ambient air. The guideline for Chromium (VI) is 0.2 ng/m³.

- Measurement of Chromium (VI) at the levels anticipated at the stack emission points is expected to be difficult, with the likely levels being below the level of detection by the most advanced methods. We have considered the concentration of total chromium and chromium (VI) in the APC residues collected upstream of the emission point for existing Municipal Waste incinerators and have assumed these to be similar to the particulate matter released from the emission point. This data shows that the mean Cr(VI) emission concentration (based on the bag dust ratio) is 3.5×10^{-5} mg/m³ (max 1.3×10^{-4}).

In addition the feedstock is MBM which is not that similar to variable feedstock in municipal waste facilities. The applicant has therefore made reference to the Glanford Power Station, (permit ref: EPR/UP3232SX) which processes a similar feedstock. The results of recent monitoring of metals concentrations in the stack and in the bottom ash and APC residues indicates that the total chromium content of the bottom ash and APC residues is less than the limit of detection (i.e. less than 0.001×10^{-3} %).

There is little data available on the background levels of Cr(VI). Taking a precautionary approach. We have assumed that the background level already exceeds the ES.

The Applicant has therefore used this reference data to model the predicted Cr(VI) impact. The PC is predicted as 0.59% of the EAL. (see table 4 above).

This assessment shows that emissions of Chromium (VI) screen out as insignificant. We agree with the Applicant's conclusions. The installation has been assessed as meeting BAT for control of metal emissions to air. See section 6 of this document.

The assessment of the impact of metals is based on predicted concentrations. We have included an improvement condition (IC6) requiring the Operator to review the monitoring of emissions of chromium VI and arsenic from the first year of operations and to assess the results against the relevant environmental standards. Where the actual emissions exceed the environmental standards, the Operator will be required to carry out further investigations.

5.2.4 Consideration of Local Factors

(i) Impact on Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs)

No Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) have been declared within an area likely to be affected by emissions from the co-incinerator.

5.3 Human health risk assessment

5.3.1 Our role in preventing harm to human health

The Environment Agency has a statutory role to protect the environment and human health from all processes and activities it regulates. We assessed the effects on human health for this application in the following ways:

i) **Applying Statutory Controls**

The plant will be regulated under EPR. These regulations include the requirements of relevant EU Directives, notably, the industrial emissions directive (IED), the waste framework directive (WFD), and ambient air directive (AAD).

The main conditions in an EfW permit are based on the requirements of the IED. Specific conditions have been introduced to specifically ensure compliance with the requirements of Chapter IV. The aim of the IED is to prevent or, where that is not practicable, to reduce emissions to air, water and land and prevent the generation of waste, in order to achieve a high level of protection of the environment taken as a whole. IED achieves this aim by setting operational conditions, technical requirements and emission limit values to meet the requirements set out in Articles 11 and 18 of the IED. These requirements include the application of BAT, which may in some circumstances dictate tighter emission limits and controls than those set out in Chapter IV of IED on waste incineration and co-incineration plants. The assessment of BAT for this installation is detailed in section 6 of this document.

ii) **Environmental Impact Assessment**

Industrial activities can give rise to odour, noise and vibration, accidents, fugitive emissions to air and water, releases to air (including the impact on Photochemical Ozone Creation Potential (POCP)), discharges to ground or groundwater, global warming potential and generation of waste. For an installation of this kind, the principal environmental effects are through emissions to air, although we also consider all of the other impacts listed. Section 5.1 and 5.2 above explain how we have approached the critical issue of assessing the likely impact of the emissions to air from the Installation on human health and the environment and any measures we are requiring to ensure a high level of protection.

iii) Expert Scientific Opinion

We take account of the views of national and international expert bodies. The gathering of evidence is a continuing process. Although gathering evidence is not our role we keep the available evidence under review. The following is a summary of some of the publications which we have considered (in no particular order). Some of the publications refer to municipal waste incinerators rather than a MBM co-incinerator, it is expected that emissions from MBM will actually be lower for a wood co-incinerator.

An independent review of evidence on the health effects of municipal waste incinerators was published by **DEFRA** in 2004. It concluded that there was no convincing link between the emissions from MSW incinerators and adverse effects on public health in terms of cancer, respiratory disease or birth defects. On air quality effects, the report concluded “Waste incinerators contribute to local air pollution. This contribution, however, is usually a small proportion of existing background levels which is not detectable through environmental monitoring (for example, by comparing upwind and downwind levels of airborne pollutants or substances deposited to land). In some cases, waste incinerator facilities may make a more detectable contribution to air pollution. Because current MSW incinerators are located predominantly in urban areas, effects on air quality are likely to be so small as to be undetectable in practice.”

The European Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control Bureau stated in the Reference Document on the Best Available Techniques for Waste Incineration August 2006 “European health impact assessment studies, on the basis of current evidence and modern emission performance, suggest that the local impacts of incinerator emissions to air are either negligible or not detectable.”

HPA (now PHE) in 2009 states that “The Health Protection Agency has reviewed research undertaken to examine the suggested links between emissions from municipal waste incinerators and effects on health. While it is not possible to rule out adverse health effects from modern, well regulated municipal waste incinerators with complete certainty, any potential damage to the health of those living close-by is likely to be very small, if detectable”. In January 2012 PHE confirmed they would be undertaking a study to look for evidence of any link between municipal waste incinerators and health outcomes including low birth weight, still births and infant deaths. Their current position that modern, well run municipal waste incinerators are not a significant risk to public health remains valid. The study will extend the evidence base and provide the public with further information

Policy Advice from Government also points out that the minimal risk from modern incinerators. Paragraph 22 (Chapter 5) of WS2007 says that “research carried out to date has revealed no credible evidence of adverse health outcomes for those living near incinerators.” It points out that “the relevant health effects, mainly cancers, have long incubation times. But the

research that is available shows an absence of symptoms relating to exposures twenty or more years ago when emissions from incinerators were much greater than is now the case.” **Paragraph 30 of PPS10** explains that “modern, appropriately located, well run and well regulated waste management facilities should pose little risk to public health.”

The **Committee on Carcinogenicity of Chemicals in Food, Consumer Products and the Environment (CoC)** issued a statement in 2000 which said that “any potential risk of cancer due to residency (for periods in excess of 10 years) near to municipal solid waste incinerators was exceedingly low and probably not measurable by the most modern epidemiological techniques.” In 2009, CoC considered six further relevant epidemiological papers that had been published since the 2000 statement, and concluded that “there is no need to change the advice given in the previous statement in 2000 but that the situation should be kept under review”.

Republic of Ireland Health Research Board report stated that “It is hard to separate the influences of other sources of pollutants, and other causes of cancer and, as a result, the evidence for a link between cancer and proximity to an incinerator is not conclusive”.

The **Food Safety Authority of Ireland (FSAI) (2003)** investigated possible implications on health associated with food contamination from waste incineration and concluded: “In relation to the possible impact of introduction of waste incineration in Ireland, as part of a national waste management strategy, on this currently largely satisfactory situation, the FSAI considers that such incineration facilities, if properly managed, will not contribute to dioxin levels in the food supply to any significant extent. The risks to health and sustainable development presented by the continued dependency on landfill as a method of waste disposal far outweigh any possible effects on food safety and quality.”

Health Protection Scotland (2009) considered scientific studies on health effects associated with the incineration of waste particularly those published after the Defra review discussed earlier. The main conclusions of this report were: “(a) For waste incineration as a whole topic, the body of evidence for an association with (non-occupational) adverse health effects is both inconsistent and inconclusive. However, more recent work suggests, more strongly, that there may have been an association between emissions (particularly dioxins) in the past from industrial, clinical and municipal waste incinerators and some forms of cancer, before more stringent regulatory requirements were implemented. (b) For individual waste streams, the evidence for an association with (non-occupational) adverse health effects is inconclusive. (c) The magnitude of any past health effects on residential populations living near incinerators that did occur is likely to have been small. (d) Levels of airborne emissions from individual incinerators should be lower now than in the past, due to stricter legislative controls and improved technology. Hence, any risk to the health of a local population living near an incinerator, associated with its emissions, should also now be lower.”

The **US National Research Council Committee on Health Effects of Waste Incineration (NRC) (NRC 2000)** reviewed evidence as part of a wide ranging report. The Committee view of the published evidence was summarised in a key conclusion: “Few epidemiological studies have attempted to assess whether adverse health effects have actually occurred near individual incinerators, and most of them have been unable to detect any effects. The studies of which the committee is aware that did report finding health effects had shortcomings and failed to provide convincing evidence. That result is not surprising given the small populations typically available for study and the fact that such effects, if any, might occur only infrequently or take many years to appear. Also, factors such as emissions from other pollution sources and variations in human activity patterns often decrease the likelihood of determining a relationship between small contributions of pollutants from incinerators and observed health effects. Lack of evidence of such relationships might mean that adverse health effects did not occur, but it could mean that such relationships might not be detectable using available methods and sources.”

The **British Society for Ecological Medicine (BSEM) published a report in 2005** on the health effects associated with incineration and concluded that “Large studies have shown higher rates of adult and childhood cancer and also birth defects around municipal waste incinerators: the results are consistent with the associations being causal. A number of smaller epidemiological studies support this interpretation and suggest that the range of illnesses produced by incinerators may be much wider. Incinerator emissions are a major source of fine particulates, of toxic metals and of more than 200 organic chemicals, including known carcinogens, mutagens, and hormone disrupters. Emissions also contain other unidentified compounds whose potential for harm is as yet unknown, as was once the case with dioxins. Abatement equipment in modern incinerators merely transfers the toxic load, notably that of dioxins and heavy metals, from airborne emissions to the fly ash. This fly ash is light, readily windborne and mostly of low particle size. It represents a considerable and poorly understood health hazard.”

The BSEM report was reviewed by the HPA and they concluded that “Having considered the BSEM report the HPA maintains its position that contemporary and effectively managed and regulated waste incineration processes contribute little to the concentrations of monitored pollutants in ambient air and that the emissions from such plants have little effect on health.” The BSEM report was also commented on by the consultants who produced the Defra 2004 report referred to above. They said that “It fails to consider the significance of incineration as a source of the substances of concern. It does not consider the possible significance of the dose of pollutants that could result from incinerators. It does not fairly consider the adverse effects that could be associated with alternatives to incineration. It relies on inaccurate and outdated material. In view of these shortcomings, the report’s conclusions with regard to the health effects of incineration are not reliable.”

A **Greenpeace** review on incineration and human health concluded that a broad range of health effects have been associated with living near to

incinerators as well as with working at these installations. Such effects include cancer (among both children and adults), adverse impacts on the respiratory system, heart disease, immune system effects, increased allergies and congenital abnormalities. Some studies, particularly those on cancer, relate to old rather than modern incinerators. However, modern incinerators operating in the last few years have also been associated with adverse health effects.”

The Health Protection Scotland report referred to above says that “the authors of the Greenpeace review do not explain the basis for their conclusion that there is an association between incineration and adverse effects in terms of criteria used to assess the strength of evidence. The weighting factors used to derive the assessment are not detailed. The objectivity of the conclusion cannot therefore be easily tested.”

From this published body of scientific opinion, we take the view stated by the HPA that “While it is not possible to rule out adverse health effects from modern, well regulated municipal waste incinerators with complete certainty, any potential damage to the health of those living close-by is likely to be very small, if detectable”. We therefore ensure that permits contain conditions which require the installation to be well-run and regulate the installation to ensure compliance with such permit conditions.

iv) Health Risk Models

Comparing the results of air dispersion modelling as part of the Environmental Impact assessment against European and national air quality standards effectively makes a health risk assessment for those pollutants for which a standard has been derived. These air quality standards have been developed primarily in order to protect human health via known intake mechanisms, such as inhalation and ingestion. Some pollutants, such as dioxins, furans and dioxin like PCBs, have human health impacts at lower ingestion levels than lend themselves to setting an air quality standard to control against. For these pollutants, a different human health risk model is required which better reflects the level of dioxin intake.

Models are available to predict the dioxin, furan and dioxin like PCBs intake for comparison with the Tolerable Daily Intake (TDI) recommended by the Committee on Toxicity of Chemicals in Food, Consumer Products and the Environment, known as COT. These include the HHRAP model.

HHRAP has been developed by the US EPA to calculate the human body intake of a range of carcinogenic pollutants and to determine the mathematic quantitative risk in probabilistic terms. In the UK, in common with other European Countries, we consider a threshold dose below which the likelihood of an adverse effect is regarded as being very low or effectively zero.

The TDI is the amount of a substance that can be ingested daily over a lifetime without appreciable health risk. It is expressed in relation to bodyweight in order to allow for different body size, such as for children of different ages. In the UK, the COT has set a TDI for dioxins, furans and

dioxin like PCB's of 2 picograms I-TEQ/Kg-body weight/day (N.B. a picogram is a million millionths (10⁻¹²) of a gram).

In addition to an assessment of risk from dioxins, furans and dioxin like PCB's, the HHRAP model enables a risk assessment from human intake of a range of heavy metals. In principle, the respective ES for these metals are protective of human health. It is not therefore necessary to model the human body intake.

