

# Permitting decisions

## Bespoke permit

---

We have decided to grant the permit for Mulberry Waste Limited Peregrine Place operated by Mulberry Waste Limited.

The permit number is EPR/FP3738JM.

We consider in reaching that decision we have taken into account all relevant considerations and legal requirements and that the permit will ensure that the appropriate level of environmental protection is provided.

### Purpose of this document

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

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

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

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

# Key issues of the decision

## Fire prevention plan

In technically assessing a fire prevention plan (FPP) we seek a proportionate approach that reflects the risks posed by the waste activity that is to be conducted. We take into account the location and proximity of sensitive receptors.

The measures set out in the Fire Prevention Plans: Environmental Permits Guidance (November 2016) (the Guidance) have been designed to meet the following three objectives:

- minimise the likelihood of a fire happening;
- aim for a fire to be extinguished within 4 hours; and
- minimise the spread of fire within the site and to neighbouring sites.

Where a site has sensitive receptors within 1km (as this site does) we expect an operator to make adequate provision for any fire to be extinguished as quickly as possible and within 4 hours.

If an operator were to adopt the measures set out in the Guidance then it is reasonable to conclude that we would approve their FPP.

### How we took our decision

As the site is storing combustible waste the Operator is required to comply with the Guidance. A FPP was submitted with the application, the final version being submitted during determination. The site complies with all the requirements of the guidance with the exception of the requirement for an automated suppression system for storing combustible waste within a building.

Our assessment of the FPP is that the Operator has proposed appropriate alternative measures for suppressing fires and we consider that they meet the three objectives of the Guidance. The main factors which we considered in coming to this decision for each of the Objectives are detailed below.

### Objective: Minimise the likelihood of a fire happening

Other than the provision of an automated suppression system within the building the Operator has proposed methods compliant with all other sections of the Guidance. This includes, quarantine procedures to separate materials should they be found to exhibiting an elevated temperature, 24 hour CCTV coverage to warn the Operator of unauthorised access of the site and protect against arson, and 6 metre separation distances between potential sources of ignition and combustible wastes.

The site has a small number of waste piles, these are within the maximum dimensions indicated for these waste types in the Guidance and are further separated into a number of smaller piles. These smaller piles have a 60cm gap between them for access. The majority of waste on site consists of nominally empty barrels and IBC's which are unlikely to generate heat. The remaining and highest risk waste piles are the kibbled plastic from the treatment of IBCs and drums, this is stored in bags internally. These bags will be probed daily with suitable equipment at the centre base of the bag where heating is most likely. The FPP has a written procedure for separating and dissipating any heat within the piles if they are found to show temperatures of 50°C and above. Thermal run away occurs at 80°C at which point mitigation measures would be unlikely to prevent a fire, a 50°C trigger temperature is low enough to enable effective mitigation before this occurs.

### Objective conclusion

We have concluded that the Operator has demonstrated they have alternative measures sufficient to meet the objective to minimise the likelihood of a fire occurring in the internal waste piles.

### Objective: Aim for a fire to be extinguished within 4 hours

The Operator is proposing a UKAS accredited heat and smoke detection system. This system works on a zone basis whereby each 5m<sup>2</sup> area of the building contains an optical sensor that can detect thermal energy and also emits a pulse from an infra-red LED every 10 seconds to detect smoke. Upon detection of a fire

either by the smoke or heat generated, the system automatically triggers an audible alarm at the site, notifies the fire and rescue service and the Operator. This system also works for out of operational hours, once automatically notified of an incident the Operator will aim to have staff attend the site within 20 minutes to assist the fire and rescue service.

The site has trained plant operators to separate and move smouldering or burning waste to the quarantine area in order to remove it from the parts of the waste pile which are not yet affected and also to spread the waste out, dissipating any heat. The site also has 2 mains fed hoses which can be operated during operational hours by trained staff. These two methods of alternative suppression are available during the day. Out of normal working hours however they will not be immediately available. In order to meet the objectives of the FPP guidance out of hours the Operator has undertaken correspondence with the fire and rescue service to discuss the procedures if a fire is detected when no staff are present at the site. The correspondence indicated that the fire and rescue service would be present the site in approximately 10 minutes and that they had the equipment to gain access to the building to fight the fire. Water supply from the nearby hydrant is sufficient to fight the fire and is compliant with the FPP guidance. The Operator also indicated that staff would be able to attend the site after 20 minutes to support the fire and rescue service. Due to the dispersed way in which the waste piles are arranged, reaction time and willingness of the fire and rescue service to fight a fire within the building any fire detected within the building is likely to be extinguished within 4 hours.

