

Permitting Decisions - Variation

We have decided to grant the variation for Shepton Mallet Egg Processors and Contract Packers operated by Framptons Limited.

The variation number is EPR/BN9551IT/V006

The variation is for the addition of a small waste co-incineration plant (SWCP), to produce steam for use in on-site processes, the SWCP is considered a directly associated activity (DAA) to the main installation activity. The SWCP will burn non-hazardous waste wood and on-site packaging waste up to a maximum of 10,000 tonnes per annum.

The SWCP comprises of the following:

- The reception, storage and handling of biomass and waste fuel materials;
- The combustion of biomass and waste fuel materials;
- Flue gas abatement system;
- Fly ash removal system;
- Bottom ash removal system; and
- Continuous Emissions Monitoring System.

The SWCP will replace the existing gas boilers on site, however two will remain on site for use as backup plant. The site boundary has been extended to include the area where the SWCP will be located. There are no other changes to the permit.

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 considerations section 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 and the variation notice.

Key issues of the decision

The key issues arising during this determination were air emissions and best available techniques (BAT), the following section describes how we considered these issues in the determination and what measures we are requiring to ensure a high level of protection.

Best Available Techniques (BAT)

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

The Applicant carried out a stack height assessment, included within the air quality assessment. It was agreed that a stack height of 18 metres represented BAT for this installation because at this height the air quality assessment has concluded there will be no significant impact on environmental or human receptors as they are screened out or there is sufficient headroom between the Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC) and the Environmental Standard for all emissions modelled.

The SWCP uses a number of abatement techniques as listed below:

- Sodium bicarbonate dosing to control acid gases
- A urea based selective non-catalytic reduction (SNCR) system for oxides of nitrogen
- Ceramic filter system to remove particulate matter

We consider given the size of the SWCP and the type of waste it will be burning these techniques represent BAT for this installation.

The stack will be fitted with MCERTS compliant continuous emissions monitoring system (CEMS), used to continuously monitor the outgoing gas stream. In conjunction with the monitoring and reporting requirements added to the permit for this emission, this meets BAT for this type of facility.

In addition, the standard permit conditions from the energy from waste template have been included to ensure the operation of the co-incineration plant meets BAT.

Air Emissions

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 (PC) 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). ES are described in our web guide 'Air emissions risk assessment for your environmental permit'.

Our web guide sets out the relevant ES as:

- Ambient Air Directive Limit Values
- Ambient Air Directive and 4th Daughter Directive Target Values
- UK Air Quality Strategy Objectives
- Environmental Assessment Levels

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 screened out as **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 exceedances 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 exceedances are considered likely, the application is subject to the requirement to operate in accordance with 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.

Assessment of Impact on Air Quality

The Applicant's assessment of the impact of air quality is set out in '*Appendix 3, Chimney height assessment and detailed air quality assessment*' of the Application.

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 Atmospheric Dispersion Modelling System (ADMS) Version 5.2 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 Bristol Airport between 2015 and 2019. The weather station is approximately 25 km to the north, north-west of the site and considered to be the most representative of

conditions at the site. 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 15(3), 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)
 - Volatile organic compounds (VOCs)
 - 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 Volatile organic compounds (VOCs)
 - Ammonia (NH₃)
- 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 and chromium.
- Third, the model also considered emissions of pollutants not covered by Annex VI of IED, specifically, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) and Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). Emission rates used in the modelling have been drawn from data in the Waste Incineration BREF.

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

As well as calculating the peak ground level concentration, the Applicant has modelled the concentration of key pollutants at a number of specific receptor locations.

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 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 assessment and similarly agree that the conclusions drawn in the reports were acceptable.

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

The dispersion modelling submitted with the application had taken the small waste incineration plant to be classed as incineration and had used the appropriate oxygen reference condition of 11%. During determination it was agreed the plant should be classed as co-incineration, which required an oxygen reference condition of 6%. The Applicant submitted additional information to demonstrate that the difference in oxygen reference condition did not negatively impact the results of the dispersion modelling. We reviewed the information provided and agree with the Applicant's conclusions.

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 the maximum predicted ground level concentration across the modelled domain. These are the worst impacted locations regardless of whether a sensitive receptor is present at these locations.

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.

For several substances the applicants report did not include background concentrations, we have therefore used background concentrations from the following sources. For ammonia (NH₃) background value, a site specific value was taken from APIS, for manganese, vanadium, arsenic and nickel maximum values were taken from Defra's heavy metal network for a highly precautionary approach.