COMEAP developed a methodology based on the results of time series epidemiological studies which allows calculation of the public health impact of exposure to the classical air pollutants (NO₂, SO₂ and particulates) in terms of the numbers of "deaths brought forward" and the "number of hospital admissions for respiratory disease brought forward or additional". COMEAP has issued a statement expressing some reservations about the applicability of applying its methodology to small affected areas. Those concerns generally relate to the fact that the exposure-response coefficients used in the COMEAP report derive from studies of whole urban populations where the air pollution climate may differ from that around a new industrial installation. COMEAP identified a number of factors and assumptions that would contribute to the uncertainty of the estimates. These were summarised in the Defra review as below:

- Assumption that the spatial distribution of the air pollutants considered is the same in the area under study as in those areas, usually cities or large towns, in which the studies which generated the coefficients were undertaken.
- Assumption that the temporal pattern of pollutant concentrations in the area under study is similar to that in the areas in which the studies which generated the coefficients were undertaken (i.e. urban areas).
- It should be recognised that a difference in the pattern of socio-economic conditions between the areas to be studied and the reference areas could lead to inaccuracy in the predicted level of effects.
- In the same way, a difference in the pattern of personal exposures between the areas to be studied and the reference areas will affect the accuracy of the predictions of effects.

The use of the COMEAP methodology is not generally recommended for modelling the human health impacts of individual installations. However it may have limited applicability where emissions of NO_x, SO₂ and particulates cannot be screened out as insignificant in the Environmental Impact assessment, there are high ambient background levels of these pollutants and we are advised that its use was appropriate by our public health consultees.

Our recommended approach is therefore the use of the methodology set out in our guidance for comparison for most pollutants (including metals) and dioxin intake model using the HHRAP model as described above for dioxins, furans and dioxin like PCBs. Where an alternative approach is adopted for dioxins, we check the predictions ourselves.

v) Consultations

As part of our normal procedures for the determination of a permit application, we consult with Local Authorities, Local Authority Directors of Public Health, FSA and PHE. We also consult the local communities who may raise health related issues. All issues raised by these consultations are considered in determining the application as described in Annex 4 of this document.

5.3.2 Assessment of Intake of Dioxins, Furans and Dioxin like PCBs

For dioxins, furans and dioxin like PCBs, the principal exposure route is through ingestion, usually through the food chain, and the main risk to health is through accumulation in the body over a period of time.

The human health risk assessment calculates the dose of dioxins and furans that would be received by local receptors if their food and water were sourced from the locality where the deposition of dioxins, furans and dioxin like PCBs is predicted to be the highest. This is then assessed against the Tolerable Daily Intake (TDI) levels established by the COT of 2 picograms I-TEQ / Kg bodyweight/ day.

The results of the Applicant's assessment of dioxin intake at point of maximum impact (a hypothetical resident) are presented in the table below. The results showed that the predicted daily intake of dioxins, furans and dioxin like PCBs at all receptors, resulting from emissions from the proposed facility, were significantly below the recommended TDI levels.

Receptor	adult	child
Hypothetical resident	0.022	0.0308

Calculated maximum daily intake of dioxins by local receptors resulting from the operation of the proposed facility (I-TEQ/ kg-BW/day)

The applicant has performed a HHRA to assess dioxins and furans from the ERF stack emissions. The applicant has used Lakes IRAP-h View, based on the US EPA Human Health Risk Assessment Protocol (HHRAP) considering the following pathways:

- Inhalation
- Ingestion of soil, food grown, etc.
- Consumption of fruit and vegetables

The ingestion exposure pathways considered in the applicant's assessment is in Appendix A of the applicant's HHRA report, J G PEARS NEWARK 42MWTH CHP HUMAN HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT. The applicant predicted intakes for metals. However, this is not required because there are no fish farms or fisheries within 10 km of the CHP Plant and therefore the long term environmental standard for each metal will be protective of the intake health criteria. We agree with their exclusion of dermal absorption, drinking water and locally caught fish pathways in this case.

The Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) demonstrates that “the predicted risks as a consequence of emissions of dioxins and furans are well within limits for the protection of human health”. As a result of our check modelling and sensitivity analysis we find that, although we do not agree with applicant’s exact numerical predictions and methodology, we are satisfied that levels for human health protection can be considered insignificant.

We note that that for children, the cadmium and chromium Mean Daily Intake (MDI) sourced from existing background dietary intake, already exceeds the TDI. The applicant maintains however, that the process contribution is “exceptionally small” and the exceedance of the overall TDI is a reflection of the fact the MDI is over 100% of the TD and that the CHP Plant would not significantly increase the health risks from cadmium or chromium for children.

As indicated, our position is that due to the ambient air EQS being more protective than the Health Criteria Values (derived from the EFSA tolerable weekly intake) the long term environmental standard for each metal will be protective of the intake health criteria. Therefore, we agree that the cadmium and chromium emissions from the CHP Plant will be insignificant compared to the long term standard for human health.

The FSA has reported that dietary studies have shown that estimated total dietary intakes of dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs from all sources by all age groups fell by around 50% between 1997 and 2001, and are expected to continue to fall. A report in 2012 showed that Dioxin and PCB levels in food have fallen slightly since 2001. In 2001, the average daily intake by adults in the UK from diet was 0.9 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bodyweight. The additional daily intake predicted by the modelling as shown in the table above is substantially below this figure.

In 2010, FSA studied the levels of chlorinated, brominated and mixed (chlorinated-brominated) dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs in fish, shellfish, meat and eggs consumed in UK. It asked COT to consider the results and to advise on whether the measured levels of these PXDDs, PXDFs and PXBs indicated a health concern (‘X’ means a halogen). COT issued a statement in December 2010 and concluded that “The major contribution to the total dioxin toxic activity in the foods measured came from chlorinated compounds. Brominated compounds made a much smaller contribution, and mixed halogenated compounds contributed even less (1% or less of TDI). Measured levels of PXDDs, PXDFs and dioxin-like PXBs do not indicate a health concern”. COT recognised the lack of quantified TEFs for these compounds but said that “even if the TEFs for PXDDs, PXDFs and dioxin-like PXBs were up to four fold higher than assumed, their contribution to the total TEQ in the diet would still be small. Thus, further research on PXDDs, PXDFs and dioxin-like PXBs is not considered a priority.”

In the light of this statement, we assess the impact of chlorinated compounds as representing the impact of all chlorinated, brominated and mixed dioxins / furans and dioxin like PCBs.

5.3.3 Particulates smaller than 2.5 microns

The Operator will be required to monitor particulate emissions using the method set out in Table S3.1 of Schedule 3 of the Permit. This method requires that the filter efficiency must be at least 99.5 % on a test aerosol with a mean particle diameter of 0.3 μm , at the maximum flow rate anticipated. The filter efficiency for larger particles will be at least as high as this. This means that particulate monitoring data effectively captures everything above 0.3 μm and much of what is smaller. It is not expected that particles smaller than 0.3 μm will contribute significantly to the mass release rate / concentration of particulates because of their very small mass, even if present. This means that emissions monitoring data can be relied upon to measure the true mass emission rate of particulates.

Nano-particles are considered to refer to those particulates less than 0.1 μm in diameter ($\text{PM}_{0.1}$). Questions are often raised about the effect of nano-particles on human health, in particular on children's health, because of their high surface to volume ratio, making them more reactive, and their very small size, giving them the potential to penetrate cell walls of living organisms. The small size also means there will be a larger number of small particles for a given mass concentration. However the HPA statement (referenced below) says that due to the small effects of incinerators on local concentration of particles, it is highly unlikely that there will be detectable effects of any particular incinerator on local infant mortality.

The HPA (now PHE) addresses the issue of the health effects of particulates in their September 2009 statement 'The Impact on Health of Emissions to Air from Municipal Incinerators'. It refers to the coefficients linking PM_{10} and $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ with effects on health derived by COMEAP and goes on to say that if these coefficients are applied to small increases in concentrations produced, locally, by incinerators; the estimated effects on health are likely to be small. PHE note that the coefficients that allow the use of number concentrations in impact calculations have not yet been defined because the national experts have not judged that the evidence is sufficient to do so. This is an area being kept under review by COMEAP.

In December 2010, COMEAP published a report on The Mortality Effects of Long-Term Exposure to Particulate Air Pollution in the United Kingdom. It says that "a policy which aims to reduce the annual average concentration of $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ by 1 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ would result in an increase in life expectancy of 20 days for people born in 2008." However, "The Committee stresses the need for careful interpretation of these metrics to avoid incorrect inferences being drawn – they are valid representations of population aggregate or average effects, but they can be misleading when interpreted as reflecting the experience of individuals."

PHE also point out that in 2007 incinerators contributed 0.02% to ambient ground level PM_{10} levels compared with 18% for road traffic and 22% for industry in general. PHE noted that in a sample collected in a day at a typical urban area the proportion of $\text{PM}_{0.1}$ is around 5-10% of PM_{10} . It goes on to say

that PM₁₀ includes and exceeds PM_{2.5} which in turn includes and exceeds PM_{0.1}.

This is consistent with the assessment of this application which shows emissions of PM₁₀ to air to be insignificant.

We take the view, based on the foregoing evidence, that techniques which control the release of particulates to levels which will not cause harm to human health will also control the release of fine particulate matter to a level which will not cause harm to human health.

5.3.4 Assessment of Health Effects from the Installation

We have assessed the health effects from the operation of this installation in relation to the above (sections 5.3.1 to 5.3.3). We have applied the relevant requirements of the national and European legislation in imposing the permit conditions. We are satisfied that compliance with these conditions will ensure protection of the environment and human health.

Taking into account all of the expert opinion available, we agree with the conclusion reached by PHE that “While it is not possible to rule out adverse health effects from modern, well regulated municipal waste incinerators with complete certainty, any potential damage to the health of those living close-by is likely to be very small, if detectable.”

In carrying out air dispersion modelling as part of the Environmental Impact assessment and comparing the predicted environmental concentrations with European and national air quality standards, the Applicant has effectively made a health risk assessment for many pollutants. These air quality standards have been developed primarily in order to protect human health.

The Applicant’s assessment of the impact from:

- Mercury
- Antimony
- Copper
- Vanadium
- Chromium(II)(III)

have all indicated that the Installation emissions screen out as insignificant; where the impact of emissions of :

- Cadmium
- Arsenic
- Chromium(VI)
- Lead
- Manganese
- Nickel

have not been screened out as insignificant, the assessment still shows that the predicted environmental concentrations are well within air quality standards or environmental action levels.

The Environment Agency has reviewed the methodology employed by the Applicant to carry out the health impact assessment.

The Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) demonstrates that “the predicted risks as a consequence of emissions of dioxins and furans are well within limits for the protection of human health”. As a result of our check modelling and sensitivity analysis we find that, although we do not agree with Applicant’s exact numerical predictions and methodology, we are satisfied that levels for human health protection can be considered insignificant.

Overall, taking into account the conservative nature of the impact assessment (i.e. that it is based upon an individual exposed for a life-time to the effects of the highest predicted relevant airborne concentrations and consuming mostly locally grown food), it was concluded that the operation of the proposed facility will not pose a significant carcinogenic or non-carcinogenic risk to human health.

Public Health England and the Local Authority Director of Public Health were consulted on the Application and concluded that they had no significant concerns regarding the risk to the health of humans from the installation. The Food Standards Agency was also consulted during the permit determination process and it concluded that it is unlikely that there will be any unacceptable effects on the human food chain as a result of the operations at the Installation. Details of the responses provided by Public Health England, the Local Authority Director of Public Health and the FSA to the consultation on this Application can be found in Annex 2.

The Environment Agency is therefore satisfied that the Applicant’s conclusions presented above are soundly based and we conclude that the potential emissions of pollutants including dioxins, furans and metals from the proposed facility are unlikely to have an impact upon human health.

5.4 Impact on Habitats sites, SSSIs, non-statutory conservation sites etc.

5.4.1 Sites Considered

There are no Habitats (i.e. Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas and Ramsar) sites within 10Km of the proposed Installation.

There are no Sites of Special Scientific Interest within 2Km of the proposed Installation.

The following non-statutory local wildlife and conservation sites are located within 2Km of the Installation:

- Old Trent Oxbow, Spalford
- South Clifton Grassland
- Fledborough to Harby Dismantled Railway
- Grassthorpe Corner
- Marnham Railway Yard
- Low Marnham Grassland
- Meadow Lane Grasslands
- Normanton on Trent
- Old Trent, Marnham

5.4.2 Assessment of other conservation sites

Conservation sites are protected in law by legislation. The Habitats Directive provides the highest level of protection for SACs and SPAs, domestic legislation provides a lower but important level of protection for SSSIs. Finally the Environment Act provides more generalised protection for flora and fauna rather than for specifically named conservation designations. It is under the Environment Act that we assess other sites (such as local wildlife sites) which prevents us from permitting something that will result in significant pollution; and which offers levels of protection proportionate with other European and national legislation. However, it should not be assumed that because levels of protection are less stringent for these other sites that they are not of considerable importance. Local sites link and support EU and national nature conservation sites together and hence help to maintain the UK's biodiversity resilience.

For SACs SPAs, Ramsars and SSSIs we consider the contribution PC and the background levels in making an assessment of impact. In assessing these other sites under the Environment Act we look at the impact from the Installation alone in order to determine whether it would cause significant pollution. This is a proportionate approach, in line with the levels of protection offered by the conservation legislation to protect these other sites (which are generally more numerous than Natura 2000 or SSSIs) whilst ensuring that we do not restrict development.

Critical levels and loads are set to protect the most vulnerable habitat types. Thresholds change in accordance with the levels of protection afforded by the legislation. Therefore the thresholds for SAC SPA and SSSI features are more stringent than those for other nature conservation sites.