To expand on the fire and rescue service reaction time, the nearest fire station to respond to any fire is Leyland Fire Station which has a Day Crewing fire engine, and is 1.3 miles away from site. The journey between the fire station and the site should take less than 6 minutes. During non-operational hours this is only extended by 4-5 minutes. In case of a major incident at the site or in the area, engines may also be called from Chorley which also has retained fire fighters. The fire and rescue service have agreed the process for accessing the site out of hours with the Operator and will undertake a risk assessment visit prior to waste being accepted at the site.

#### Objective conclusion

We have concluded that the Operator has demonstrated they have alternative measures sufficient to meet the objective of enabling a fire in the internal waste piles to be extinguished within 4 hours.

#### Objective: Minimise the spread of fire

The site has 12 fire extinguishers and 2 fire hoses. Each fire hose is 25 mm x 30 m long and has a reach of 12 m when used in jet form and 4.5 m in spray. The hoses are provided on a swinging reel for maximum mobility, ensuring that they can be used to tackle a fire anywhere in the building. The hoses are fed from the mains water supply and thus are primed and ready for immediate use. Staff are trained in their use and dedicated fire marshals who have received external fire-fighting training are rostered onto each shift.

In the event of a fire, the first responding fire marshal will assume control of the response and organise the emergency procedures on site along with any liaison required by the emergency services. An annual check of training records will be made with fire training scheduled as necessary. As mentioned above the fire and rescue service should be on site and fighting the fire quickly. During operational hours the Operator will have plant operators on hand to separate and move waste piles in order to facilitate cooling and extinguishing of the fire. Out of normal operating hours the Operator has indicated that they will have personnel to support the fire and rescue service in the above mentioned functions approximately 20 minutes after fire detection. These procedures are further augmented by the nature of the waste piles which are kept with 6m gaps between waste piles and are further segmented into smaller liner rows.

#### Objective conclusion

We have concluded that the Operator has demonstrated they have alternative measures sufficient to meet the objective to minimise the spread of fire within the site and to neighbouring sites.

#### Decision

Taking into account the proposals contained within the FPP outlined above we agree that the measures proposed constitute an alternative to an automated suppression system and meet the three objectives of the Guidance. We are therefore satisfied that the FPP as a whole is compliant with the Guidance and that the Operator has put in place appropriate controls to prevent, extinguish and minimise the spread of fires on the site.

Three pre-operational conditions (PO2-PO4) in relation to the fire prevention plan are incorporated within the permit. PO2 relates to our decision to approve the alternative measures and requires the operator to provide written evidence to demonstrate that the fire and rescue service have carried out an operational risk assessment at the site, further clarifying the procedures carried out by the fire and rescue service on the site in the case of a fire. PO3 and PO4 relate to a fire wall that is proposed at the site to separate two waste piles, the plan for wall is not currently available and so PO3 and PO4 ensure that prior to a proposed fire wall specification compliant with the Guidance and satisfactory installation of this fire wall the 6 metre separation distances required by the Guidance are maintained.

## **Discharge to Sewer**

As part of this permit application the Operator has proposed a discharge of trade effluent to sewer. This is subject to a trade effluent consent with United Utilities PLC and is treated at Leyland Wastewater Treatment Works (WWTW). The WWTW then discharges the effluent to the River Lostock.

When assessing the risk of the discharge to sewer from emission point S1 using the H1 emission screening tool it became apparent that emissions of Ammonia, Chromium, Copper, Cyanide, Lead and its compounds, Nickel and its compounds, Silver, Sulphate, Tin, Vanadium and Zinc did not screen out as insignificant. Discharge to sewer S2 was not assessed with the H1 emission screening tool as the discharge is comprised of clean rainwater collected from the roof of the building.

We modelled the discharge and it was found that although the effluent does not screen out there is no breach to the maximum allowable concentrations (MAC) environmental quality standards. In addition, based on the dry weather flow of 10,940m<sup>3</sup>/d, the flow to full treatment of 28,598m<sup>3</sup>/d at Leyland WWTW combined with the low effluent volume being discharged from the site it is unlikely that it will have a significant effect. As a result no site specific effluent discharge limits are required.