Permitting Decisions- Variation

Non-metals

Pollutant	EQS / EAL		Back-ground $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	Process Contribution (PC)		Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC)	
	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	Reference period		$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	% of EAL	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	% of EAL
NO ₂	40	Annual Mean	6.37	8.75	21.88	15.1	37.8
	200	99.79th %ile of 1-hour means	11.96	37.26	18.6	49.2	24.6
PM ₁₀	40	Annual Mean	12.81	0.388	0.97	n/a	n/a
	50	90.41st %ile of 24-hour means	25.16	0.873	1.75	n/a	n/a
PM _{2.5}	20	Annual Mean	7.97	8.36	41.80	16.33	81.7
SO ₂	266	99.9th %ile of 15-min means	2.25	29.53	11.1	31.79	11.9
	350	99.73rd %ile of 1-hour means	n/a	16.14	4.61	n/a	n/a
	125	99.18th %ile of 24-hour means	n/a	5.52	4.4	n/a	n/a
HCl	750	1-hour average	n/a	17	2.267	n/a	n/a
HF	16	Monthly average	n/a	0.039	0.24	n/a	n/a
	160	1-hour average	n/a	1.71	1.06875	n/a	n/a
TOC	5	Annual Mean	0.129	0.498	9.96	0.63	12.54
	30	24-hour average	0.259	18.19	60.63	18.45	61.50
CO	10000	Maximum daily running 8-hour mean	0.1892	101.0	1.01	n/a	n/a
PAH	0.00025	Annual Mean	0.000077	0.0000388	15.52	0.00043	46.32
NH ₃	180	Annual Mean	3.85	0.388	0.22	n/a	n/a

Pollutant	EQS / EAL		Back-ground	Process Contribution (PC)		Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC)	
	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	Reference period		$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	% of EAL	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$
		2500	1-hour average	n/a	17.13	0.69	n/a
PCBs	0.2	Annual Mean	n/a	3.88E-09	0.000002	0.00013	n/a
	6	1-hour average	n/a	1.71E-07	0.000003	0.00025	n/a

PAH as benzo[a]pyrene

Note 1 – where PC is insignificant (shown in green) we do not consider the background or PEC

Metals

Pollutant	EQS / EAL		Back-ground	Process Contribution		Predicted Environmental Concentration	
	ng/m^3	Reference period		ng/m^3	ng/m^3	% of EAL	ng/m^3
Cd	5	Annual mean	0.098	1.93	38.6	2.03	40.6
Hg	250	Annual mean	1.53	1.93	0.77	n/a	n/a
	7500	1-hour average	n/a	85	1.133	n/a	n/a
Sb	5000	Annual mean	n/a	19	0.38	19.00	n/a
	150000	1-hour average	n/a	830	0.55	830	n/a
Pb	250	Annual mean	3.6	19	7.60	22.60	9.04
Cu	10000	Annual mean	n/a	19	0.19	n/a	n/a
	200000	1-hour average	n/a	830	0.42	n/a	n/a
Mn	150	Annual mean	2.5	19	12.67	25.03	14.33
	1500000	1-hour average	n/a	830	0.055	n/a	n/a

Pollutant	EQS / EAL		Back-ground	Process Contribution		Predicted Environmental Concentration	
	ng/m ³	Reference period		ng/m ³	ng/m ³	% of EAL	ng/m ³
V	5000	Annual mean	n/a	19	0.3800	n/a	n/a
	1000	24-hr average	0.65	830	83	830	83.07
As	6	Annual mean	0.61	19	316.67	19.6	326.83
Cr (VI)	0.25	Annual mean	0.96	19	7600	19.96	7984
Ni	20	Annual mean	0.45	19	95.00	19.81	97.25

(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:

- PM₁₀
- HCl
- HF
- CO
- PCBs
- NH₃
- Hg
- Sb
- Cu

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
- SO₂
- PM_{2.5}
- Ni
- Mn
- Pb
- V
- Cd
- TOC
- PAH

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 or short term ES.

- Cr and As - see section below 'Assessment of Emission of Metals' for further information

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.

The following emissions of metals were screened out as insignificant:

- Hg
- Sb
- Cu

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

- Ni
- Mn
- Pb
- Cd
- V

This left emissions of Cr and As requiring further assessment as they are considered to have the potential to give rise to pollution.

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 a 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 metals Cr and As the Applicant used representative emissions data 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". 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.

Data for Cr (VI) was based on total Cr emissions measurements and the proportion of total Cr to Cr (VI) in APC residues.

Based on the above, emissions of Cr and As were screened out as insignificant.

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 incinerator.

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

Sites Considered

The following Habitats (i.e. Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas and Ramsar) sites are located within 10Km of the Installation:

- Mells Valley SAC
- Mendip woodlands SAC

The following Sites of Special Scientific Interest are located within 2Km of the Installation:

- Hobb's Quarry SSSI
- Viaduct Quarry SSSI
- Doulling Railway Cutting SSSI

The SSSIs all represent geological sites and not sensitive to nutrient nitrogen or acid deposition, they have not been assessed further.

