

Permitting Decisions - Variation

We have decided to grant the variation for Finningley Landfill Site operated by Tetron Finningley LLP.

The variation number is EPR/JB3002LB/V002.

The variation is for the addition of a hazardous landfill accepting asbestos wastes. This will be a Part A(1) activity in accordance with section 5.2 (a) of schedule 1 to the Environmental Permitting Regulations (an installation) and replaces the current closed landfill activity.

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
- 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 and the variation notice.

Key issues of the decision

The application is for a hazardous landfill and the wastes proposed to be accepted are asbestos wastes. These wastes are chemically, biologically, and physically stable so do not breakdown to generate landfill gas or leachate. As a result, the operator has reduced the basal and side engineering specification from that set out in the Landfill Directive and is not proposing an artificial sealing liner or a leachate collection layer. The applicant has assessed the risk to

groundwater based on the types of waste to be accepted and the proposed engineering. We agree that the risk of pollution of the groundwater is low.

However, the applicant is proposing to use wastes as cover for the deposited asbestos wastes that require testing to ensure that they meet the inert waste acceptance criteria (WAC). One source of waste to be used as cover is from the operator's waste treatment site which is located at the entrance to the landfill.

This waste, under EWC 19 02 06, is residual waste from the operator's treatment plant. This will be from a variety of sources and may not, therefore, have consistent properties. The landfill is designed on the principle that only inert and asbestos waste will be accepted so no drainage layer, sealing layer or leachate collection are proposed. As the site is within source protection zone 3 and there are two abstractions to the south of the site there is the potential for contamination of the groundwater should any waste be accepted at the site which has the potential to form leachate. Therefore, it is critical that the inert waste accepted for use as cover for the asbestos waste is inert and therefore, the operator has provided suitable waste acceptance procedures for ensuring only inert waste is accepted for use as cover.

We have required the operator to include additional testing of asbestos wastes to be accepted under codes 17 05 03*, 19 02 05*, 19 12 11* and 19 13 01* in their waste acceptance procedures as the properties of the waste may not be consistent for each load. The operator is required to demonstrate that the asbestos waste accepted is hazardous, that the only hazardous property is asbestos and that the waste meets the inert WAC.

No Restoration Plan has been agreed as part of this determination as the applicant withdrew that aspect of the application. Therefore, the operator will be required to agree a Restoration Plan with us before restoration of the landfill commences.

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 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:

- Food Standards Agency
- Doncaster Council Environmental Health
- Doncaster Council Planning Authority
- Doncaster Council Director of Public Health
- Public Health England
- Health and Safety Executive.

The comments and our responses are summarised in the consultation responses section.

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' and Appendix 1 of RGN 2 'Interpretation of Schedule 1'.

The regulated facility is now an installation in accordance with section 5.2 (a) of the Environmental Permitting Regulations:

Part A(1)

- (a) The disposal of waste in a landfill—
- (i) receiving more than 10 tonnes of waste in any day, or
 - (ii) with a total capacity of more than 25,000 tonnes,
- but excluding disposals in a landfill taking only inert waste.

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 plans which we consider to be satisfactory.

These show the extent of the site of the facility including the footprint of the area of waste disposal.

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 landfill sites.

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. See Key Issues section above.

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.

Noise management

We have reviewed the noise management plan in accordance with our guidance on noise assessment and control.

We consider that the noise and vibration management plan is satisfactory and we approve this plan.

We have approved the noise and vibration 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.

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.

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.

The operator is proposing to accept a range of wastes for use as cover for the asbestos waste including wastes which will require testing to ensure they meet the waste acceptance criteria (WAC) for inert waste. See Key Issues section above.

We made these decisions with respect to waste types in accordance with the Landfill Directive, the Decision and the operator's risk assessments.

Pre-operational conditions

Based on the information in the application, we consider that we need to include pre-operational conditions.

PO1 has been included to require the operator to install an additional groundwater and gas monitoring borehole and to collect background groundwater data. We have included this requirement as we consider that there are insufficient up-gradient boreholes at the site and that this additional borehole will provide information regarding the groundwater quality up-gradient of this landfill and down-gradient of the adjacent Biffa landfill site.