## Decision checklist

Aspect considered	Decision
<b>Receipt of application</b>	
Confidential information	A claim for commercial or industrial confidentiality has not been made.
Identifying confidential information	We have not identified information provided as part of the application that we consider to be confidential.
<b>Consultation</b>	
Consultation	<p>The consultation requirements were identified in accordance with the Environmental Permitting Regulations and our public participation statement.</p> <p>The application was publicised on the GOV.UK website.</p> <p>We consulted the following organisations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health and Safety Executive</li> <li>• Fire and Rescue Service</li> <li>• Director of Public Health</li> <li>• Public Health England</li> <li>• Environmental Health</li> <li>• Local Planning Authority</li> </ul> <p>The comments and our responses are summarised in the <a href="#">consultation section</a>.</p>
<b>Operator</b>	
Control of the facility	We are satisfied that the applicant (now the operator) is the person who will have control over the operation of the facility after the grant of the permit. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on legal operator for environmental permits.
<b>The facility</b>	
The regulated facility	<p>We considered the extent and nature of the facility at the site in accordance with RGN2 'Understanding the meaning of regulated facility', Appendix 2 of RGN 2 'Defining the scope of the installation', Appendix 1 of RGN 2 'Interpretation of Schedule 1', guidance on waste recovery plans and permits.</p> <p>The extent of the facility defined in the site plan and in the permit. The activities are defined in table S1.1 of the permit.</p>
<b>The site</b>	
Extent of the site of the facility	The operator has provided a plan which we consider is satisfactory, showing the extent of the site of the facility. The plan is included in the permit.

Aspect considered	Decision
Site condition report	<p>The operator has provided a description of the condition of the site, which we consider is satisfactory. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on site condition reports and baseline reporting under the Industrial Emissions Directive.</p> <p>We have advised the operator what measures they need to take to improve the site condition report.</p>
Biodiversity, heritage, landscape and nature conservation	<p>The application is within the relevant distance criteria of a site of heritage, landscape or nature conservation, and/or protected species or habitat.</p> <p>We have assessed the application and its potential to affect all known sites of nature conservation, landscape and heritage and/or protected species or habitats identified in the nature conservation screening report as part of the permitting process.</p> <p>We consider that the application will not affect any sites of nature conservation, landscape and heritage, and/or protected species or habitats identified.</p> <p>We have not consulted Natural England on the application. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance.</p>
<b>Environmental risk assessment</b>	
Environmental risk	<p>We have reviewed the operator's assessment of the environmental risk from the facility.</p> <p>The operator's risk assessment is satisfactory.</p> <p>The assessment shows that, applying the conservative criteria in our guidance on environmental risk assessment, all emissions may be categorised as environmentally insignificant with the exception of emissions of effluent to sewer including the following substances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ammonia</li> <li>• Chromium</li> <li>• Copper</li> <li>• Cyanide</li> <li>• Lead and its compounds</li> <li>• Nickel and its compounds</li> <li>• Silver</li> <li>• Sulphate</li> <li>• Tin</li> <li>• Vanadium</li> <li>• Zinc</li> </ul> <p>This emission is treated in a waste water treatment works before discharge to the river Lostock. After further analysis the emissions were found to adhere to the relevant environmental quality standards. The methods proposed by the site are therefore BAT.</p>
<b>Operating techniques</b>	
General operating techniques	<p>We have reviewed the techniques used by the operator and compared these with the relevant guidance notes and we consider them to represent</p>