Therefore we would generally conclude that the Installation is not causing significant pollution at these other sites if the PC is less than the relevant critical level or critical load, provided that the Applicant is using BAT to control emissions.

We have reviewed the information submitted in the Application, Appendix 6 of J G Pears Newark 42MWth CHP Air Quality Assessment of the Supporting Information and agree with the results as presented in Table 9.4: Impact of Emissions at Non-Statutory Designated Sensitive Ecological Receptors that the PCs are below 100% of the critical levels or loads. We are satisfied that the Installation will not cause significant pollution at these sites. The Applicant is required to prevent, minimise and control emissions using BAT, this is considered further in Section 6. we are satisfied that appropriate measures will be in place to ensure that energy is used efficiently within the Installation.

5.5 Impact of abnormal operations

Article 50(4)(c) of IED requires that waste incineration and co-incineration plants shall operate an automatic system to prevent waste feed whenever any of the continuous emission monitors show that an emission limit value (ELV) is exceeded due to disturbances or failures of the purification devices. Notwithstanding this, Article 46(6) allows for the continued incineration and co-incineration of waste under such conditions provided that this period does not (in any circumstances) exceed 4 hours uninterrupted continuous operation or the cumulative period of operation does not exceed 60 hours in a calendar year. This is a recognition that the emissions during transient states (e.g. start-up and shut-down) are higher than during steady-state operation, and the overall environmental impact of continued operation with a limited exceedance of an ELV may be less than that of a partial shut-down and re-start.

For incineration plant, IED sets backstop limits for particulates, CO and TOC which must continue to be met at all times. The CO and TOC limits are the same as for normal operation, and are intended to ensure that good combustion conditions are maintained. The backstop limit for particulates is 150 mg/m³ (as a half hourly average) which is five times the limit in normal operation.

Article 45(1)(f) requires that the permit shall specify the maximum permissible period of any technically unavoidable stoppages, disturbances, or failures of the purification devices or the measurement devices, during which the concentrations in the discharges into the air may exceed the prescribed emission limit values. In this case we have decided to set the time limit at 4 hours, which is the maximum period prescribed by Article 46(6) of the IED.

These abnormal operations are limited to no more than a period of 4 hours continuous operation and no more than 60 hour aggregated operation in any calendar year. This is less than 1% of total operating hours and so abnormal operating conditions are not expected to have any significant long term environmental impact unless the background conditions were already close to, or exceeding, an ES. For the most part therefore consideration of abnormal operations is limited to consideration of its impact on short term ESs.

In making an assessment of abnormal operations the following worst case scenario has been assumed:

- Dioxin emissions of 10 ng/m³ (100 x normal)
- Mercury emissions are 100 times those of normal operation
- NO_x emissions of 1500 mg/m³ (5 x normal)
- Particulate emissions of 225 mg/m³ (15 x normal)
- Metal emissions other than mercury are 5 times those of normal operation
- SO₂ emissions of 1585 mg/m³ (20 x normal)
- HCl emissions of 815 mg/m³ (24 x normal)
- PCBs (100 x normal)

This is a worst case scenario in that these abnormal conditions include a number of different equipment failures not all of which will necessarily result in an adverse impact on the environment (e.g. a failure of a monitoring instrument does not necessarily mean that the incinerator or abatement plant is malfunctioning). This analysis assumes that any failure of any equipment results in all the negative impacts set out above occurring simultaneously.

The result on the Applicant's short-term environmental impact is summarised in the table below.

Pollutant	EQS / EAL		Back-ground	Process Contribution (PC)		Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC)	
	µg/m ³			µg/m ³	% of EAL	µg/m ³	% of EAL
NO ₂	200	2	37.2	11.6	5.8	58.1	29.1
PM ₁₀	50	3	44.4	0.4	0.80	6	12.0
SO ₂	266	4	11.8	9.3	3.5	196.8	74.0
	350	5	11.8	7.8	2.23	165.5	47.3
HCl	750	6	1.44	2.4	0.32	130.4	17.39
HF	160	6	4.7	0.2	0.125	21.60	13.5
Hg	7.5	1	0.002	7.99E-03	0.11	0.11985	1.598
Pb	150	1	4.50E-04	4.50E-04	0.0003	0.00050	0.0003
Cu	200	1	0.0152	4.63E-04	0.0002	0.06950	0.035

Pollutant	EQS / EAL		Back-ground	Process Contribution (PC)		Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC)	
	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$			$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	% of EAL	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	% of EAL
Mn	1500	1	0.00689	9.59E-03	0.001	0.14380	0.0096
V	1	1	0.00068	9.60E-05	0.010	0.01438	1.4380
Cr (II)(III)	150	1	0.00052	8.30E-04	0.001	9.10E-04	0.0006
Dioxins			2.28E-08	8.70E-10		1.51E-06	

- Notes
- 1 1-hr Maximum
 - 2 99.79th %ile of 1-hour means
 - 3 90.41st %ile of 24-hour means
 - 4 99.9th ile of 15-min means
 - 5 99.73rd %ile of 1-hour means
 - 6 1-hour average

From the table above the emissions of the following substances can still be considered insignificant, in that the PC is still <10% of the short-term ES.

- Mercury, Hg
- Lead, Pb
- Copper, Cu
- Maganese, Mn
- Vanadium, V
- Chromium, Cr (II)(III)

Also from the table above emissions of the following emissions (which were not screened out as insignificant) have been assessed as being unlikely to give rise to significant pollution in that the predicted environmental concentration is less than 100% of short term ES.

- Nitrogen dioxide
- Particulate matter (PM10s)
- Sulphur dioxide (daily)
- Sulphur dioxide (1-hour)
- Sulphur dioxide (15-min)
- Hydrogen chloride
- Hydrogen fluoride

We are therefore satisfied that it is not necessary to further constrain the conditions and duration of the periods of abnormal operation beyond those permitted under Chapter IV of the IED.

We have not assessed the impact of abnormal operations against long term ESs for the reasons set out above. Except that if dioxin emissions were at 10

ng/m³ for the maximum period of abnormal operation, this would result in an increase of approximately 1.7 times in the TDI reported in section 5.3.2. In these circumstances the TDI would be 0.0374 pg(I-TEQ/ kg-BW/day), which is 1.87% of the COT TDI. At this level, emissions of dioxins will still not pose a risk to human health.

6. Application of Best Available Techniques

6.1 Scope of Consideration

In this section, we explain how we have determined whether the Applicant's proposals are the Best Available Techniques for this Installation.

- The first issue we address is the fundamental choice of incineration technology. There are a number of alternatives, and the Applicant has explained why it has chosen one particular kind for this Installation.
 - We then consider in particular control measures for the emissions which were not screened out as insignificant in the previous section on minimising the installation's environmental impact. They are: Annual Mean for Nitrogen Dioxide, TOC as 1,3 butadiene, VOC as benzene, Cadmium and PAH's.
- We also have to consider the combustion efficiency and energy utilisation of different design options for the Installation, which are relevant considerations in the determination of BAT for the Installation, including the Global Warming Potential of the different options.
- Finally, the prevention and minimisation of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) must be considered, as we explain below.

Chapter IV of the IED specifies a set of maximum emission limit values. Although these limits are designed to be stringent, and to provide a high level of environmental protection, they do not necessarily reflect what can be achieved by new plant. Article 14(3) of the IED says that BAT Conclusions shall be the reference for setting the permit conditions, so it may be possible and desirable to achieve emissions below the limits referenced in Chapter IV. However BAT Conclusions and a revised BREF for Incineration have not yet been drafted or published, so the existing BREF and Chapter IV of the IED remain relevant.

Even if the Chapter IV limits are appropriate, operational controls complement the emission limits and should generally result in emissions below the maximum allowed; whilst the limits themselves provide headroom to allow for unavoidable process fluctuations. Actual emissions are therefore almost certain to be below emission limits in practice, because any Operator who sought to operate its installation continually at the maximum permitted level would almost inevitably breach those limits regularly, simply by virtue of

normal fluctuations in plant performance, resulting in enforcement action (including potentially prosecution) being taken. Assessments based on, say, Chapter IV limits are therefore “worst-case” scenarios.

Should the Installation, once in operation, emit at rates significantly below the limits included in the Permit, we will consider tightening ELVs appropriately. We are, however, satisfied that emissions at the permitted limits would ensure a high level of protection for human health and the environment in any event.

6.1.1 Consideration of Furnace Type

The prime function of the furnace is to achieve maximum combustion of the waste. Chapter IV of the IED requires that the plant (furnace in this context) should be designed to deliver its requirements. The main requirements of Chapter IV in relation to the choice of a furnace are compliance with air emission limits for CO and TOC and achieving a low TOC/LOI level in the bottom ash.

The Waste Incineration BREF elaborates the furnace selection criteria as:

- the use of a furnace (including secondary combustion chamber) dimensions that are large enough to provide for an effective combination of gas residence time and temperature such that combustion reactions may approach completion and result in low and stable CO and TOC emissions to air and low TOC in residues.
- use of a combination of furnace design, operation and waste throughput rate that provides sufficient agitation and residence time of the waste in the furnace at sufficiently high temperatures.
- The use of furnace design that, as far as possible, physically retain the waste within the combustion chamber (e.g. grate bar spacing) to allow its complete combustion.

The BREF also provides a comparison of combustion and thermal treatment technologies and factors affecting their applicability and operational suitability used in EU and for all types of wastes. There is also some information on the comparative costs. The table below has been extracted from the BREF tables. This table is also in line with the Guidance Note “The Incineration of Waste (EPR 5.01)). However, it should not be taken as an exhaustive list nor that all technologies listed have found equal application across Europe.

Overall, any of the furnace technologies listed below would be considered as BAT provided the Applicant has justified it in terms of:

- nature/physical state of the waste and its variability
- proposed plant throughput which may affect the number of incineration lines
- preference and experience of chosen technology including plant availability
- nature and quantity/quality of residues produced.
- emissions to air – usually NO_x as the furnace choice could have an effect on the amount of unabated NO_x produced

- energy consumption – whole plant, waste preparation, effect on GWP
- Need, if any, for further processing of residues to comply with TOC
- Costs

Summary comparison of thermal treatment technologies (reproduced from the Waste Incineration BREF)

Technique	Key waste characteristics and suitability	Throughput per line	Advantages	Disadvantages / Limitations of use	Bottom Ash Quality	Cost
Moving grate (air-cooled)	<p>Low to medium heat values (LCV 5 – 16.5 GJ/t)</p> <p>Municipal and other heterogeneous solid wastes</p> <p>Can accept a proportion of sewage sludge and/or medical waste with municipal waste</p> <p>Applied at most modern MSW installations</p>	<p>1 to 50 t/h with most projects 5 to 30 t/h.</p> <p>Most industrial applications not below 2.5 or 3 t/h.</p>	<p>Widely proven at large scales.</p> <p>Robust</p> <p>Low maintenance cost</p> <p>Long operational history</p> <p>Can take heterogeneous wastes without special preparation</p>	<p>generally not suited to powders, liquids or materials that melt through the grate</p>	<p>TOC 0.5 % to 3 %</p>	<p>High capacity reduces specific cost per tonne of waste</p>
Moving grate (liquid Cooled)	<p>Same as air-cooled grates except:</p> <p>LCV 10 – 20 GJ/t</p>	<p>Same as air-cooled grates</p>	<p>As air-cooled grates but:</p> <p>higher heat value waste is treatable</p> <p>better Combustion control possible.</p>	<p>As air-cooled grates but:</p> <p>risk of grate damage/leaks</p> <p>higher complexity</p>	<p>TOC 0.5 % to 3 %</p>	<p>Slightly higher capital cost than air-cooled</p>

Technique	Key waste characteristics and suitability	Throughput per line	Advantages	Disadvantages / Limitations of use	Bottom Ash Quality	Cost
Rotary Kiln	Can accept liquids and pastes solid feeds more limited than grate (owing to refractory damage) often applied to hazardous Wastes	<10 t/h	Very well proven with broad range of wastes and good burn out even of HW	Throughputs lower than grates	TOC <3 %	Higher specific cost due to reduced capacity
Fluid bed - bubbling	Only finely divided consistent wastes. Limited use for raw MSW <input type="checkbox"/> often applied to sludges	1 to 10 t/h	Good mixing Fly ashes of good leaching quality	Careful operation required to avoid clogging bed. Higher fly ash quantities.	TOC <3 %	FGT cost may be lower. Costs of waste preparation
Fluid bed - circulating	Only finely divided consistent wastes. Limited use for raw MSW, often applied to sludges / RDF.	1 to 20 t/h most used above 10 t/h	Greater fuel flexibility than BFB Fly ashes of good leaching quality	Cyclone required to conserve bed material Higher fly ash quantities	TOC <3 %	FGT cost may be lower. Costs of preparation.
Oscillating furnace	MSW / <input type="checkbox"/> heterogeneous wastes	1 – 10 t/h	Robust Low maintenance Long history Low NOX level	-higher thermal loss than with grate furnace - LCV under 15 GJ/t	TOC 0.5 – 3 %	Similar to other technologies