PO2 has been included to require the operator to derive compliance limits for groundwater in the down gradient borehole BH2001. We consider that the compliance limits set for this borehole in the permit are interim as insufficient data has been collected from which appropriate compliance limits can be derived.

Emission limits

Emission Limit Values (ELVs) have not been set for the following reasons:

- there are no point source emissions to air as no landfill gas collection or use is required; and
- only uncontaminated surface water is discharged to ground via a soakaway.

We have, however, set compliance limits for emissions to groundwater, for landfill gas in monitoring boreholes outside the waste deposit and for asbestos fibres in ambient air.

We have included these limits based on background groundwater quality, methane, and carbon dioxide monitoring and on our standard monitoring requirement for concentrations of fibres in air.

Monitoring

We have decided that monitoring should be amended or added for the following:

- emissions to land via a soakaway;
- groundwater in up-gradient and down-gradient boreholes;
- landfill gas in boreholes outside the waste and in boreholes within the waste; and
- asbestos fibres.

We have specified that the monitoring should be carried out using the methods detailed and to the frequencies specified in the tables in schedule 3 of the permit.

These monitoring requirements have been included in order to demonstrate that the pollution prevention measures are effective, that the wastes accepted are inert and that the handling and disposal of the asbestos waste does not result in the release of fibres.

We made these decisions in accordance with our landfill technical guidance and the monitoring specified in the hazardous landfill permit template.

Reporting

We have added and amended reporting in the permit for the following:

- emissions to land via a soakaway;
- groundwater in up-gradient and down-gradient boreholes;
- landfill gas in boreholes outside the waste and in boreholes within the waste; and
- asbestos fibres.

We made these decisions in accordance with the landfill technical guidance and the standard requirements in the hazardous landfill permit template.

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

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.

Financial competence

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

Financial provision

We are satisfied that the operator has made the necessary financial provision.

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.

Consultation Responses

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

Response received from: Public Health England (PHE).

Brief summary of issues raised: The main emissions of concern are dust arising from the operation and possible release of asbestos fibres. The site is remote from a significant number of receptors and our opinion is that existing regulatory requirements relating to the handling, transport and disposal of asbestos containing materials will provide adequate protection. Consequently the operation should not pose any significant risk to public health. We recommend that the Environment Agency should satisfy itself that the Particulate Matter Management Plan contains appropriate controls and that the regulations relating to handling of asbestos will be fully observed. Based on the information in the application PHE has no significant concerns.

Summary of actions taken: We have reviewed the Particulate Management Plan and the Asbestos Management Plan and the subsequent revisions to them following our requests for information via schedule 5 notices and we are satisfied that the operator has the appropriate measures in place to control and minimise emissions of dust and to prevent emissions of asbestos.

Response received from: Doncaster MBC Planning

Brief summary of issues raised: The Planning Authority has serious concerns regarding the proposals, and objects, as follows:

- It is not clear which planning permission is being complied with – the historical permission or the varied ones – so the operator should contact the Planning Authority to clarify their position.
- The site operator had previously indicated the site would be restored with inert or non-hazardous wastes with no need for cell development or lining. The inclusion of hazardous waste is a departure from the permissions and this and the lining works may need planning permission.

Summary of actions taken:

We have made the operator aware of the objections raised by the Planning Authority.

We are not required to take into account the presence or absence of suitable planning permission when we determine applications for landfill sites. The operator has to comply with both the environmental permit and the planning permission and it is their responsibility to ensure that the requirements of both the planning and permitting regimes are in place and are met.

Although the landfill is for hazardous waste, the types of waste to be accepted will not degrade so leachate and landfill gas are not required to be managed as it is unlikely that they will be generated. The basal engineering proposed by the operator is equivalent to that required for an inert landfill and we are satisfied that the amended hydrogeological risk assessment submitted following a review of the one submitted with the application demonstrates that groundwater is protected.