Ecological Receptors Assessment

We have audited the Applicant's air quality risk assessment, its selection of input data and the critical loads figures used for the habitats and species within the conservation sites. We have referred to the Air Pollution Information System (APIS) website. We agree with the assessment's conclusions, that there would be no likely significant effect on the interest features of the protected sites.

Habitats assessment

The table below shows the PCs at the most impacted site.

Pollutant	ES / EAL (µg/m ³)	Back-ground (µg/m ³)	Process Contribution (PC) (µg/m ³)	PC as % of ES	Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC) (µg/m ³)	PEC as % ES
Direct Impacts ¹						
NO _x Annual	30	n/a	0.245	0.08	n/a	n/a
NO _x Daily Mean	75	n/a	0.27	0.36	n/a	n/a
SO ₂	20	n/a	0.00467	0.02	n/a	n/a
Ammonia	3	n/a	0.0009	0.094	n/a	n/a
Deposition Impacts ¹						
N Deposition (kg N/ha/yr)	15	25.5	0.0055	0.04	n/a	n/a
Acidification (Kecq/ha/yr)	4.856	1.8	0.0012	0.03	n/a	n/a

(1) Direct impact units are $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and deposition impact units are $\text{kg N}/\text{ha}/\text{yr}$ or $\text{Keq}/\text{ha}/\text{yr}$.

The long term (annual average) predicted PC of nitrogen oxides deposition, as nutrient nitrogen, is below the significance screening threshold of 1% of the nutrient-nitrogen critical load function for the ecological site.

The long term (annual average) predicted PC of nitrogen oxides deposition, as pollutants responsible for acidification, is below the significance screening threshold of 1% of the acid function critical load for the ecological site.

We have therefore concluded that that there will be no likely significant effect on the interest features of the designated European sites.

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 $150 \text{ mg}/\text{m}^3$ (as a half hourly average) ($225 \text{ mg}/\text{m}^3$ at an oxygen reference volume of 6%) 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:

- Particulate emissions of 225 mg/m³ (5 x normal)

For incineration applications we would normally expect the scope of the applicant's abnormal emissions assessment to be broader than that above, however in this case due to the small scale of the SWCP and in particular the non-hazardous nature of the waste wood being burned, we are satisfied with the stated scenario.

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.

We have reviewed this scenario under the conditions described in the paragraphs above as detailed in IED and are satisfied that under these worst-case scenario conditions the emissions under abnormal operations are unlikely to give rise to significant pollution and will not constitute a risk to human health.

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.

Human health risk assessment

The applicant did not submit a full human health risk assessment. Due to the small scale of the SWCP and in particular the non-hazardous nature of the waste wood being burned we are satisfied that this does not need to be required.

Decision considerations

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 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' and 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.

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.

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.

Operating techniques for emissions that do/not screen out as insignificant

Emissions have been screened out as either insignificant or unlikely to give rise to significant pollution, see key issues section above, and so we agree that the applicant's proposed techniques are Best Available Techniques (BAT) for the installation.

We consider that the emission limits included in the installation permit reflect the BAT for the sector.

National Air Pollution Control Programme

We have considered the National Air Pollution Control Programme as required by the National Emissions Ceilings Regulations 2018. By setting emission limit values in line with technical guidance we are minimising emissions to air. This will aid the delivery of national air quality targets. We do not consider that we need to include any additional conditions in this 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.

We have set pre-operational conditions to allow the operator time in which to implement their fire prevention plan before commencing the activities authorised.

The plan has been incorporated into the operating techniques table 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.
- Updating permit conditions during consolidation
- We have updated permit conditions to those in the current generic permit template as part of permit consolidation. The conditions will provide the same level of protection as those in the previous permits.

Pre-operational conditions

Based on the information in the application, we consider that we need to include pre-operational conditions. The pre-operational conditions will ensure that all aspects of the Fire Prevention Plan guidance are met and that the SWCP is commissioned appropriately.

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 the SWCP is commissioned appropriately and that the CEMS is suitable.

Emission limits

Emission Limit Values (ELVs) have been added for the substances for which limits are specified in our standard template applicable to Schedule 13 co-incinerators and in accordance with IED.

Monitoring

We have decided that monitoring should be added for the parameters listed in Tables S3.1, S3.1(a), S3.2, S3.3 and S3.4 of the permit, using the methods detailed and to the frequencies specified.

We made these decisions in accordance with our standard template applicable to Schedule 13 co-incinerators and in accordance with IED.

Reporting

We have added reporting detailed in Tables S4.1, S4.2 and S4.3 of the permit.

We have specified the reporting requirements in Schedule 4 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.

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.

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 variation.

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.