			Low LOI of bottom ash		
--	--	--	-----------------------	--	--

Technique	Key waste characteristics and suitability	Throughput per line	Advantages	Disadvantages / Limitations of use	Bottom Ash Quality	Cost
Pulsed hearth	Only higher CV waste (LCV >20 GJ/t) □ mainly used for clinical wastes	<7 t/h	can deal with liquids and powders	bed agitation may be lower	Dependent on waste type	Higher specific cost due to reduced capacity
Stepped and static hearths	Only higher CV waste (LCV >20 GJ/t) Mainly used for clinical wastes	No information	Can deal with liquids and powders	Bed agitation may be lower	Dependent on waste type	Higher specific cost due to reduced capacity
Spreader - stoker combustor	- RDF and other particle feeds - poultry manure - wood wastes	No information	- simple grate construction - less sensitive to particle size than FB	only for well defined mono-streams	No information	No information
Gasification - fixed bed	- mixed plastic wastes - other similar consistent streams - gasification less widely used/proven than incineration	1 to 20 t/h	-low leaching residue -good burnout if oxygen blown - syngas available - Reduced oxidation of recyclable metals	- limited waste feed - not full combustion - high skill level - tar in raw gas - less widely proven	-Low leaching bottom ash -good burnout with oxygen	High operation/ maintenance costs

Technique	Key waste characteristics and suitability	Throughput per line	Advantages	Disadvantages / Limitations of use	Bottom Ash Quality	Cost
Gasification - entrained flow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - mixed plastic wastes - other similar consistent streams - not suited to untreated MSW - gasification less widely used/proven than incineration 	To 10 t/h	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - low leaching slag - reduced oxidation of recyclable metals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - limited waste feed - not full combustion - high skill level - less widely proven 	low leaching slag	High operation/ maintenance costs pre-treatment costs high
Gasification - fluid bed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - mixed plastic wastes - shredded MSW - shredder residues - sludges - metal rich wastes - other similar consistent streams - less widely used/proven than incineration 	5 – 20 t/h	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -temperatures e.g. for Al recovery - separation of non-combustibles -can be combined with ash melting - reduced oxidation of recyclable metals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -limited waste size (<30cm) - tar in raw gas - higher UHV raw gas - less widely proven 	If Combined with ash melting chamber ash is vitrified	Lower than other gasifiers
Pyrolysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - pre-treated MSW - high metal inert streams - shredder residues/plastics - pyrolysis is less widely used/proven than incineration 	~ 5 t/h (short drum) 5 – 10 t/h (medium drum)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no oxidation of metals - no combustion energy for metals/inert - in reactor acid neutralisation possible - syngas available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - limited wastes - process control and engineering critical - high skill req. - not widely proven - need market for syngas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - dependent on process temperature - residue produced requires further processing e.g. combustion 	High pre-treatment, operation and capital costs

The Applicant has carried out a review of the following candidate furnace types:

- Spreader –stoker combustor
- Rotary Kiln
- Fluidised Bed
- Pyrolysis / Gasification

The Applicant has proposed to use a furnace technology comprising spreader –stoker combustor provided by Aalborg Energie Technik a/s, which is identified in the tables above as being considered BAT in the BREF or TGN for this type of waste feed.

The Applicant proposes to use LNG/LPG as support fuel for start-up, shut down and for the auxiliary burners. The choice of support fuel is based on the fuels being clean in nature and readily available.

Boiler Design

In accordance with our Technical Guidance Note, EPR 5.01, the Applicant has confirmed that the boiler design will include the following features to minimise the potential for reformation of dioxins within the de-novo synthesis range:

- ensuring that the steam/metal heat transfer surface temperature is a minimum where the exhaust gases are within the de-novo synthesis range;
- design of the boilers using CFD to ensure no pockets of stagnant or low velocity gas;
- boiler passes are progressively decreased in volume so that the gas velocity increases through the boiler; and
- Design of boiler surfaces to prevent boundary layers of slow moving gas.

Any of the options listed in the BREF and summarised in the table above can be BAT. The Applicant has chosen a furnace technique that is listed in the BREF and we are satisfied that the Applicant has provided sufficient justification to show that their technique is BAT. This is not to say that the other techniques could not also be BAT, but that the Applicant has shown that their chosen technique is at least comparable with the other BAT options. We believe that, based on the information gathered by the BREF process, the chosen technology will achieve the requirements of Chapter IV of the IED for the air emission of TOC/CO and the TOC on bottom ash.

6.2 BAT and emissions control

The prime function of flue gas treatment is to reduce the concentration of pollutants in the exhaust gas as far as practicable. The techniques which are described as BAT individually are targeted to remove specific pollutants, but the BREF notes that there is benefit from considering the FGT system as a whole unit. Individual units often interact, providing a primary abatement for some pollutants and an additional effect on others.

The BREF lists the general factors requiring consideration when selecting flue-gas treatment (FGT) systems as:

- type of waste, its composition and variation
- type of combustion process, and its size
- flue-gas flow and temperature
- flue-gas content, size and rate of fluctuations in composition
- target emission limit values
- restrictions on discharge of aqueous effluents
- plume visibility requirements
- land and space availability
- availability and cost of outlets for residues accumulated/recovered
- compatibility with any existing process components (existing plants)
- availability and cost of water and other reagents
- energy supply possibilities (e.g. supply of heat from condensing scrubbers)
- reduction of emissions by primary methods
- release of noise.

Taking these factors into account the Technical Guidance Note points to a range of technologies being BAT subject to circumstances of the Installation.

6.2.1 Particulate Matter

Particulate matter				
Technique	Advantages	Disadvantages	Optimisation	Defined as BAT in BREF or TGN for:
Bag / Fabric filters (BF)	Reliable abatement of particulate matter to below 5mg/m ³	Max temp 250°C	Multiple compartments Bag burst detectors	Most plants
Wet scrubbing	May reduce acid gases simultaneously.	Not normally BAT. Liquid effluent produced	Require reheat to prevent visible plume and dew point problems.	Where scrubbing required for other pollutants
Ceramic filters	High temperature	May "blind" more than		Small plant.

	applications Smaller plant.	fabric filters		High temperature gas cleaning required.
Electrostatic precipitators	Low pressure gradient. Use with BF may reduce the energy consumption of the induced draft fan.	Not normally BAT.		When used with other particulate abatement plant

The Applicant proposes to use fabric filters for the abatement of particulate matter. Fabric filters provide reliable abatement of particulate matter to below 5 mg/m³ and are BAT for most installations. The Applicant proposes to use multiple compartment filters with burst bag detection to minimise the risk of increased particulate emissions in the event of bag rupture.

Emissions of particulate matter have been previously screened out as insignificant, and so the Environment Agency agrees that the Applicant's proposed technique is BAT for the installation.

6.2.2 Oxides of Nitrogen

Oxides of Nitrogen : Primary Measures				
Technique	Advantages	Disadvantages	Optimisation	Defined as BAT in BREF or TGN for:
Low NOx burners	Reduces NOx at source		Start-up, supplementary firing.	Where auxiliary burners required.
Starved air systems	Reduce CO simultaneously.			Pyrolysis, Gasification systems.
Optimise primary and secondary air injection				All plant.
Flue Gas Recirculation (FGR)	Reduces the consumption of reagents used for secondary NOx control. May increase overall energy recovery	Some applications experience corrosion problems.		All plant unless impractical in design (needs to be demonstrated)

Oxides of Nitrogen : Secondary Measures (BAT is to apply Primary Measures first)				
Technique	Advantages	Disadvantages	Optimisation	Defined as BAT in BREF or TGN for:
Selective catalytic reduction (SCR)	NOx emissions < 70mg/ m ³ Reduces CO, VOC, dioxins	Expensive. Re-heat required – reduces plant efficiency		All plant
Selective non-catalytic reduction (SNCR)	NOx emissions typically 150 - 180mg/m ³	Relies on an optimum temperature around 900 °C, and sufficient retention time for reduction May lead to Ammonia slip	Port injection location	All plant unless lower NOx release required for local environmental protection.
Reagent Type: Ammonia	Likely to be BAT Lower nitrous oxide formation	More difficult to handle Narrower temperature window		All plant

Oxides of Nitrogen : Secondary Measures (BAT is to apply Primary Measures first)				
Technique	Advantages	Disadvantages	Optimisation	Defined as BAT in BREF or TGN for:
Reagent Type: Urea	Likely to be BAT			All plant

The Applicant proposes to implement the following primary measures:

- Low NO_x burners – this technique reduces NO_x at source and is defined as BAT where auxiliary burners are required.
- Optimise primary and secondary air injection – this technique is BAT for all plant.
- Flue gas recirculation – this technique reduces the consumption of reagents for secondary NO_x control and can increase overall energy recovery, although in some applications there can be corrosion problems – the technique is considered BAT for all plant.

There are two recognised techniques for secondary measures to reduce NO_x. These are Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR) and Selective Non-Catalytic Reduction (SNCR). For each technique, there is a choice of urea or ammonia reagent.

SCR can reduce NO_x levels to below 70 mg/m³ and can be applied to all plant, it is generally more expensive than SNCR and requires reheating of the waste gas stream which reduces energy efficiency, periodic replacement of the catalysts also produces a hazardous waste. SNCR can typically reduce NO_x levels to between 150 and 180 mg/m³, it relies on an optimum temperature of around 900 deg C and sufficient retention time for reduction. SNCR is more likely to have higher levels of ammonia slip. The technique can be applied to all plant unless lower NO_x releases are required for local environmental protection. Urea or ammonia can be used as the reagent with either technique, urea is somewhat easier to handle than ammonia and has a wider operating temperature window, but tends to result in higher emissions of N₂O. Either reagent is BAT, and the use of one over the other is not normally significant in environmental terms.

The Applicant proposes to use SCR with ammonia gas as the reagent.

This technique has been chosen as MBM fuel (which is up to 10+% on dry, ash-free basis) has a higher nitrogen content of which converts to NO_x in the combustion process. In addition it will provide resilience should alternative biomass fuels be burnt in CHP Plant in the future, which due to composition and nature may require a better performance of abatement technique for reducing NO_x levels. It is also noted that the SCR system will also provide the option of fitting a CO catalyst in the future, should a different fuel source be considered in the future with potentially a higher moisture content which would require additional CO emission reduction controls to achieve IED levels.

In order to prevent formation of ammonia bisulphate, which can foul the catalyst, SO₂ levels downstream of the bag filter will be implemented to keep SO₂ levels at <10 mg/Nm³ (see section 6.2.3 below). Pressure drop sensors shall be fitted across the catalyst to warn of the catalyst becoming blinded or of any potential blockages as part of the catalyst deactivation program.

We agree that the Applicant's proposed technique is BAT for the installation.

We asked the applicant via email to justify the use of ammonia as the reagent the applicant responded on the 1st June 2017 the to protect the catalyst from fouling/poisoning the SCR unit is located downstream of the bag filter, which has a hard upper flue gas temperature limit of 250°C. If urea injection was used then it would be necessary to reheat the flue gas after the filter, which adds cost and increases energy consumption of the plant, therefore ammonia injection has been chosen. The Environment Agency agrees with this assessment.

The amount of ammonia used for NO_x abatement will need to be optimised to maximise NO_x reduction and minimise NH₃ slip. Improvement condition IC5 requires the Operator to report to the Environment Agency on optimising the performance of the NO_x abatement system. The Operator is also required to monitor and report on NH₃ and N₂O emissions every 6 months.

6.2.3 Acid Gases, SO_x, HCl and HF

Acid gases and halogens : Primary Measures				
Technique	Advantages	Disadvantages	Optimisation	Defined as BAT in BREF or TGN for:
Low sulphur fuel, (< 0.1%S gasoil or natural gas)	Reduces SO _x at source		Start-up, supplementary firing.	Where auxiliary fuel required.
Management of waste streams	Disperses sources of acid gases (e.g. PVC) through feed.	Requires closer control of waste management		All plant with heterogeneous waste feed

Acid gases and halogens : Secondary Measures (BAT is to apply Primary Measures first)

Technique	Advantages	Disadvantages	Optimisation	Defined as BAT in BREF or TGN for:
Wet	<p>High reaction rates</p> <p>Low solid residues production</p> <p>Reagent delivery may be optimised by concentration and flow rate</p>	<p>Large effluent disposal and water consumption if not fully treated for re-cycle</p> <p>Effluent treatment plant required</p> <p>May result in wet plume</p> <p>Energy required for effluent treatment and plume reheat</p>		Plants with high acid gas and metal components in exhaust gas – HWIs
Dry	<p>Low water use</p> <p>Reagent consumption may be reduced by recycling in plant</p> <p>Lower energy use</p> <p>Higher reliability</p>	<p>Higher solid residue production</p> <p>Reagent consumption controlled only by input rate</p>		All plant
Semi-dry	<p>Medium reaction rates</p> <p>Reagent delivery may be varied by concentration and input rate</p>	<p>Higher solid waste residues</p>		All plant

Acid gases and halogens : Secondary Measures (BAT is to apply Primary Measures first)				
Technique	Advantages	Disadvantages	Optimisation	Defined as BAT in BREF or TGN for:
Reagent Type: Sodium Hydroxide	Highest removal rates Low solid waste production	Corrosive material ETP sludge for disposal		HWIs
Reagent Type: Lime	Very good removal rates Low leaching solid residue Temperature of reaction well suited to use with bag filters	Corrosive material May give greater residue volume if no in-plant recycle	Wide range of uses	MWIs, CWIs
Reagent Type: Sodium Bicarbonate	Good removal rates Easiest to handle Dry recycle systems proven	Efficient temperature range may be at upper end for use with bag filters – Leachable solid residues Bicarbonate more expensive	Not proven at large plant	CWIs

The Applicant proposes to implement the following primary measures:

- Use of low sulphur fuels for start up and auxiliary burners – gas should be used if available, where fuel oil is used, this will be low sulphur (i.e. <0.1%), this will reduce SO_x at source. The Applicant has justified its choice of LNG/LPG as the support fuel on the basis that they are clean fuels low in sulphur and we agree with that assessment.
- Management of heterogeneous wastes – this will disperse problem wastes such as PVC by ensuring a homogeneous waste feed.