However, we are required to take account of the planning permission when we assess and agree the Restoration Plan in so far as that the planning permission does require the site to be restored with waste (so that we can agree that the restoration is a recovery activity) and what the agreed final contours and end use of the land are. We have sought to clarify the end use and final contours with the applicant and received an explanation on 30/07/2021 regarding their understanding of which planning permission is extant. We have consulted the planning authority on this response to determine if they agree with the applicant's response that the revisions to the planning made in 2012/2013 have been "abandoned" and that the permission from 1984 is the one that all parties are now working to.

We received a response from the planning authority on 06/10/2021 who reiterated their objection on the grounds that the 1984 planning permission was not extant as mineral extraction had taken place in accordance with a later amendment to the planning permission which also required the site to be restored using inert or non-hazardous waste.

Given the continued uncertainty regarding the relevant planning permission we are not able to agree the Restoration Plan. Therefore, the applicant has withdrawn this aspect of the application and will agree a Restoration Plan with us at a later date. Condition 2.6.2 in the permit requires the operator to agree a Restoration Plan prior to commencement of restoration of the site. Therefore, the operator will not be able to restore the site until a Restoration Plan has been agreed with us.

No responses were received from the other organisations listed in the Consultations section.

Representations from individual members of the public

We received 26 letters from individual members of the public. Many of the responses raised concerns on similar issues and these have been summarised below.

Brief summary of issues raised: Concern that this is not the right location for a hazardous landfill as it is too close to residential properties and businesses

Summary of actions taken: Decisions over land use are matters for the planning authority. The location of the installation is a relevant consideration for Environmental Permitting, but only in so far as its potential to have an adverse environmental impact on communities or sensitive environmental receptors. The environmental impact is assessed as part of the determination process and has been reported upon in the main body of this document.

Brief summary of issues raised: Concern about safety of walkers and cyclists on local roads, the route of the traffic and the increase in traffic as a result of the activity in an already congested area.

Summary of actions taken: The impact of traffic outside the site and management of traffic are relevant considerations for the planning authority, but do not form part of the Environmental Permit decision making process.

Brief summary of issues raised: Concerns were raised about pollution from the site, especially of ground, groundwater, and surrounding water courses, due to seepage of chemicals and run-off from the site.

Summary of actions taken: The types of waste that are proposed to be accepted are those containing asbestos and inert wastes for cover. All of the wastes will need to be tested prior to acceptance to confirm that they meet the waste acceptance criteria for inert wastes. This means that the wastes deposited in the site are physically, chemically, and biologically stable and do not break down to create leachate. In addition, the operator is required to engineer the base and sides of the landfill to a specific depth and permeability. Therefore, the risk to ground, groundwater, and surface water from the breakdown of wastes is low.

The applicant carried out a hydrogeological risk assessment, including modelling of pollutants, in accordance with our guidance, to demonstrate that the risk of

pollution of the groundwater is low. We have reviewed this risk assessment and agree with the applicant's conclusions.

We have included compliance limits in the permit for downgradient boreholes and have required the operator to carry out monitoring of groundwater so that the operator can demonstrate that there is no contamination of the groundwater as a result of the landfill activities.

Surface water is required to be managed during the operational phase of the site and also when the site is closed. Surface water will be collected in a series of ditches around the site which drain to a soakaway. Therefore, surface water will not be run-off the site and cause flooding of low-lying areas. We have required the operator to monitor the soakaway to demonstrate that the surface water run-off from the site is not contaminated.

Brief summary of issues raised: The site will be a health risk to local residents and the prevailing winds are towards the village and if there was an accident with the waste or a chemical spillage.

Summary of actions taken: The operator will only accept asbestos waste at the site and no chemical wastes. The operator's waste acceptance procedures state that only asbestos waste that is double wrapped and/or delivered in enclosed vehicles will be accepted. The operator will only accept loads that they have been pre-notified of.

When the waste will be deposited in the void, drop heights between the vehicle and the ground will be minimised so that the asbestos waste will not be broken up and fibres released and the waste will be covered immediately with inert waste after deposit. We have specified monitoring of asbestos fibres in table S3.4 of the permit.

We published a report in March 2013, "Improving Business Performance – Review of Asbestos Monitoring and Compliance Approach" setting out the results of a programme of monitoring at operational landfill sites to help inform our monitoring requirements and compliance limits for asbestos fibres.

