

Application SCR evaluation template

Name of activity, address and NGR	Kingston Research Limited, Saltend Chemicals Park, Saltend, Hull HU12 8DS TA1635828057 KRL Location on Saltend Site.doc shows Kingston Research Ltd site location within the larger Saltend Industrial Park.
-----------------------------------	---

Document reference of application SCR	49306645 / LERP0002 / 3005 / JS/ PJ (on EDRM as Site condition report 2009) (NB Site location in this doc is wrong)
---------------------------------------	---

Date and version of application SCR	June 2009.pdf
-------------------------------------	---------------

1.0 Site details

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

Site plans showing site layout, drainage, surfacing, receptors, sources of emissions/releases and monitoring points

Yes.

49306645 Kingston R, Saltend (F6.3-1) drain.pdf (on EDRM as Drainage Plan)

2.0 Condition of the land at permit issue

To be completed by GWCL officers
(Receptor)

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

- a) Environmental setting including geology, hydrogeology and surface waters
- b) Pollution history including:
 - pollution incidents that may have affected land
 - historical land-uses and associated contaminants
 - visual/olfactory evidence of existing contamination
 - evidence of damage to existing pollution prevention measures
- c) Evidence of historic contamination (i.e. historical site investigation, assessment, remediation and verification reports (where available))
- d) Has the applicant chosen to collect baseline reference data?

a),b),c) See Section 2 of Application SCR 49306645 / LERP0002 / 3005 / JS/ PJ

d) see Appendix C Section 4 of Application SCR 49306645 / LERP0002 / 3005 / JS/ PJ

Applicants are not necessarily required to collect baseline reference data as part of the application. However, at sites where historic contamination may be an issue, they may choose to establish baseline conditions that can be referred to at surrender. Without this it may be difficult for them to prove that they have not caused the contamination.

3.0 Permitted activities

(Source)

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

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

- a) Permitted activities
- b) Non-permitted activities undertaken at the site

a) See Section 3 of Application SCR 49306645 / LERP0002 / 3005 / JS
Biobutanol Demonstration Project. One EPR Scheduled activity S4.1A(1)(a)(ii).
Grain Storage and Handling Area; Process Area for Saccharification, Fermentation, Distillation and Stillage; Feeds Area; Electricity Control Room; Microbiology Laboratory; Tank Farm; HVAC Area; and Transformer and Miscellaneous Pads.

3.0(a) Environmental Risk Assessment

(Source)

The H1 environmental risk assessment should identify elements that could impact on land and waters, cross- referenced back to documents and plans provided as part of the wider permit application.

Appendix A to Application SCR 49306645 / LERP0002 / 3005 / JS/PJ

The environmental risk assessment has concluded that given the nature of materials and physical and procedural measures in place, the operation of the installation presents a low risk to the underlying ground and groundwater and hence no intrusive sampling is considered to be necessary.

3.0(b) Will the pollution prevention measures protect land and groundwater?

(Conceptual model)

Are the activities likely to result in pollution of land?

No.

For dangerous and/or hazardous substances only, are the pollution prevention measures for the relevant activities to a standard that is likely to prevent pollution of land?

N/A

Application SCR decision summary	Tick relevant decision
Sufficient information has been supplied to describe the condition of the site at permit issue	
Information is missing- the following information must be obtained from the applicant. (Advise the permitting team on what additional information is needed)	
Pollution of land and water is unlikely; or	
Pollution of land and water is likely (Advise the permitting team on what additional controls/checks may be necessary)	
Historical contamination is present- advise operator that collection of background data may be appropriate	
Date and name of reviewer:	

Operational phase SCR evaluation template

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

4.0 Changes to the activities (Source)	
Have there been any changes to the following during the operation of the site?	Response (Specify what information is needed from the applicant, if any)
a) Activity boundaries b) Permitted activities c) "Dangerous substances" used or produced	
a) None. b) Operations ceased in December 2015 and the plant mothballed since then with regular maintenance inspections. c) None	

