

## Decision document new bespoke Permit

---

We have decided to grant the permit for 3R Technology UK Limited operated by 3R Technology UK Limited.

The permit number is EPR/TP3602SH.

The application is for the operation of a plastics recycling facility that will accept waste plastics including those from Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) containing persistent organic pollutants (POPs). The plastics will undergo sorting, grinding and separation into different fractions which will then be transferred to an appropriate recycling/disposal facility.

All waste storage and treatment will be carried out within a building with no external emission points to air, land or water.

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.

- summarises the decision making process in the [decision considerations](#) section to show how the main relevant factors have been taken into account
- highlights [key issues](#) in the determination
- 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.

### Key issues of the decision

The key issues identified during the determination was the efficiency of the process used for the separation of waste plastics containing Persistent Organic

Pollutants (POPs). The process uses well established size reduction (grinding) and density separation (floatation tank) techniques to separate the plastics via density distribution into POPs containing fractions and non-POPs containing fractions. The separated fractions will then be sent forward to appropriate recycling or disposal facilities, with the POP containing fraction being sent for high-temperature incineration.

The Operator was required (via a Schedule 5 Notice) to provide details of the monitoring they propose to undertake to demonstrate on an ongoing basis the effectiveness of the process in separating plastic containing POPs from that which does not. They provided a process monitoring/sampling procedure and we have incorporated this into the permit conditions via Table S1.2 of Schedule 1 to the permit.

## **Decision considerations**

### **Confidential information**

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

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

### **Identifying confidential information**

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

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

### **Consultation**

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

The comments and our responses are summarised in the [consultation responses](#) section.

The application was publicised on the GOV.UK website.

We consulted the following organisations:

Local Authority Environmental Health; Health and Safety Executive; Fire and Rescue.

The comments and our responses are summarised in the [consultation responses](#) section.

## **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 RGN2 'Understanding the meaning of regulated facility, Appendix 2 of RGN2 'Defining the scope of the installation', Appendix 1 of RGN 2 'Interpretation of Schedule 1.

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.

The plans show the location of the part of the installation to which this permit applies on that site.

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.

## **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.

## **General operating techniques**

We have reviewed the techniques used by the operator and compared these with the relevant guidance notes and we consider them to represent appropriate techniques for the facility.

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

## **Fire Prevention Plan**

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 plan sets out alternative measures that we consider meet the objectives of the Fire Prevention Plan guidance.

We have approved the fire prevention 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 plan has been incorporated into the operating techniques S1.2.

## **Waste types**

We have specified the permitted waste types, descriptions and quantities, which can be accepted at the regulated facility.

We are satisfied that the operator can accept these wastes for the following reasons:

- they are suitable for the proposed activities

- the proposed infrastructure is appropriate; and
- the environmental risk assessment is acceptable.

We have restricted the following wastes for the following reasons:

We have restricted the waste types to the plastic fraction of the waste only.

We made these decisions with respect to waste types in accordance with WM3 Guidance.

## **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 ensure that monitoring and assessment are undertaken to verify the effectiveness of the float/sink density separation process.

## **Emission Limits**

We have decided that emission limits are not required in the permit as there are no point source emissions from the installation.

## **Reporting**

We have specified reporting in the permit. This has been included in order to measure the performance of the site with regards to water usage, energy usage, raw materials and waste disposal and/or recovery.

## **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.

## **Technical Competence**

Technical competence is required for activities permitted.

The operator is a member of the CIWM/WAMITAB scheme. Mr Richard Martin has an EPOC certificate.

We are satisfied that the operator is technically competent.

## **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.

## Consultation Responses

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

### **Responses from organisations listed in the consultation section:**

Response received from Preston City Council Environmental Health Department.

Brief summary of issues raised: The Environmental Health Officer advised that they required a Noise Impact Assessment as part of the planning consultation for the site. They advised that "All looks to be ok with no impact on the neighbours. Whilst the background levels have been borrowed from another report due to the current Covid restrictions, the predicted noise levels, calculations etc. seem reasonable. The applicant does want 24hr operation, although no deliveries/collections overnight. There is also the recommendation to keep the roller shutter doors closed in-between deliveries during processing, which is sensible. It would be interesting to know if this would be a problem in summer when it is potentially hot inside the unit. Anyway I'll confirm to LCC that I'm satisfied, but mention the closure of the doors and times when deliveries should be restricted."

Summary of actions taken: We have included our standard condition for noise and vibration.