There are three recognised techniques for secondary measures to reduce acid gases. These are wet, dry and semi-dry. Wet scrubbing produces an effluent for treatment and disposal in compliance with Article 46(3) of IED. It will also require reheat of the exhaust to avoid a visible plume. Wet scrubbing is unlikely to be BAT except where there are high acid gas and metal components in the exhaust gas as may be the case for some hazardous waste incinerators. In this case, the Applicant does not propose using wet scrubbing, and the Environment Agency agrees that wet scrubbing is not appropriate in this case.

The Applicant has therefore considered dry and semi-dry methods of secondary measures for acid gas abatement. Either can be BAT for this type of facility.

Both dry and semi-dry methods rely on the dosing of powdered materials into the exhaust gas stream. Semi-dry systems (i.e. hydrated reagent) offer reduced material consumption through faster reaction rates, but reagent recycling in dry systems can offset this.

In both dry and semi-dry systems, the injected powdered reagent reacts with the acid gases and is removed from the gas stream by the bag filter system. The powdered materials are either lime or sodium bicarbonate. Both are effective at reducing acid gases, and dosing rates can be controlled from continuously monitoring acid gas emissions. The decision on which reagent to use is normally economic. Lime produces a lower leaching solid residue in the APC residues than sodium bicarbonate and the reaction temperature is well suited to bag filters, it tends to be lower cost, but it is a corrosive material and can generate a greater volume of solid waste residues than sodium bicarbonate. Either reagent is BAT and the use of one over the other is not significant in environmental terms in this case.

The temperature level where the bag filter will operate in the proposed plant (>210°C), makes the effectiveness of lime is limited and given that 100% firing of MBM fuel, has a higher sulphur content requiring more reagent use sodium bicarbonate is preferred.

In this case, the Applicant proposes to a dry system using pre-milled sodium bicarbonate as a reagent for acid gas removal. The system consists of a silo, an extraction unit (dosing bin and variable speed screw) and a pneumatic conveying and injection system. The quantity of absorbent fed into the injection system will be controlled by means of signals from the flue gas emissions monitoring equipment (CEMs). 100% firing of MBM fuel, which has a higher sulphur content will use more reagent than 100% wood pellets. A flue gas desulphurisation reactor will be installed upstream of the filter to increase residence time for reaction. In addition a recirculation system that passes a proportion of filter residue back to the reaction chamber will be provided to increase concentration of adsorbent in the flue gas and improve adsorbent utilisation.

The applicant has chosen the dry process for the following reasons:

- A dry system consumes less electricity than a semi-dry process, therefore increasing the amount of renewable energy available for export.
- A dry process has no water consumption than a semi-dry process.
- Easier handling of spent sorbent in dry form.

The Environment Agency is satisfied that this is BAT.

6.2.4 Carbon monoxide and volatile organic compounds (VOCs)

The prevention and minimisation of emissions of carbon monoxide and volatile organic compounds is through the optimisation of combustion controls, where all measures will increase the oxidation of these species.

Carbon monoxide and volatile organic compounds (VOCs)				
Technique	Advantages	Disadvantages	Optimisation	Defined as BAT in BREF or TGN for:
Optimise combustion control	All measures will increase oxidation of these species.		Covered in section on furnace selection	All plants

6.2.5 Dioxins and furans (and Other POPs)

Dioxins and furans				
Technique	Advantages	Disadvantages	Optimisation	Defined as BAT in BREF or TGN for:
Optimise combustion control	All measures will increase oxidation of these species.		Covered in section on furnace selection	All plants
Avoid <i>de novo</i> synthesis			Covered in boiler design	All plant
Effective Particulate matter removal			Covered in section on particulate matter	All plant
Activated Carbon injection	Can be combined with acid gas absorber or fed separately.	Combined feed rate usually controlled by acid gas content.		All plant. Separate feed normally BAT unless feed is constant and acid gas control also controls dioxin release.

The prevention and minimisation of emissions of dioxins and furans is achieved through:

- optimisation of combustion control including the maintenance of permit conditions on combustion temperature and residence time, which has been considered in 6.1.1 above;
- avoidance of de novo synthesis, which has been covered in the consideration of boiler design;
- the effective removal of particulate matter, which has been considered in 6.2.1 above;
- injection of activated carbon. This can be combined with the acid gas reagent or dosed separately. Where the feed is combined, the combined feed rate will be controlled by the acid gas concentration in the exhaust. Therefore, separate feed of activated carbon would normally be considered BAT unless the feed was relatively constant. Effective control of acid gas emissions also assists in the control of dioxin releases.

In this case the Applicant proposes no activated carbon injection, and this is based on the feedstock being chlorine free and the careful control of the combustion conditions in the boiler which they consider will mean there will be no dioxins and furans.

The Applicant has justified this for the following reasons:

- MBM waste does not contain chlorinated compounds such as PVC;
- A temperature of above 850°C for a period of 2 seconds is maintained in the furnace to help destroy the dioxins and furans;
- Rapid cooling from 900°C to 340°C and then to 80°C to avoid the de-novo synthesis range for dioxin and furan formation;
- Any remaining dioxins in the flue gases will be removed by efficient particle removal within the bag filter.

and considering the above techniques we are satisfied their proposal is BAT.

6.2.6 Metals

Metals				
Technique	Advantages	Disadvantages	Optimisation	Defined as BAT in BREF or TGN for:
Effective Particulate matter removal			Covered in section on particulate matter	All plant

Metals				
Technique	Advantages	Disadvantages	Optimisation	Defined as BAT in BREF or TGN for:
Activated Carbon injection for mercury recovery	Can be combined with acid gas absorber or fed separately.	Combined feed rate usually controlled by acid gas content.		All plant. Separate feed normally BAT unless feed is constant and acid gas control also controls dioxin release.

The prevention and minimisation of metal emissions is achieved through the effective removal of particulate matter, and this has been considered in 6.2.1 above.

Unlike other metals however, mercury if present will be in the vapour phase. BAT for mercury removal is also dosing of activated carbon into the exhaust gas stream. This can be combined with the acid gas reagent or dosed separately. Where the feed is combined, the combined feed rate will be controlled by the acid gas concentration in the exhaust. Therefore, separate feed of activated carbon would normally be considered BAT unless the feed was relatively constant.

There are NO elevated levels of mercury in the MBM fuel and it is therefore considered that adequate mercury control will be achieved without active carbon injection.

The Applicant has justified this approach as

- MBM is a very dry fuel, meaning that combustion temperatures in the primary combustion zone are very high and formation of dioxins in the combustion process very low. In addition, the content of catalysing trace elements such as copper is low.
- Similar operation plants using the same combustion system and subject to similar ELVs for dioxins and heavy metals as prescribed by comfortably achieved ELV's without the use of Powdered Activated Carbon System (PAC).
- PAC introduces significant potential fire and explosion risks to the plant, especially in the PAC storage and handling systems. With a bag filter inlet temperature of approx. 215°C PAC injection will also significantly increase risk of a filter fire.
- The effect of PAC at these temperatures is doubtful.
- Flue gas recirculation (FGR) and the provision of a SCR system downstream of the bag filter will aid destruction of dioxins/furans, thus reducing the need for PAC.

We have reviewed the Applicant's justification and we are satisfied that their proposals are BAT.

6.3 BAT and global warming potential

This section summarises the assessment of greenhouse gas impacts which has been made in the determination of this Permit. Emissions of carbon dioxide (CO₂) and other greenhouse gases differ from those of other pollutants in that, except at gross levels, they have no localised environmental impact. Their impact is at a global level and in terms of climate change. Nonetheless, CO₂ is clearly a pollutant for IED purposes.

The principal greenhouse gas emitted is CO₂, but the plant also emits small amounts of N₂O arising from the operation of secondary NO_x abatement. N₂O has a global warming potential 310 times that of CO₂. The Applicant will therefore be required to optimise the performance of the secondary NO_x abatement system to ensure its GWP impact is minimised.

The major source of greenhouse gas emissions from the installation is however CO₂ from the combustion of waste. There will also be CO₂ emissions from the burning of support fuels at start up, shut down and should it be necessary to maintain combustion temperatures. BAT for greenhouse gas emissions is to maximise energy recovery and efficiency.

The electricity that is generated by the Installation will displace emissions of CO₂ elsewhere in the UK, as virgin fossil fuels will not be burnt to create the same electricity.

The Installation is not subject to the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Trading Scheme Regulations 2012 therefore it is a requirement of IED to investigate how emissions of greenhouse gases emitted from the installation might be prevented or minimised.

Factors influencing GWP and CO₂ emissions from the Installation are:

On the debit side

- CO₂ emissions from the burning of the waste;
- CO₂ emissions from burning auxiliary or supplementary fuels;
- CO₂ emissions associated with electrical energy used;
- N₂O from the de-NO_x process.

On the credit side

- CO₂ saved from the export of electricity to the public supply by displacement of burning of virgin fuels;
- CO₂ saved from the export of heat to the adjacent rendering production facility by displacement of burning of virgin fuels

MBM and wood are considered to be renewable fuels and their CO₂ emissions from combustion attract a GWP of zero in accordance with H1 guidance annex H, therefore unlike other incineration plants, the GWP of the plant is not dominated by the emissions of carbon dioxide that are released as

a result of waste combustion. This will constant for all options considered in the BAT assessment. Any differences in the GWP of the options in the BAT appraisal will therefore arise from small differences in energy recovery and in the amount of N₂O emitted.

The Applicant considered energy efficiency and compared SCR to SNCR in its BAT assessment. This is set out in sections 4.3.7, 6.1.1 and 6.2.2 of this decision document.

Note: avoidance of methane which would be formed if the waste was landfilled has not been included in this assessment. If it were included due to its avoidance it would be included on the credit side. Ammonia has no direct GWP effect.

Taking all these factors into account, the Operator's assessment shows their preferred option is best in terms of GWP.

The Environment Agency agrees with this assessment and that the chosen option is BAT for the installation.

6.4 BAT and POPs

International action on Persistent Organic pollutants (POPs) is required under the UN's Stockholm Convention, which entered into force in 2004. The EU implemented the Convention through the POPs Regulation (850/2004), which is directly applicable in UK law. The Environment Agency is required by national POPs Regulations (SI 2007 No 3106) to give effect to Article 6(3) of the EC POPs Regulation when determining applications for environmental Permits.

However, it needs to be borne in mind that this application is for a particular type of installation, namely a waste co-incinerator. The Stockholm Convention distinguishes between intentionally-produced and unintentionally-produced POPs. Intentionally-produced POPs are those used deliberately (mainly in the past) in agriculture (primarily as pesticides) and industry. Those intentionally-produced POPs are not relevant where waste incineration is concerned, as in fact high-temperature incineration is one of the prescribed methods for destroying POPs.

The unintentionally-produced POPs addressed by the Convention are:

- dioxins and furans;
- HCB (hexachlorobenzene)
- PCBs (polychlorobiphenyls) and
- PeCB (pentachlorobenzene)

The UK's national implementation plan for the Stockholm Convention, published in 2007, makes explicit that the relevant controls for unintentionally-produced POPs, such as might be produced by waste incineration, are delivered through the requirements of IED. That would include an examination of BAT, including potential alternative techniques, with a view to

preventing or minimising harmful emissions. These have been applied as explained in this document, which explicitly addresses alternative techniques and BAT for the minimisation of emissions of dioxins.

Our legal obligation, under regulation 4(b) of the POPs Regulations, is, when considering an application for an environmental permit, to comply with article 6(3) of the POPs Regulation:

“Member States shall, when considering proposals to construct new facilities or significantly to modify existing facilities using processes that release chemicals listed in Annex III, without prejudice to Council Directive 1996/61/EC, give priority consideration to alternative processes, techniques or practices that have similar usefulness but which avoid the formation and release of substances listed in Annex III.”

The 1998 Protocol to the Convention recommended that unintentionally produced should be controlled by imposing emission limits (e.g. 0.1 ng/m³ for MWIs) and using BAT for incineration. UN Economic Commission for Europe (Executive Body for the Convention) (ECE-EB) produced BAT guidance for the parties to the Convention in 2009. This document considers various control techniques and concludes that primary measures involving management of feed material by reducing halogenated substances are not technically effective. This is not surprising because halogenated wastes still need to be disposed of and because POPs can be generated from relatively low concentrations of halogens. In summary, the successful control techniques for waste incinerators listed in the ECE-EB BAT are:

- maintaining furnace temperature of 850°C and a combustion gas residence time of at least 2 seconds
- rapid cooling of flue gases to avoid the *de novo* reformation temperature range of 250-450°C
- use of bag filters and the injection of activated carbon or coke to adsorb residual POPs components.

Using the methods listed above, the UN-ECE BAT document concludes that incinerators can achieve an emission concentration of 0.1 ng TEQ/m³.

We believe that the Permit ensures that the formation and release of POPs will be prevented or minimised. As we explain above, high-temperature incineration is one of the prescribed methods for destroying POPs. Permit conditions are based on the use of BAT and Chapter IV of IED and incorporate all the above requirements of the UN-ECE BAT guidance and deliver the requirements of the Stockholm Convention in relation to unintentionally produced POPs.