5.0 Measures taken to protect land To be completed by EM/PPC officers (Pathway)
Has the applicant provided evidence from records collated during the lifetime of the permit, to show that the pollution prevention measures have worked?
Plant operated in line with the permitted activities detailed in Section 3 of the Site Condition Report reference: 49306645 / LERP0002 / 3005 / JS/ PJ

6.0 Pollution incidents that may have impacted on land and their remediation To be completed by EM/PPC officers (Sources)
Has the applicant provided evidence to show that any pollution incidents which have taken place during the life of the permit and which may have impacted on land or water have been investigated and remediated (where necessary)?
There were no pollution incidents.

7.0 Soil gas and water quality monitoring (where relevant)
Where soil gas and/or water quality monitoring has been undertaken, does this demonstrate that there has been no change in the condition of the land? Has any change that has occurred been investigated and remediated?
None undertaken.

Surrender SCR Evaluation Template

If you haven't already completed previous sections 4.0 to 7.0, do so now before assessing the surrender.

8.0 Decommissioning and removal of pollution risk

To be completed by EM/PPC officers

Has the applicant demonstrated that decommissioning works have been undertaken and that all pollution risks associated with the site have been removed? Has any contamination of land that has occurred during these activities been investigated and remediated?

The plant ceased operation in December 2015. During Q1 of 2016 the plant was placed in protective storage by KRL. As part of this work, the plant was de-inventorised to eliminate any future risks of air or groundwater releases. All materials were disposed of in line with the required regulations through licenced contractors. Where relevant, these were included in the 2016 Annual Report submitted in early 2017.

KRL has an inspection and maintenance contract for the plant with BP. Any relevant repairs that are required are completed as part of this contract. As part of this contract, the plant is visually inspected every 2 weeks. Furthermore, the plant is heated to minimise any degradation of the equipment.

9.0 Reference data and remediation (where relevant)

To be completed by GWCL officers

Has the applicant provided details of any surrender reference data that they have collected and any remediation that they have undertaken?

No reference data collected.

KRL currently leases the site from BP and completed constructed the pilot plant in 2010. KRL intends to sell the plant to BP and transfer the lease back to BP. BP will retain the plant in its current mothballed state for future use.

Since the plant has been constructed, KRL has completed an Annual Return each year. The land is in a "satisfactory state" for the permit to be surrendered.

10.0a Statement of site condition

To be completed by EM/PPC officers

Has the applicant provided a statement, backed up with evidence, confirming that the permitted activities have ceased, decommissioning works are complete and that pollution risk has been removed and that the land and waters at the site are in a satisfactory state?

This section should be used if the operator is relying solely on records obtained during the operational phase of the activity. If no, specify why

10.0b Statement of site condition

To be completed by GWCL officers

Has the applicant provided a statement, backed up with evidence, confirming that the permitted activities have ceased, decommissioning works are complete and that pollution risk has been removed and that the land and waters at the site are in a satisfactory state?

The plant stopped operation at the end of 2015, and was placed into protective storage in 1Q 2016. It has remained mothballed since that date, with localised heating to prevent degradation of the equipment inside.

The plant is de-inventoried and has remained so since end of Q1 2016.

The building at mothballed equipment will remain on the site for potential future use. A new permit will be required before the plant could be re-started.

See pre-populated comments directly above. The applicants own Site Condition report also states that no pollution incidents were recorded in line with their inspection and maintenance procedures.

Surrender SCR decision summary To be completed by GWCL officers and returned to NPS	Tick relevant decision
Sufficient information has been supplied to show that pollution risk has been removed and that the site is in a satisfactory state – accept the application to surrender the permit; or	X
Insufficient information has been supplied to show that pollution risk has been removed or that the site is in a satisfactory state – do not accept the application to surrender the permit. The following information must to be obtained from the applicant before the permit is determined:	
Date and name of reviewer: James Senior, Technical Officer – Groundwater & Contaminated Land Team (Yorkshire Area). Date: 21st May 2018	