The results showed that there was no increase in measured fibres above background at the down-wind monitoring point compared to the up-wind (background) monitoring point beyond 20m of the tipping face where the operators had suitable measures in place to prevent release of fibres that were in accordance with our guidance and HSE best practice for the management of asbestos waste.

The applicant has provided an Asbestos Management Plan and a Particulate Management Plan that describe the measures to be taken to prevent and control emissions.

The transport of asbestos and any resulting accidents before the waste is accepted at the site is outside our remit and is not considered as part of our determination. It is the responsibility of the waste producer to ensure that the waste is contained and transported so as to comply with the relevant legislation regarding the transport of dangerous goods

We are satisfied that the operator will have all relevant measures in place to prevent the release of asbestos fibres. These measures are in accordance with our guidance and HSE best practice for handling of asbestos waste.

Brief summary of issues raised: Concern about pollution of the air from emissions and odour.

Summary of actions taken: There are no point source emissions to air from the activities. The potential for aerial emissions arises from the deposit of the asbestos waste and the movement of vehicles around the site.

As discussed in the response to the previous comment, we are satisfied that the operator will have all relevant measures in place to prevent the release of fibres.

Emissions of dust can arise as a result of the movement of vehicles around the site travelling on unmade roads. The operator has submitted a Particulate Emissions Management Plan detailing the measures to be taken to prevent and minimise emissions of particulates. We are satisfied that these measures are in accordance with our guidance and best practice, that the operator will have all relevant measures in place to prevent and minimise particulate emissions.

The waste to be accepted is asbestos containing wastes and inert wastes for cover. These wastes are chemically, biologically, and physically stable so are not odorous and will not breakdown to produce landfill gas or leachate which are usually the source of odours at landfill sites accepting biodegradable wastes.

Brief summary of issues raised: Query regarding what precautions will be taken on site to cover or seal the waste. Concern that asbestos requires mandatory encapsulation and how sealing of waste is ensured before it is deposited in the site.

Summary of actions taken: Only pre-notified loads of asbestos waste will be accepted and the operator's waste acceptance procedures require that only double wrapped waste or waste in sealed containers will be accepted.

The operator is proposing to minimise drop heights when asbestos waste is unloaded at the waste face and that the asbestos waste will be covered immediately to prevent fibres being released. The final layer of waste will be inert waste before a 2m capping or separation layer is installed to a permeability of

$1 \times 10^{-9} \text{m}^3$. A restoration layer with a thickness of 0.6m will be laid above the capping layer. Therefore there will be a separation layer of greater than 2.6m above the final layer of asbestos waste which we consider provides adequate separation to prevent the release of asbestos fibres.

We are satisfied that the operator will have all relevant measures in place to prevent the release of asbestos fibres. These measures are in accordance with our guidance and HSE best practice for handling of asbestos waste.

Brief summary of issues raised: Query regarding what studies have been carried out at similar sites.

Summary of actions taken: We regulate many landfill sites across England some of which accept asbestos waste. We require that operators of these sites comply with the conditions of their permits and that they operate in accordance with our guidance and best practice.

We published a report in March 2013, “Improving Business Performance – Review of Asbestos Monitoring and Compliance Approach” setting out the results of a programme of monitoring at operational landfill sites to help inform our monitoring requirements and compliance limits for asbestos fibres.

The results showed that there was no increase in measured fibres above background at the down-wind monitoring point compared to the up-wind (background) monitoring point beyond 20m of the tipping face where the operators had suitable measures in place to prevent release of fibres that were in accordance with our guidance and HSE best practice for the management of asbestos waste.

Brief summary of issues raised: Query about why public was not consulted.

Summary of actions taken: We carried out consultation on the application in accordance with the Environmental Permitting Regulations and our statutory Public Participation Statement. We advertised the application by a notice placed on our website which included copies of all the documents submitted with the application. The consultation was available between 21/09/2020 and 19/10/2020.

Brief summary of issues raised: Query regarding how asbestos fires will be contained.