The release of **dioxins and furans** to air is required by the IED to be assessed against the I-TEQ (International Toxic Equivalence) limit of 0.1 ng/m³. Further development of the understanding of the harm caused by dioxins has resulted in the World Health Organisation (WHO) producing updated factors to calculate the WHO-TEQ value. Certain **PCBs** have

structures which make them behave like dioxins (dioxin-like PCBs), and these also have toxic equivalence factors defined by WHO to make them capable of being considered together with dioxins. The UK's independent health advisory committee, the Committee on Toxicity of Chemicals in Food, Consumer Products and the Environment (COT) has adopted WHO-TEQ values for both dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs in their review of Tolerable Daily Intake (TDI) criteria. The Permit requires that, in addition to the requirements of the IED, the WHO-TEQ values for both dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs should be monitored for reporting purposes, to enable evaluation of exposure to dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs to be made using the revised TDI recommended by COT. The release of dioxin-like PCBs and PAHs is expected to be low where measures have been taken to control dioxin releases. The Permit also requires monitoring of a range of PAHs and dioxin-like PCBs at the same frequency as dioxins are monitored. We have included a requirement to monitor and report against these WHO-TEQ values for dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs and the range of PAHs as listed in the Permit. We are confident that the measures taken to control the release of dioxins will also control the releases of dioxin-like PCBs and PAHs. Section 5.2.1 of this document details the assessment of emissions to air, which includes dioxins and concludes that there will be no adverse effect on human health from either normal or abnormal operation.

Hexachlorobenzene (HCB) is released into the atmosphere as an accidental product from the combustion of coal, waste incineration and certain metal processes. It has also been used as a fungicide, especially for seed treatment although this use has been banned in the UK since 1975. Natural fires and volcanoes may serve as natural sources. Releases of (HCB) are addressed by the European Environment Agency (EEA), which advises that:

"due to comparatively low levels in emissions from most (combustion) processes special measures for HCB control are usually not proposed. HCB emissions can be controlled generally like other chlorinated organic compounds in emissions, for instance dioxins/furans and PCBs: regulation of time of combustion, combustion temperature, temperature in cleaning devices, sorbents application for waste gases cleaning etc." [reference
http://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/EMEPCORINAIR4/sources_of_HCB.pdf]

Pentachlorobenzene (PeCB) is another of the POPs list to be considered under incineration. PeCB has been used as a fungicide or flame retardant, there is no data available however on production, recent or past, outside the UN-ECE region. PeCBs can be emitted from the same sources as for PCDD/F: waste incineration, thermal metallurgic processes and combustion plants providing energy. As discussed above, the control techniques described in the UN-ECE BAT guidance and included in the permit, are effective in controlling the emissions of all relevant POPs including PeCB.

We have assessed the control techniques proposed for dioxins by the Applicant and have concluded that they are appropriate for dioxin control. We

are confident that these controls are in line with the UN-ECE BAT guidance and will minimise the release of HCB, PCB and PeCB.

We are therefore satisfied that the substantive requirements of the Convention and the POPs Regulation have been addressed and complied with.

6.5 Other Emissions to the Environment

6.5.1 Emissions to water

All process effluents produced by the CHP Plant will be treated in the on-site effluent treatment plant (ETP) at the rendering plant operated by J G Pears before being discharged to the River Trent. CHP Plant effluent will be re-used to wet the ash streams and for internal effluent cooling, so reducing the net volume discharged to the main rendering facility ETP. Clean surface water from the building roof and yard surfaces are collected in a balancing tank for controlled discharge to the River Trent.

Based upon the information in the application we are satisfied that appropriate measures will be in place to prevent and /or minimise emissions to water.

6.5.2 Emissions to sewer

There are no emissions to sewer

6.5.3 Fugitive emissions

The IED specifies that plants must be able to demonstrate that the plant is designed in such a way as to prevent the unauthorised and accidental release of polluting substances into soil, surface water and groundwater. In addition storage requirements for waste and for contaminated water of Article 46(5) must be arranged.

No materials will be stored outside. The MBM & wood pellets will be delivered to and stored within silos within the fuel storage building. Transfer to the combustion chamber takes place using an automated handling system via a charging system comprising a series of fully enclosed conveyors. The Applicant has a programme of inspection, housekeeping and maintenance in place to ensure containment is maintained and fugitive emissions of dust are prevented.

All drainage is fully covered

- Yard surfaces with any potential contamination risk are directed for treatment through the ETP
- Specific site procedures to cover spillages
- All above ground tanks will be bunded with tanker connection points inside the bund.
- Dedicated storage areas which are bunded for storing chemicals, lubricants etc that are utilised by the CHP Plant. COSHH information shall be displayed at these storage areas.

- Spillage kits will be located at strategic points around the site
- Regular visual inspections will be carried out to check the integrity of drainage systems including when necessary CCTV investigation.
- Regular visual inspection of tanks, pipework, connection points and surface water drainage infrastructure.

Based upon the information in the application we are satisfied that appropriate measures will be in place to prevent and /or minimise fugitive emissions.

6.5.4 Odour

MBM is stored in silos in a closed loop system with no external venting of emissions to atmosphere. Tipping of MBM only takes place inside the purpose built fuel storage facility which is maintained under negative pressure. Combustion air will be drawn storage bunker in order to prevent odours and airborne particulates from leaving the facility building. When the boiler is off-line the extracted air from the fuel storage building is directed to the rendering plant bio-filters. The extracted air from a silo during filling will be filtered by the provision of a filter system on top of a silo. The level of odour from a silo storing MBM should not give rise to off-site odours. If it is considered that there could be an impact then action shall be taken to direct this extracted air during a delivery back via a closed loop system into the fuel reception building where the air is extracted for boiler combustion air.

In addition, the following measures will also be implemented and to minimise odour:

- Establish odour monitoring and odour management plan that already exists for the whole of the site as part of the rendering operations.
- Effective design of the fuel handling system to prevent stagnation and hence the possibility of anaerobic processes taking place.
- Pneumatic systems and conveyor belts handling fuel will be regularly cleaned to prevent accumulations.
- All personnel access doors to the fuel storage building and CHP Plant buildings shall be fitted with self-closers.

Based upon the information in the application we are satisfied that the appropriate measures will be in place to prevent or where that is not practicable to minimise odour and to prevent pollution from odour.

6.5.5 Noise and vibration

The application contained a noise impact assessment which was prepared as part of the application for planning permission in 2009 for day time impacts based on the now withdrawn standard BS4142:1997 Method for rating industrial noise affecting mixed residential industrial areas and for night time impacts with reference to the WHO sleep disturbance criteria. We did not agree with this approach and we asked the Applicant in our notice dated 02/03/17 to provide a revised noise risk assessment in accordance with

BS4142:2014 and with reference to the Environment Agency's Horizontal Guidance for Noise IPPC H3 (Part 2) Noise Assessment and Control.

A revised Environmental Noise Assessment JG Pears Low Marnham was submitted on the 31/03/2017 was carried out in accordance with BS 4142:2014 to compare the predicted plant rating noise levels with the established background levels. Measurements were taken of the prevailing ambient noise levels to produce a baseline noise survey and the impact from both current operations and the proposed CHP plant were modelled using SoundPLAN 7.4. The assessment predicted, a worst case impact of +7dB at Church Farm during the night time and the applicant concluded, on the basis of a numerical noise impact prediction, that there are no indications of 'significant adverse' impacts associated with the facility.

In accordance with BS4142:2014 a difference of greater than +5dB above background can indicate an adverse impact depending on context. We have audited the assessment and made observations conducting check modelling with sensitivity testing. We identified that the dominant noise source at receptors is HGV movements on site and that the consultant has used a sound power level of 106.2 dB for their HGV operations. This value is overly conservative. We also noted a number of inconsistencies in the submitted reports regarding the height of the biofilter noise barrier being sometimes 3m and at other times or 6m .

In our audit we used a conservative power levels for HGV's, assumed that the biofilter is screened by acoustic barrier height of 6m and we predict a similar numerical noise impact and from our sensitivity modelling and reading of the context we expect that the impact of noise will be acceptable subject to Holly Farm, a property owned by the company being vacated following completion of the CHP plant and not re-let.

The Applicant additionally provided a Noise Management Plan (NMP) which we considered to be unsatisfactory for although it proposed a number of additional noise mitigation measures as described in the noise model (Noise Risk Assessment) no time scales were provided to implement the identified mitigation measures and it was not clear which operator would be responsible for their implementation.

A revised Noise Management Plan V0.3 which included the operations at the Animal Rendering Plant undertaken by J G Pears (Newark) Limited was submitted on the 27/06/2017. This was further revised (Noise Management Plan V0.4) and resubmitted on 12/07/2017. We consider that the revised noise management plan is satisfactory and we have incorporated this into the permit in table S1.2.

We have included an improvement condition in the Permit IC8 which requires the Operator to validate the predicted emissions once the CHP is operational and that all the noise prevention and minimisation measures specified in the two tables ENMP2 and ENMP3 of the NMP V0.4 dated July 2017 have been

completed and to demonstrate that noise attenuation is at least as effective as that predicted in the Noise Assessment report.

Based upon the information in the application and the revised noise management plan we are satisfied that the appropriate measures will be in place to prevent or where that is not practicable to minimise noise and vibration and to prevent pollution from noise and vibration outside the site.

6.6 Setting ELVs and other Permit conditions

6.6.1 Translating BAT into Permit conditions

Article 14(3) of IED states that BAT conclusions shall be the reference for permit conditions. Article 15(3) further requires that under normal operating conditions; emissions do not exceed the emission levels associated with the best available techniques as laid down in the decisions on BAT conclusions.

At the time of writing of this document, no BAT conclusions have been published for waste incineration or co-incineration.

The use of IED Chapter IV emission limits for air dispersion modelling sets the worst case scenario. If this shows emissions are insignificant then we have accepted that the Applicant's proposals are BAT, and that there is no justification to reduce ELVs below the Chapter IV limits in these circumstances.

Below we consider whether, for those emission not screened out as insignificant, different conditions are required as a result of consideration of local or other factors, so that no significant pollution is caused (Article 11(c)) or to comply with environmental quality standards (Article 18).

(i) Local factors

We have assessed the impacts of emissions locally and concluded that no EQS's will be breached as a result of emissions from the Installation.

(ii) National and European ESs

No National or European EQSs will be breached as a result of emissions from the Installation.

(iii) Global Warming

CO₂ is an inevitable product of the combustion of waste. The amount of CO₂ emitted will be essentially determined by the quantity and characteristics of waste being incinerated, which are already subject to conditions in the Permit. It is therefore inappropriate to set an emission limit value for CO₂, which could do no more than recognise what is going to be emitted. The gas is not therefore targeted as a key pollutant under Annex II of IED, which lists the

main polluting substances that are to be considered when setting emission limit values (ELVs) in Permits.

We have therefore considered setting equivalent parameters or technical measures for CO₂. However, provided energy is recovered efficiently (see section 4.3.7 above), there are no additional equivalent technical measures (beyond those relating to the quantity and characteristics of the waste) that can be imposed that do not run counter to the primary purpose of the plant, which is the recovery of energy from waste. Controls in the form of restrictions on the volume and type of waste that can be accepted at the Installation and permit conditions relating to energy efficiency effectively apply equivalent technical measures to limit CO₂ emissions.

(iv) Commissioning

Before the CHP plant can become fully operational it will be necessary for it to be commissioned. Before commissioning can commence the Operator is required by pre-operational condition PO3 to submit a commissioning plan to the Agency for approval. Commissioning can only begin and be carried out in accordance with the approved proposals in the plan.

The following improvement conditions have been set to submit reports post commissioning to confirm that the performance of the plant is that described within the Application.

- Calibration of CEMs in accordance with BS EN 14181 (IC7).
- Verification of furnace residence time, temperature and oxygen content (IC4).
- The plant in total conforms to the permit conditions and that satisfactory process control procedures for the plant have been developed (IC3).
- Abatement plant optimisation details (IC5).

6.7 Monitoring

6.7.1 Monitoring during normal operations

We have decided that monitoring should be carried out for the parameters listed in Schedule 3 using the methods and to the frequencies specified in those tables. These monitoring requirements have been imposed in order to demonstrate compliance with emission limit values and to enable correction of measured concentration of substances to the appropriate reference conditions; to gather information about the performance of the SCR system; to establish data on the release of dioxin-like PCBs and PAHs from the incineration process and to deliver the requirements of Chapter IV of IED for monitoring of residues and temperature in the combustion chamber.

For emissions to air, the methods for continuous and periodic monitoring are in accordance with the Environment Agency's Guidance M2 for monitoring of stack emissions to air.

Based on the information in the Application and the requirements set in the conditions of the permit we are satisfied that the Operator's techniques, personnel and equipment will have either MCERTS certification or MCERTS accreditation as appropriate.

6.7.2 Monitoring under abnormal operations arising from the failure of the installed CEMs

The Operator has stated in the response to schedule 5 notice dated 13/04/2017 that they will provide portable back-up CEMS working in parallel to the operating CEMS. These will be switched into full operation immediately in the event that there is any failure in the regular monitoring equipment. The back-up CEMS measure the same parameters as the operating CEMS. In the unlikely event that the back-up CEMS also fail Condition 2.3.10 of the permit requires that the abnormal operating conditions apply.