Aspect considered	Decision
	<p>appropriate techniques for the facility.</p> <p>The operating techniques that the applicant must use are specified in table S1.2 in the environmental permit.</p>
<p>Operating techniques for emissions that do not screen out as insignificant</p>	<p>Emissions of Ammonia, Chromium, Copper, Cyanide, Lead and its compounds, Nickel and its compounds, Silver, Sulphate, Tin, Vanadium, Zinc in the discharge to sewer cannot be screened out as insignificant. We have assessed whether the proposed techniques are BAT.</p> <p>The proposed techniques/ emission levels for emissions that do not screen out as insignificant are in line with the techniques and benchmark levels contained in the technical guidance and we consider them to represent appropriate techniques for the facility.</p> <p>Please see the <a href="#">key issues</a> section for more information.</p>
<p>Operating techniques for emissions that screen out as insignificant</p>	<p>Emissions of Nitrogen Oxides, Sulphur dioxide, Chromium, Arsenic, Benzo-a-pyrene, Beryllium, Cadmium, Carbon monoxide, Copper dusts, Lead, Mercury, Nickel, Particulate matter, Selenium and Vanadium to air from the diesel generator have been screened out as insignificant, and so we agree that the applicant's proposed technique are BAT for the installation.</p> <p>We consider that the emission limits included in the installation permit reflect the BAT for the sector.</p>
<p>Fire prevention plan</p>	<p>We have assessed the fire prevention plan and are satisfied that it meets the measures and objectives set out in the Fire Prevention Plan guidance. The operator has proposed using alternative measures for meeting the requirement for an automated suppressions system in the building. Please see the <a href="#">key issues</a> section for more information.</p>
<p><b>Permit conditions</b></p>	
<p>Raw materials</p>	<p>We have specified limits and controls on the use of raw materials and fuels.</p> <p>Fuel oil must be less than 1.0% Sulphur Content.</p>
<p>Waste types</p>	<p>We have specified the permitted waste types, descriptions and quantities, which can be accepted at the regulated facility.</p> <p>We are satisfied that the operator can accept these wastes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• they are suitable for the proposed activities</li> <li>• the proposed infrastructure is appropriate</li> <li>• the environmental risk assessment is acceptable.</li> </ul>
<p>Pre-operational conditions</p>	<p>Based on the information in the application, we consider that we need to impose pre-operational conditions.</p> <p>Four pre-operational conditions have been incorporated within the permit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PO1 ensures that necessary improvements to infrastructure on site are carried out before the acceptance of waste. The improvements will comprise of:</li> </ul>

Aspect considered	Decision
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The installation of kerbing round the site yard;</li> <li>○ The installation of a speed ramp at the entrance;</li> <li>○ Repairs to cracks in the concrete;</li> <li>○ Repairs to concrete expansion joints were necessary; and,</li> <li>○ Replacement of the tarmac strip outside the building with concrete to ensure the surface is impermeable.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● PO2 requires that the Operator submit written evidence to show that the fire and rescue service have carried out an operational risk assessment at the facility prior to acceptance of waste.</li> <li>● PO3 requires that the Operator submit specifications compliant with the Guidance for the fire wall proposed within the FPP.</li> <li>● PO4 requires the Operator to install the fire walls in accordance with the specifications provided in compliance with PO3. The condition ensures that until these requirements have been met that the separation distances of 6 metres between all waste piles on the site are maintained in compliance with the Guidance.</li> </ul>
Emission limits	<p>We have decided that emission limits are not required in the permit.</p> <p>We have made this decision as a result of the nature of point source emissions at the site.</p>
Reporting	<p>We have specified reporting in the permit.</p> <p>We made these decisions in accordance with How to SGN S5.06 – Guidance for Recovery and Disposal of Hazardous and Non Hazardous Wastes.</p>
<b>Operator competence</b>	
Management system	<p>There is no known reason to consider that the operator will not have the management system to enable it to comply with the permit conditions.</p> <p>The decision was taken in accordance with the guidance on operator competence and how to develop a management system for environmental permits.</p>
Technical competence	<p>Technical competence is required for activities permitted.</p> <p>The operator is a member of an agreed scheme.</p> <p>We are satisfied that the operator is technically competent.</p>
Relevant convictions	<p>The Case Management System has been checked to ensure that all relevant convictions have been declared.</p> <p>No relevant convictions were found. The operator satisfies the criteria in our guidance on operator competence.</p>
Financial competence	<p>There is no known reason to consider that the operator will not be financially able to comply with the permit conditions.</p>
<b>Growth Duty</b>	
Section 108 Deregulation	<p>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</p>



Aspect considered	Decision
Act 2015 – Growth duty	<p>the guidance issued under section 110 of that Act in deciding whether to grant this permit.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.3 of the guidance says:</p> <p>“The primary role of regulators, in delivering regulation, is to achieve the regulatory outcomes for which they are responsible. For a number of regulators, these regulatory outcomes include an explicit reference to development or growth. The growth duty establishes economic growth as a factor that all specified regulators should have regard to, alongside the delivery of the protections set out in the relevant legislation.”</p> <p>We have addressed the legislative requirements and environmental standards to be set for this operation in the body of the decision document above. The guidance is clear at paragraph 1.5 that the growth duty does not legitimise non-compliance and its purpose is not to achieve or pursue economic growth at the expense of necessary protections.</p> <p>We consider the requirements and standards we have set in this permit are reasonable and necessary to avoid a risk of an unacceptable level of pollution. This also promotes growth amongst legitimate operators because the standards applied to the operator are consistent across businesses in this sector and have been set to achieve the required legislative standards.</p>