Summary of actions taken: The operator’s risk assessment and techniques for fire prevention and control (included in the Operational Working Plan) state that the risk of fires is low and that there is a low potential for fires at the site. The site

is manned during the day and is fenced and locked at night to prevent access out of hours. The operator has provided details of the actions to be taken in the event of a fire.

We agree with the operator's assessment of fire risk and are satisfied that appropriate measures to prevent and control fires will be in place.

Brief summary of issues raised: Concern about impact of the site on the airport and aircraft engines.

Summary of actions taken: The site is accepting asbestos waste and inert waste for cover only. Asbestos waste is chemically, physically, and biologically inert so will not be attractive to birds. Therefore, there is no increase in risk to the airport from bird strikes as a result of this activity.

Brief summary of issues raised: The risk assessment refers to asbestos risk being high.

Summary of actions taken: In parts of the risk assessment the probability of exposure and the consequence of the exposure are stated to be high risk. However, when the management measures are taken into account, the residual risk is low.

We are satisfied that the operator will have all relevant measures in place to prevent the release of asbestos fibres. These measures are in accordance with our guidance and HSE best practice for handling of asbestos waste.

Brief summary of issues raised: Concerns raised regarding compliance due to experience with illegally deposited waste at another site and that the proposals will disturb previously deposited waste and cause pollution.

Summary of actions taken: It is unclear what illegally deposited waste is being referred to as only limited details were provided. For a permitted site, the operator has to comply with the conditions of the permit and we carry out checks to ensure that the conditions are being complied with. This includes visits to the site as well as assessment of information, such as monitoring data, which is required to be submitted to us.

If a site inspection reveals that the operator is not complying with the permit conditions then a range of options are available: advice and guidance; specified actions with deadlines detailed in the site inspection reports; warning letters; enforcement notices; suspension of the permit; prosecution; and revocation of the Environmental Permit.

This permit application relates to an area with no previous waste deposits.

Brief summary of issues raised: Request to re-acquaint ourselves with the Corporate Social Responsibility Statement.

Summary of actions taken: This is not relevant to our determination as it refers to the statement of a third party that is not the permit holder or the regulator.

Brief summary of issues raised: Concerns raised about pollution from glass deposited on the site leaking into the groundwater.

Summary of actions taken: It isn't clear what is being referred to as only limited information has been submitted. There is no glass or other waste deposited at this site subject to the variation application.

Brief summary of issues raised: Concerns that the operation will have irreversible impact on habitats and will destroy them.

Summary of actions taken: The site is within the relevant screening distances of protected habitats and two local wildlife sites. There are no point source emissions from the site and the operator has provided management plans for fugitive emissions of dust and asbestos waste. As the waste is chemically, physically, and biologically inert no gas or leachate will be produced.

We are satisfied that the operator will have measures in place to prevent and control fugitive emissions from the site and, therefore, we consider that the site is unlikely to impact on the protected habitats or wildlife sites.

Brief summary of issues raised: Concerns about the impact on the local economy as visitors won't come to spot planes.

Summary of actions taken: The effect on the local economy is outside our remit and is a matter for the local planning authority. It is not a relevant consideration in the determination of the application. However, given there will be no significant pollution of the environment or harm to human health there is no reason why the local economy should be affected.

Brief summary of issues raised: Concern that the activity will impede a long-established right of way.

Summary of actions taken: No detail regarding the right of way has been provided so we are unable to comment. There is a footpath on the eastern side of the site which will not be affected by the proposal. Any concerns regarding rights of way should be raised with the local authority. We have not received any comments from the local authority in this regard.

Brief summary of issues raised: Concern raised about how the operator will compensate local people for health issues related to asbestos.

Summary of actions taken: The claiming of compensation for being affected by asbestos is an issue of civil liability and is outside the scope of Environmental Permitting Regulations 2016 (as amended).

Brief summary of issues raised: A query was raised regarding the type of asbestos to be disposed of.

Summary of actions taken: The types of waste proposed to be accepted at the site for disposal are set out in the permit in table S2.1. The operator is only permitted to accept those wastes.

We are satisfied that the wastes are suitable for acceptance and that the operator will have appropriate controls in place to manage these wastes.