6.7.3 Continuous emissions monitoring for dioxins and heavy metals

Chapter IV of IED specifies manual extractive sampling for heavy metals and dioxin monitoring. However, Article 48(5) of the IED enables The Commission to act through delegated, authority to set the date from which continuous measurements of the air emission limit values for heavy metals, dioxins and furans shall be carried out, as soon as appropriate measurement techniques are available within the Community. No such decision has yet been made by the Commission.

The Environment Agency has reviewed the applicability of continuous sampling and monitoring techniques to the installation.

Recent advances in mercury monitoring techniques have allowed standards to be developed for continuous mercury monitoring, including both vapour-phase and particulate mercury. There is a standard which can apply to CEMs which measure mercury (EN 15267-3) and standards to certify CEMs for mercury, which are EN 15267-1 and EN 15267-3. Furthermore, there is an MCERTS-certified CEM which has been used in trials in the UK and which has been verified on-site using many parallel reference tests as specified using the steps outlined in EN 14181.

In the case of dioxins, equipment is available for taking a sample for an extended period (several weeks), but the sample must then be analysed in the conventional way. A CEN committee has agreed Technical Specifications (EN TS 1948-5) for continuous sampling of dioxins. This specification will lead to a CEN standard following a validation exercise which is currently underway. According to IED Article 48(5), "As soon as appropriate measurement techniques are available within the Union, the Commission shall, by means of delegated acts in accordance with Article 76 and subject to the conditions laid down in Articles 77 and 78, set the date from which continuous measurements of emissions into the air of heavy metals and dioxins and furans are to be carried out. This is yet to happen. However, our extant 'dioxin enforcement policy' recommends continuous sampling of dioxins where multiple emission

exceedances occur and no clear root cause can be identified. Therefore should continuous sampling be required at a later date during the operation of the installation, then sampling and analysis shall comply with the requirements of EN TS 1948

For either continuous monitoring of mercury or continuous sampling of dioxins to be used for regulatory purposes, an emission limit value would need to be devised which is applicable to continuous monitoring. Such limits for mercury and dioxins have not been set by the European Commission. Use of a manual sample train is the only technique which fulfils the requirements of the IED. At the present time, it is considered that in view of the predicted low levels of mercury and dioxin emission it is not justifiable to require the Operator to install additionally continuous monitoring or sampling devices for these substances.

In accordance with its legal requirement to do so, the Environment Agency reviews the development of new methods and standards and their performance in industrial applications. In particular the Environment Agency considers continuous sampling systems for dioxins to have promise as a potential means of improving process control and obtaining more accurate mass emission estimates.

6.8 Reporting

We have specified the reporting requirements in Schedule 5 of the Permit either to meet the reporting requirements set out in the IED, or to ensure data is reported to enable timely review by the Environment Agency to ensure compliance with permit conditions and to monitor the efficiency of material use and energy recovery at the installation.

7 Other legal requirements

In this section we explain how we have addressed other relevant legal requirements, to the extent that we have not addressed them elsewhere in this document.

7.1 The EPR 2010 and related Directives

The EPR delivers the requirements of a number of European and national laws.

7.1.1 Schedules 1 and 7 to the EPR 2010 – IED Directive

We address the requirements of the IED in the body of this document above and the specific requirements of Chapter IV in Annex 1 of this document.

There is one requirement not addressed above, which is that contained in Article 5(3) IED. Article 5(3) requires that “In the case of a new installation or a substantial change where Article 4 of Directive 85/337/EC (now Directive 2011/92/EU) (the EIA Directive) applies, any relevant information obtained or conclusion arrived at pursuant to articles 5, 6 and 7 of that Directive shall be examined and used for the purposes of granting the permit.”

- Article 5 of EIA Directive relates to the obligation on developers to supply the information set out in Annex IV of the Directive when making an application for development consent.
- Article 6(1) requires Member States to ensure that the authorities likely to be concerned by a development by reason of their specific environmental responsibilities are consulted on the Environmental Statement and the request for development consent.
- Article 6(2)-6(6) makes provision for public consultation on applications for development consent.
- Article 7 relates to projects with transboundary effects and consequential obligations to consult with affected Member States.

The grant or refusal of development consent is a matter for the relevant local planning authority. The Environment Agency’s obligation is therefore to examine and use any relevant information obtained or conclusion arrived at by the local planning authorities pursuant to those EIA Directive articles.

In determining the Application we have considered the following documents: -

- The decision of the Secretary of States of 21 October 2014 for a biomass fuelled combined heat and power plant, auxiliary boilers, product silos, new offices, revised trailer and car parking, associated facilities, landscaping and internal circulation roads at Marnham Road, Low Marnham, Newark, Nottinghamshire, NG23 6SL be granted in accordance with conditions attached in Annex B (of the decisions letter)
- The Environmental Statement submitted with the planning application (which also formed part of the Environmental Permit Application).

From consideration of all the documents above, the Environment Agency considers that no additional or different conditions are necessary.

The Environment Agency has also carried out its own consultation on the Environmental Permitting Application which includes the Environmental Statement submitted to the local planning authority. The results of our consultation are described elsewhere in this decision document.

7.1.2 Schedule 9 to the EPR 2010 – Waste Framework Directive

As the Installation involves the treatment of waste, it is carrying out a *waste operation* for the purposes of the EPR 2010, and the requirements of Schedule 9 therefore apply. This means that we must exercise our functions so as to ensure implementation of certain articles of the WFD.

We must exercise our relevant functions for the purposes of ensuring that the waste hierarchy referred to in Article 4 of the Waste Framework Directive is applied to the generation of waste and that any waste generated is treated in accordance with Article 4 of the Waste Framework Directive. (See also section 4.3.9)

The conditions of the permit ensure that waste generation from the facility is minimised. Where the production of waste cannot be prevented it will be recovered wherever possible or otherwise disposed of in a manner that minimises its impact on the environment. This is in accordance with Article 4.

We must also exercise our relevant functions for the purposes of implementing Article 13 of the Waste Framework Directive; ensuring that the requirements in the second paragraph of Article 23(1) of the Waste Framework Directive are met; and ensuring compliance with Articles 18(2)(b), 18(2)(c), 23(3), 23(4) and 35(1) of the Waste Framework Directive.

Article 13 relates to the protection of human health and the environment. These objectives are addressed elsewhere in this document.

Article 23(1) requires the permit to specify:

- (a) the types and quantities of waste that may be treated;
- (b) for each type of operation permitted, the technical and any other requirements relevant to the site concerned;
- (c) the safety and precautionary measures to be taken;
- (d) the method to be used for each type of operation;
- (e) such monitoring and control operations as may be necessary;
- (f) such closure and after-care provisions as may be necessary.

These are all covered by permit conditions.

We consider that the intended method of waste treatment is acceptable from the point of view of environmental protection so Article 23(3) does not apply.

Energy efficiency is dealt with elsewhere in this document but we consider the conditions of the permit ensure that the recovery of energy take place with a high level of energy efficiency in accordance with Article 23(4).

Article 35(1) relates to record keeping and its requirements are delivered through permit conditions.

7.1.3 Schedule 22 to the EPR 2010 – Water Framework and Groundwater Directives

To the extent that it might lead to a discharge of pollutants to groundwater (a “groundwater activity” under the EPR 2010), the Permit is subject to the requirements of Schedule 22, which delivers the requirements of EU Directives relating to pollution of groundwater. The Permit will require the taking of all necessary measures to prevent the input of any hazardous substances to groundwater, and to limit the input of non-hazardous pollutants into groundwater so as to ensure such pollutants do not cause pollution, and satisfies the requirements of Schedule 22.

No releases to groundwater from the Installation are permitted. The Permit also requires material storage areas to be designed and maintained to a high standard to prevent accidental releases.

7.1.4 Directive 2003/35/EC – The Public Participation Directive

Regulation 59 of the EPR 2010 requires the Environment Agency to prepare and publish a statement of its policies for complying with its public participation duties. We have published our public participation statement.

This Application has been consulted upon in line with this statement, as well as with our guidance RGS6 on Sites of High Public Interest, which addresses specifically extended consultation arrangements for determinations where public interest is particularly high. This satisfies the requirements of the Public Participation Directive.

As we had only one public response to this initial consultation, we did not consult on the draft decision. The way in which Environment Agency has consulted with the public and other interested parties is set out in Section 2.2. A summary of the responses received to our consultation and our consideration of them is set out in Annex 4.

7.2 National primary legislation

7.2.1 **Environment Act 1995**

(i) Section 4 (Pursuit of Sustainable Development)

We are required to contribute towards achieving sustainable development, as considered appropriate by Ministers and set out in guidance issued to us. The Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs has issued *The*

Environment Agency's Objectives and Contribution to Sustainable Development: Statutory Guidance (December 2002). This document:

"provides guidance to the Agency on such matters as the formulation of approaches that the Agency should take to its work, decisions about priorities for the Agency and the allocation of resources. It is not directly applicable to individual regulatory decisions of the Agency".

In respect of regulation of industrial pollution through the EPR, the Guidance refers in particular to the objective of setting permit conditions *"in a consistent and proportionate fashion based on Best Available Techniques and taking into account all relevant matters..."* The Environment Agency considers that it has pursued the objectives set out in the Government's guidance, where relevant, and that there are no additional conditions that should be included in this Permit to take account of the Section 4 duty.

(ii) Section 5 (Preventing or Minimising Effects of Pollution of the Environment)

We are satisfied that our pollution control powers have been exercised for the purpose of preventing or minimising, remedying or mitigating the effects of pollution.

(iii) Section 6(1) (Conservation Duties with Regard to Water)

We have a duty to the extent we consider it desirable generally to promote the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty and amenity of inland and coastal waters and the land associated with such waters, and the conservation of flora and fauna which are dependent on an aquatic environment.

We consider that no additional or different conditions are appropriate for this Permit.

(iv) Section 6(6) (Fisheries)

We have a duty to maintain, improve and develop fisheries of salmon, trout, eels, lampreys, smelt and freshwater fish.

We consider that no additional or different conditions are appropriate for this Permit.

(v) Section 7 (Pursuit of Conservation Objectives)

This places a duty on us, when considering any proposal relating to our functions, to have regard amongst other things to any effect which the proposals would have on sites of archaeological, architectural, or historic interest; the economic and social well-being of local communities in rural areas; and to take into account any effect which the proposals would have on the beauty or amenity of any rural area.

(vi) Section 39 (Costs and Benefits)

We have a duty to take into account the likely costs and benefits of our decisions on the applications ('costs' being defined as including costs to the environment as well as any person). This duty, however, does not affect our obligation to discharge any duties imposed upon us in other legislative provisions.

In so far as relevant we consider that the costs that the permit may impose on the applicant are reasonable and proportionate in terms of the benefits it provides.

(vii) 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 guidance issued under section 110 of that Act in deciding whether to grant this permit.

Paragraph 1.3 of the guidance says:

“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.”

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.

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.

(viii) Section 81 (National Air Quality Strategy)

We have had regard to the National Air Quality Strategy and consider that our decision complies with the Strategy, and that no additional or different conditions are appropriate for this Permit.

7.2.2 Human Rights Act 1998

We have considered potential interference with rights addressed by the European Convention on Human Rights in reaching our decision and consider that our decision is compatible with our duties under the Human Rights Act 1998. In particular, we have considered the right to life (Article 2), the right to a fair trial (Article 6), the right to respect for private and family life (Article 8) and the right to protection of property (Article 1, First Protocol). We do not believe that Convention rights are engaged in relation to this determination.

7.2.3 Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW 2000)

Section 85 of this Act imposes a duty on Environment Agency to have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty (AONB). There is no AONB which could be affected by the Installation.

7.2.4 Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981

Under section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 the Environment Agency has a duty to take reasonable steps to further the conservation and enhancement of the flora, fauna or geological or physiographical features by reason of which a site is of special scientific interest. Under section 28I the Environment Agency has a duty to consult Natural England in relation to any permit that is likely to damage SSSIs.

There is no SSSI which could be affected by the Installation.

7.2.5 Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006

Section 40 of this Act requires us to have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of our functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. We have done so and consider that no different or additional conditions in the Permit are required.

7.3 National secondary legislation

7.3.1 The Persistent Organic Pollutants Regulations 2007

We have explained our approach to these Regulations, which give effect to the Stockholm Convention on POPs and the EU's POPs Regulation, above.

7.4 Other relevant legal requirements

7.4.1 Duty to Involve

S23 of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 require us where we consider it appropriate to take such steps as we consider appropriate to secure the involvement of interested persons in the exercise of our functions by providing them with information, consulting them

or involving them in any other way. S24 requires us to have regard to any Secretary of State guidance as to how we should do that.

The way in which the Environment Agency has consulted with the public and other interested parties is set out in section 2.2 of this document. The way in which we have taken account of the representations we have received is set out in Annex 4. Our public consultation duties are also set out in the EP Regulations, and our statutory Public Participation Statement, which implement the requirements of the Public Participation Directive. In addition to meeting our consultation responsibilities, we have also taken account of our guidance on sites of high public interest and the Environment Agency's Building Trust with Communities toolkit.

7.4.2 Duty to Consider Economic Growth

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 guidance issued under section 110 of that Act in deciding whether to grant this Permit. Paragraph 1.3 of the guidance says:

“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.”

We have addressed the legislative requirements and environmental standards to be set for this operation in this decision document. 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.

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.

