

## Permitting Decisions- Bespoke Permit

---

We have decided to grant the permit for G.R. Wright and Sons operated by G.R. Wright and Sons Limited.

The permit number is EPR/EP3404SR.

The application is for a Schedule 1 Section 6.8 Part A (1)(d)(ii) activity: the treatment and processing, other than exclusively packaging, of the following raw materials, whether previously processed or unprocessed, intended for the production of food or feed (where the weight of the finished product excludes packaging) - only vegetable raw materials with a finished product production capacity greater than 300 tonnes per day. The installation will process approximately 450 tonnes of wheat per day to produce 360 tonnes of flour which is split between bulk and bagged products. The flour is stored on site prior to export.

A gas fired boiler with a thermal input capacity of 1.3MW is used to raise steam for direct injection into the wheat feed to condition it prior to the pelleting process

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

### **Purpose of this document**

This decision document provides a record of the decision making process. It summarises the decision-making process to show how the main relevant factors have been taken into account.

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

Read the permitting decisions in conjunction with the environmental permit.

### **Confidential information**

A claim for commercial or industrial confidentiality has not been made.

### **Identifying confidential information**

We have not identified information provided as part of the application that we consider to be confidential.

The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on confidentiality.

## **Consultation**

The consultation requirements were identified in accordance with the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations (2016) and our public participation statement.

The application was publicised on the GOV.UK website.

We consulted the following organisations:

Harlow Council,

Public Health England,

Thames Water, and

No concerns were raised.

## **Operator**

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.

## **The regulated facility**

We considered the extent and nature of the facility at the site in accordance with Appendix 2 of RGN2 'Defining the scope of the installation'.

The extent of the facility is defined in the site plan and in the permit. The activities are defined in table S1.1 of the permit.

## **The site**

The operator has provided a plan which we consider to be satisfactory.

This shows the extent of the site of the facility including the discharge points.

The plan is included in the permit.

## **Site condition report**

The operator has provided a description of the condition of the site, which we consider is satisfactory. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance

on site condition reports and baseline reporting under the Industrial Emissions Directive.

Following review of the data provided we note that whilst VOCs were encountered, the results for the majority of determinants were below detection level. We advised the operator that they may wish to consider groundwater monitoring throughout the operational phase as this would support the permit at time of surrender. However there is no obligation to do so.

## **Nature conservation, landscape, heritage and protected species and habitat designations**

We have checked the location of the application to assess if it is within the screening distances we consider relevant for impacts on nature conservation, landscape, heritage and protected species and habitat designations. The application is within our screening distances for these designations.

We have assessed the application and its potential to affect sites of nature conservation, landscape, heritage and protected species and habitat designations identified in the nature conservation screening report as part of the permitting process.

We consider that the application will not affect any site of nature conservation, landscape and heritage, and/or protected species or habitats identified.

We have not consulted Natural England.

The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance.

## **Environmental risk**

We have reviewed the operator's assessment of the environmental risk from the facility.

The operator's risk assessment is satisfactory.

## **Climate change adaptation**

We have assessed the climate change adaptation risk assessment.

We consider the climate change adaptation risk assessment is satisfactory.

We have decided to include a condition in the permit requiring the operator to review and update their climate change risk assessment over the life of the permit.

## **General operating techniques**

We have reviewed the techniques used by the operator and compared these with the food and drink sector BAT conclusions and we consider them to represent appropriate techniques for the facility.

The operating techniques that the applicant must use are specified in table S1.2 in the environmental permit.

## **Dust management**

We have reviewed the dust and emission management plan in accordance with our guidance on emissions management plans for dust.

We consider that the dust and emission management plan is satisfactory and we approve this plan.

We have approved the dust and emission management plan as we consider it to be appropriate measures based on information available to us at the current time. The applicant should not take our approval of this plan to mean that the measures in the plan are considered to cover every circumstance throughout the life of the permit.

The applicant should keep the plans under constant review and revise them annually or if necessary sooner if there have been complaints arising from operations on site or if circumstances change. This is in accordance with our guidance 'Control and monitor emissions for your environmental permit.

The plan has been incorporated into the operating techniques S1.2.

## **Improvement programme**

Based on the information on the application, we consider that we need to include an improvement programme.

We have included an improvement programme to verify that there is no impact from natural gas fuelled boiler. The operator was unable to obtain testing data from the manufacturer to complete an H1 assessment. We are satisfied that pollutants screen out when using the limits set in the permit. As the limits are mandatory we agreed that an H1 assessment could be provided to verify this with operational data.

## **Emission Limits**

Emission Limit Values (ELVs) based on Best Available Techniques (BAT) have been added for the following substances:

An ELV of 100mg/m<sup>3</sup> Oxides of nitrogen (NO and NO<sub>2</sub> expressed as NO<sub>2</sub>) has been set for the boiler.

This is in accordance with the medium Combustion Plant Directive for this type of plant.

A BAT-AEL of 5mg/m<sup>3</sup> has been set for flour dust from the filter stacks. This is in line with BAT for new plant.

## **Monitoring**

We have decided that monitoring should be carried out for the parameters listed in the permit, using the methods detailed and to the frequencies specified.

These monitoring requirements have been included in order to ensure that the plant operates within the emission limits specified in the permit.

The operator will carry out monitoring in accordance with the relevant methods specified in our guidance TGN M5.

We made these decisions in accordance with BAT for the sector MCP technical guidance.

Based on the information in the application we are satisfied that the operator's techniques, personnel and equipment have either MCERTS certification or MCERTS accreditation as appropriate.

## **Reporting**

We have specified reporting in the permit for the following parameters:

Oxides of nitrogen

Carbon monoxide

Flour dust

We made these decisions in accordance our MCP technical guidance and the Best Available Technique Conclusions for grain milling.

## **Management System**

We are not aware of any reason to consider that the operator will not have the management system to enable it to comply with the permit conditions.

The decision was taken in accordance with the guidance on operator competence and how to develop a management system for environmental permits.

A full review of the management system is undertaken during compliance checks.

## **Previous performance**

We have assessed operator competence. There is no known reason to consider the applicant will not comply with the permit conditions.

We have checked our systems to ensure that all relevant convictions have been declared.

No relevant convictions were found. The operator satisfies the criteria in our guidance on operator competence.

## **Financial competence**

There is no known reason to consider that the operator will not be financially able to comply with the permit conditions.

## **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.