# Consultation

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

## Responses from organisations listed in the consultation section

<b>Response received from</b>
Public Health England
<b>Brief summary of issues raised</b>
<p>We recommend that any Environmental Permit issued for this site should contain conditions to ensure that emissions to air from dust, noise and odours are prevented, controlled and managed such that they do not adversely impact upon public health.</p> <p>Based solely on the information contained in the application provided, PHE has no significant concerns regarding risk to health of the local population from this proposed activity, providing that the applicant takes all appropriate measures to prevent or control pollution, in accordance with the relevant sector technical guidance or industry best practice.</p>
<b>Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered</b>
The determination process and permit document has ensured that both fugitive and point source emissions are controlled so that there is no significant effect on human or environmental sensitive receptors. No further action required.

<b>Response received from</b>
South Ribble Borough Council
<b>Brief summary of issues raised</b>
The last complaint that we received about the site was in 2011 regarding odour. Taking into account the good track record of the business I have no objection to the application.
<b>Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered</b>
No further action required.

<b>Response received from</b>
Sewage Authority- United Utilities PLC
<b>Brief summary of issues raised</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A discharge to sewer consent has been issued for this site.</li> <li>• Treatment at Clydesdale Place meets BAT. There are adequate interceptors at Peregrine Place.</li> <li>• Bunding is acceptable. Interceptors must be regularly maintained by the trader. There is a flow meter in place. Spot samples for charging will be taken in line with UU policy. Monitoring samples will be taken where necessary.</li> <li>• Substances declared on G02 form in effluent will be analysed.</li> <li>• Metals should be limited within permit to 10 mg/l.</li> </ul>
<b>Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered</b>
<p>The emissions in the site effluent to sewer did not screen out as environmentally insignificant, however after review of the information provided there is no breach to the maximum allowable concentrations in environmental quality standards. In addition, based on the treatment activities at Leyland WWTW, and the proposed low effluent volume from this installation, it is unlikely that the proposal will lead to any significant impact.</p> <p>Best available technique conclusions with regards to emission limits have been recently issued and in the</p>

future the operator will have to comply with these for the indirect discharge. [BAT AEL](#) limits are more stringent than the 10mg/l for the metals specified. The information provided on the discharge shows the likely emissions to be in compliance with these limits.

**Representations from individual members of the public.**

<b>Brief summary of issues raised</b>
<p><b>Clayton Landfill</b></p> <p>There are issues with fugitive emissions including odour from Clayton landfill site impacting on businesses and residents, this new site will contribute to this.</p>
<b>Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered</b>
<p>The Environment Agency recognises there is compliance issues at the Clayton Hall landfill site. The effort to bring these fugitive emissions under control is extensive and is currently ongoing. Clayton Hall Landfill was commissioned before the Environment Agency was formed (1994) when the regulations were less effective.</p> <p>As we are satisfied the Operator of this permit is proposing the best available techniques to ensure there are no adverse impact on local sensitive receptors the performance of other sites or operators in the area cannot be taken into account in its determination.</p> <p>Mulberry Waste Limited Peregrine Place will be subject to the current <a href="#">Environmental Permitting Regulations 2016</a>, <a href="#">Hazardous Waste Regulations</a>, <a href="#">sector guidance note 5.06</a>, <a href="#">Best available technique conclusions</a> as well as the <a href="#">fire prevention plan guidance</a>. The site does not permanently deposit waste, meaning that should the site breach the conditions of the permit, revocation of the licence and requirement for the removal of all waste from the site may be warranted.</p>

<b>Brief summary of issues raised</b>
<p><b>HGV movements</b></p> <p>The network of roads surrounding the site may be adversely impacted due to the volume of lorry movements associated with the operation of the site.</p>
<b>Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered</b>
<p>Road traffic is part of local planning considerations and is outside the remit of the Environment Agency's permit determination.</p>