ANNEX 1: APPLICATION OF CHAPTER IV OF THE INDUSTRIAL EMISSIONS DIRECTIVE

IED Article	Requirement	Delivered by
45(1)(a)	The permit shall include a list of all types of waste which may be treated using at least the types of waste set out in the European Waste List established by Decision 2000/532/EC, if possible, and containing information on the quantity of each type of waste, where appropriate.	Condition 2.3.4(a) and Table S2.2 in Schedule 2 of the Permit.
45(1)(b)	The permit shall include the total waste incinerating or co-incinerating capacity of the plant.	Condition 2.3.4(a) and Table S2.2 in Schedule 2 of the Permit.
45(1)(c)	The permit shall include the limit values for emissions into air and water.	Conditions 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 and Tables S3.1 in Schedule 3 of the Permit.
45(1)(d)	The permit shall include the requirements for pH, temperature and flow of waste water discharges.	Not Applicable
45(1)(e)	The permit shall include the sampling and measurement procedures and frequencies to be used to comply with the conditions set for emissions monitoring.	Conditions 3.5.1 to 3.5.5 and Tables S3.1, S3.3 and S3.4 in Schedule 3 of the Permit.
45(1)(f)	The permit shall include the maximum permissible period of unavoidable stoppages, disturbances or failures of the purification devices or the measurement devices, during which the emissions into the air and the discharges of waste water may exceed the prescribed emission limit values.	Conditions 2.3.10 and 2.3.11.
45(2)(a)	The permit shall include a list of the quantities of the different categories of hazardous waste which may be treated.	Not Applicable
45(2)(b)	The permit shall include the minimum and maximum mass flows of those hazardous waste, their lowest and maximum calorific values and the maximum contents of polychlorinated biphenyls,	Not Applicable
J G Pears CHP Plant Date of issue: 22/08/2017	Page 90 of 99	Application Number EPR/MP3235CC/A001

IED Article	Requirement	Delivered by
	pentachlorophenol, chlorine, fluorine, sulphur, heavy metals and other polluting substances.	
46(1)	Waste gases shall be discharged in a controlled way by means of a stack the height of which is calculated in such a way as to safeguard human health and the environment.	Condition 2.3.1(a) and Table S1.2 of Schedule 1 of the Permit.
46(2)	Emission into air shall not exceed the emission limit values set out in parts 4 or determined in accordance with part 4 of Annex VI.	Conditions 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 and Tables S3.1
46(3)	Relates to conditions for water discharges from the cleaning of exhaust gases.	There are no such discharges as condition 3.1.1 prohibits this.
46(4)	Relates to conditions for water discharges from the cleaning of exhaust gases.	There are no such discharges as condition 3.1.1 prohibits this.
46(5)	Prevention of unauthorised and accidental release of any polluting substances into soil, surface water or groundwater. Adequate storage capacity for contaminated rainwater run-off from the site or for contaminated water from spillage or fire-fighting.	The application explains the measures to be in place for achieving the directive requirements
46(6)	Limits the maximum period of operation when an ELV is exceeded to 4 hours uninterrupted duration in any one instance, and with a maximum cumulative limit of 60 hours per year. Limits on dust (150 mg/m ³), CO and TOC not to be exceeded during this period.	Conditions 2.3.10 and 2.3.11
47	In the event of breakdown, reduce or close down operations as soon as practicable. Limits on dust (150 mg/m ³), CO and TOC not to be exceeded during this period.	Condition 2.3.11
48(1)	Monitoring of emissions is carried out in accordance with Parts 6 and 7 of Annex VI.	Conditions 3.5.1 to 3.5.5. Reference conditions are defined

IED Article	Requirement	Delivered by
		in Schedule 6 of the Permit.
48(2)	Installation and functioning of the automated measurement systems shall be subject to control and to annual surveillance tests as set out in point 1 of Part 6 of Annex VI.	Condition 3.5.3, and tables S3.1 and S3.4
48(3)	The competent authority shall determine the location of sampling or measurement points to be used for monitoring of emissions.	Conditions 3.5.3 and 3.5.4
48(4)	All monitoring results shall be recorded, processed and presented in such a way as to enable the competent authority to verify compliance with the operating conditions and emission limit values which are included in the permit.	Conditions 4.1.1 and 4.1.2, and Tables S4.1 and S4.4
49	The emission limit values for air and water shall be regarded as being complied with if the conditions described in Part 8 of Annex VI are fulfilled.	Conditions 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 and 3.5.5
50(1)	Slag and bottom ash to have Total Organic Carbon (TOC) < 3% or loss on ignition (LOI) < 5%.	Conditions 3.5.1 and Table S3.5
50(2)	Flue gas to be raised to a temperature of 850°C for two seconds, as measured at representative point of the combustion chamber.	Condition 2.3.7, Pre-operational condition PO4 and Improvement condition IC4
50(3)	At least one auxiliary burner which must not be fed with fuels which can cause higher emissions than those resulting from the burning of gas oil, liquefied gas or natural gas.	Condition 2.3.8
50(4)(a)	Automatic shut to prevent waste feed if at start up until the specified temperature has been reached.	Condition 2.3.7
50(4)(b)	Automatic shut to prevent waste feed if the combustion temperature is not maintained.	Condition 2.3.7
50(4)(c)	Automatic shut to prevent waste feed if the CEMs show that ELVs are exceeded due to disturbances or failure of waste cleaning devices.	Condition 2.3.7
50(5)	Any heat generated from the	The plant will
J G Pears CHP Plant Date of issue: 22/08/2017		Page 92 of 99
Application Number EPR/MP3235CC/A001		

IED Article	Requirement	Delivered by
	process shall be recovered as far as practicable.	generate heat and steam to the adjacent animal rendering facility
50(6)	Relates to the feeding of infectious clinical waste into the furnace.	No infectious clinical waste will be burnt
50(7)	Management of the Installation to be in the hands of a natural person who is competent to manage it.	Conditions 1.1.1 to 1.1.3 and 2.3.1 of the Permit.
51(1)	Different conditions than those laid down in Article 50(1), (2) and (3) and, as regards the temperature Article 50(4) may be authorised, provided the other requirements of this chapter are met.	No such conditions Have been allowed
51(2)	Changes in operating conditions do not cause more residues or residues with a higher content of organic polluting substances compared to those residues which could be expected under the conditions laid down in Articles 50(1), (2) and (3).	No such conditions have been allowed
51(3)	Changes in operating conditions shall include emission limit values for CO and TOC set out in Part 3 of Annex VI.	No such conditions have been allowed
52(1)	Take all necessary precautions concerning delivery and reception of Wastes, to prevent or minimise pollution.	Conditions 2.3.1, 2.3.3, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 and 3.6.
52(2)	Determine the mass of each category of wastes, if possible according to the EWC, prior to accepting the waste.	Condition 2.3.4 and Table S2.2 in Schedule 3 of the Permit.
52(3)	Prior to accepting hazardous waste, the operator shall collect available information about the waste for the purpose of compliance with the permit requirements specified in Article 45(2).	Not Applicable
52(4)	Prior to accepting hazardous waste, the operator shall carry out the procedures set out in Article 52(4).	Not Applicable

IED Article	Requirement	Delivered by
52(5)	Granting of exemptions from Article 52(2), (3) and (4).	Not Applicable
53(1)	Residues to be minimised in their amount and harmfulness, and recycled where appropriate.	Conditions 1.4.1, 1.4.2 and 3.5.1 with Table S3.5
53(2)	Prevent dispersal of dry residues and dust during transport and storage.	Conditions 1.4.1, 2.3.1, 2.3.2 and 3.2.1.
53(3)	Test residues for their physical and chemical characteristics and polluting potential including heavy metal content (soluble fraction).	Condition 3.5.1 and Table S3.5 and pre-operational condition PO4.
55(1)	Application, decision and permit to be publicly available.	All documents are accessible from the Environment Agency Public Register.
55(2)	An annual report on plant operation and monitoring for all plants burning more than 2 tonne/hour waste.	Condition 4.2.2 and 4.2.3.

ANNEX 2: Pre-Operational Conditions

Based on the information on the Application, we consider that we do need to impose pre-operational conditions. These conditions are set out in the permit in table S1.4 in schedule 1, and referred to, where applicable, in the text of the decision document. We are using these conditions to require the Operator to confirm that the details and measures proposed in the Application have been adopted or implemented prior to the operation of the Installation.

ANNEX 3: Improvement Conditions

Based in the information in the Application we consider that we need to set improvement conditions. These conditions are set out in table S1.3, in schedule 1 of the permit - justifications for these is provided at the relevant section of the decision document. We are using these conditions to require the Operator to provide the Environment Agency with details that need to be established or confirmed during and/or after commissioning.

ANNEX 4: Consultation Responses

A) Advertising and Consultation on the Application

The Application has been advertised and consulted upon in accordance with the Environment Agency's Public Participation Statement. The way in which this has been carried out along with the results of our consultation and how we have taken consultation responses into account in reaching our draft decision is summarised in this Annex. Copies of all consultation responses have been placed on the Environment Agency public register.

The Application was advertised on the consultation hub of GOV.UK website from the 07/12/16 to 07/01/17. The Application was made available to view on the Public Register at The Environment Agency, Trentside Office, Scarrington Road, Nottingham, NG2 5BR.

We consulted the following organisations:

- Director of Public Health
- Health and Safety Executive
- Foods Standards Agency
- Local Authority
- Public Health England
- Severn Trent

1) Consultation Responses from Statutory and Non-Statutory Bodies

Response Received from
Bassetlaw DC – Environmental Health by email received on 12/06/2017
Brief summary of issues raised
Site has an A(2) Permit and has made a number of improvement to address odour and noise complaints as listed below, complaints have reduced. <u>Odour</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2010 - the addition of two new biofilters• 2011 - the removal of the under-performing chemical scrubber• 2011/2012 – the erection of fully-enclosed hoods over the biofilters and erection of a 15m chimneys on each• 2013 – Biofilter chimneys extended to 20m• 2013 – complete removal of the bio-filter medium and replacement with improved substrate (clay)• 2014 – Construction of a large trailer shed to house incoming raw-meat trailers prior to transfer to the factory• 2015 – Installation of a new tank farm to ensure fats and solids can be stored properly• 2014/2015 - installation of the thermal oxidiser for high-intensity odours

Noise:

- Alternation of the site layout to situate noise-generating plant away from the nearest residents
- New fans installed and improvement in the noise power output of key equipment
- Better noise insulation in boiler rooms
- Noise attenuator fitted to the boiler chimneys
- Noise bunds installed on perimeter fence line (temporary)
- Fully site perimeter acoustic fencing to replace temporary arrangements
- New planting schemes proposed (still to commence)

Other improvements:

- Site management processes and procedures updated, to ensure operated in accordance with permit.
- Better cleaning regimes
- Better record keeping
- Improved training records for new staff
- Improvements to the proactive maintenance of key plant and equipment
- Rapid response to breakdowns of key equipment
- Improved communication with the public around expansion and/or issues at the site

Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered

No action required. Odour Management is discussed in section 6.5.4 of this document. Noise Control is discussed in section 6.5.5 and Operation of the site and management systems in place is discussed in section 4.3 of this document

2) Consultation Responses from Members of the Public and Community Organisations

Only one response was received from an individual member of the public.

Brief summary of issues raised

They were disappointed that the consultation was not well advertised being only web based and only running for a month, would have liked to have contacted directly.

They found the figures presented in the Human Health Risk assessment confusing and did not agree with the conclusion that the effect will be 'not very significant' to our children, given that dioxins appear to be at 90% of the WHO limits, they regard this present a slim margin.

Clarification on the following was also sought on the regulation of the site when a permit is granted and in particular

- Whether the data from the CEMs would be made available
- Whether dust and soil monitoring for sensitive receptor areas would be ongoing
- OPRA scoring
- Where the permit may be viewed.

Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered

We carried out consultation on the Application in accordance with the EPR and our statutory Public Participation Statement.

Our assessment of the Human Health Risk Assessment is discussed in section 5.3 of this document

We regulate the performance of permitted plants by:

- issuing an environmental permit;
- carrying out a continued assessment of plant operations and its environmental performance in a number of ways;
- operators must monitor emissions at given times and report the results to us;
- we regularly inspect installations, review monitoring techniques and assess monitoring results to measure the performance of the plant;
- we carry out independent routine monitoring of emissions (including making spot checks);
- operators must inform us within 24 hours of any breach of the emissions limits, followed by a fuller report of the size of the release, its impact and how they propose to avoid this happening in the future;
- Operators' monitoring results are placed on the public register at The Environment Agency, Trentside Office, Scarrington Road, Nottingham, NG2 5BR.
- Depending on the seriousness of any breach, we will take appropriate enforcement action and/or prosecute.

Condition 3.1.5 of the permit requires periodic soil and groundwater monitoring to be undertaken.

OPRA is a risk assessment tool that provides an objective and consistent assessment of the environmental risk of operating a regulated facility. The Opra scheme is based around the following attributes:

- Complexity;
- Emissions;
- Location;
- Operator Performance;
- Compliance Rating.

Each attribute is allocated one or more lettered bands, from which a score is derived from the weighting tables that can be found in the respective charging regime sections of Environmental Permitting Charging Scheme & Guidance Version 5 (valid from 4 January

2017)

An electronic copy of the permit is available here [industrial emissions directive-ied-environmental-permits-issued](#) or by visiting and viewing the public register The Environment Agency, Trentside Office, Scarrington Road, Nottingham, NG2 5BR.