<b>Brief summary of issues raised on local sensitive receptors</b>	<b>Summary of action taken / how this has been covered</b>
<p>Release of hazardous substance or pollutants from the site may cause impact on the following sensitive receptors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local population</li> <li>• Schools</li> <li>• Homes</li> <li>• Work places</li> <li>• Local hospice</li> <li>• Nearby food and drink manufacturers.</li> </ul>	<p>Local sensitive receptors are taken into account when assessing the impact of the site upon the surrounding area. As the operator has taken all the measures necessary to prove they are using best available techniques as detailed in <a href="#">sector guidance note 5.06</a> (SGN 5.06) and the permit does not allow for any fugitive emissions from the site, none of the receptors should be impacted by the waste operation. Any breach of these conditions would lead to compliance action with the possibility of the licence being revoked.</p> <p>Measures to reduce likelihood of fugitive emissions (pollution) include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An impermeable surface with a sealed drainage system for all areas of the site storing waste with written infrastructure maintenance procedure.</li> <li>• Storage of all aqueous waste within the site building.</li> <li>• Pre-acceptance and acceptance procedures/ inspections in line with <a href="#">sector guidance note 5.06</a> to ensure no non-compliant waste is accepted into the site with the corresponding written quarantine and rejections</li> </ul>

Brief summary of issues raised on local sensitive receptors	Summary of action taken / how this has been covered
	<p>procedures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of a quarantine area for non-compliant waste.</li> <li>• Accident management plan in place to deal with a range of emergencies including spills.</li> <li>• Separate storage of incompatible waste types.</li> <li>• Daily inspection of wastes containers, impermeable surfacing and bunding.</li> <li>• Combustible waste is stored and treated in line with the <a href="#">fire prevention plan guidance</a>.</li> <li>• Monitoring of discharge to sewer to ensure compliance with discharge consent.</li> <li>• All treatment activities are bunded and carried out within the site building, acting to contain any potential fugitive emissions.</li> <li>• Provision of HNC qualified chemists to sample, inspect and supervise receipt of waste.</li> <li>• Any container identified without a lid or cap will be immediately sealed upon arrival.</li> <li>• Effluent holding tank meets BAT requirements. It is enclosed and bunded to 110% of its capacity and will only store the waters from the cleaning of compatible waste types. It is fitted with a high level alarm to ensure it is not overfilled. The tank, its pipework and surrounding pavement will be inspected monthly. In the unlikely event that both the tank and bunding fail the site impermeable area has the capacity to contain any spill.</li> </ul> <p>Many of the measures outlined above are concerning the potential release of polluting liquids, this is the key concern for the site as most of the treatment processes are wet processes. Although the site takes some aqueous wastes the majority of the incoming waste streams will be 'nominally empty' containers meaning that there will only be residues of waste in the bottom. This risk of this is also mitigated by the small storage capacity at any one time which is 164 tonnes.</p> <p>Point source emissions from the site include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Perkins 2306C-E14TAG1A, with a stand-by power capacity of 350 kVA / 280kW<sub>e</sub> diesel generator (thermal output 786 kW), the air emissions from this screen out as insignificant using our <a href="#">H1 emission screening</a>.</li> <li>• A discharge of clean rain water only collected from the roof to Sewer.</li> <li>• A discharge of Effluent to sewer for treatment in a waste water treatment works. The potential pollutants in this effluent are limited by the discharge consent. The emissions are below maximum concentrations allowed by environmental quality standards. Compliance with these limits is supported by sampling within the container before discharge to the holding tank and also before discharge from the holding tank to the sewer via an interceptor. If the effluent is found to be non-compliant with the discharge limits it will be tankered off site to a suitable facility.</li> </ul>
The site should be placed away from sensitive receptors.	Decisions over land use are matters for the local authority's planning system. Location is a relevant consideration for permitting but only in so far as the site's potential to have an adverse environmental impact on receptors. We are satisfied that the applicant has proposed appropriate controls to ensure no fugitive or point source emissions

<b>Brief summary of issues raised on local sensitive receptors</b>	<b>Summary of action taken / how this has been covered</b>
	from the proposed facility would adversely impact upon local sensitive receptors.

<b>Brief summary of issues raised</b>
<b>House prices impacted</b> Another waste site in the area would exacerbate the deterioration in living standards and therefore house prices.
<b>Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered</b>
Our remit in assessing and determining Environmental Permit applications is to ensure compliance with the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2016 and to ensure that the site operations do not represent a significant risk to people or the environment. We are satisfied that the operator has proposed appropriate controls to ensure this. Concerns about impact on local house pricing is not within the remit of the Environment Agency and therefore not a factor we can take into account during determination.