

Determination of an Application for an Environmental Permit under the Environmental Permitting (England & Wales) Regulations 2016

Consultation on our decision document recording our decision-making process

The Permit Number is: EPR/BP3124SC/A001
The Applicant / Operator is: BIOMASS UK NO.4 LIMITED
The Installation is located at: Unit 21-29, Belliver way,
 Roborough, Plymouth.
 PL6 7BW

What this document is about

This is a decision document, which accompanies a permit.

It explains how we have considered the Applicant's Application, and why we have included the specific conditions in the permit we are issuing to the Applicant. It is our record of our decision-making process, to show how we have taken into account all relevant factors in reaching our position. Unless the document explains otherwise, we have accepted the Applicant's proposals.

We try to explain our decision as accurately, comprehensively and plainly as possible. Achieving all three objectives is not always easy, and we would welcome any feedback as to how we might improve our decision documents in future. A lot of technical terms and acronyms are inevitable in a document of this nature: we provide a glossary of acronyms near the front of the document, for ease of reference.

Preliminary information and use of terms

We gave the application the reference number EPR/BP3124SC/A001. We refer to the application as "the **Application**" in this document in order to be consistent.

The number we have given to the permit is EPR/BP3124SC. We refer to the permit as "the **Permit**" in this document.

The Application was duly made on 24/11/2023.

The applicant is BIOMASS UK NO.4 LIMITED. We refer to BIOMASS UK NO.4 LIMITED as "the **Applicant**" in this document. Where we are talking about what would happen after the Permit is granted, we call BIOMASS UK NO.4 LIMITED "the **Operator**".

BIOMASS UK NO.4 LIMITED proposed facility is located at Plymouth EfW Facility, Unit 21-29, Belliver way, Roborough, Plymouth, PL6 7BW. We refer to this as "the **Installation**" in this document.

How this document is structured

Contents

Glossary of acronyms used in this document	3
Links to guidance documents	6
UKHSA: Municipal waste incinerators emissions: impact on health	6
1 Our decision	7
2 How we reached our decision	7
3 The legal framework	8
4 The Installation	9
4.1 Description of the Installation and related issues	9
4.2 The site and its protection	12
4.3 Operation of the Installation – general issues	14
5 Minimising the Installation’s environmental impact	22
5.1 Assessment Methodology	23
5.2 Assessment of Impact on Air Quality	25
5.3 Human health risk assessment	36
5.4 Impact on protected conservation areas (SPAs, SACs, Ramsar sites and SSSIs and local nature sites)	45
5.5 Impact of abnormal operations	49
6 Application of Best Available Techniques	51
6.1 Scope of Consideration	51
6.2 BAT and emissions control	58
6.3 BAT and global warming potential	69
6.4 BAT and POPs	70
6.5 Other Emissions to the Environment	73
6.6 Setting ELVs and other Permit conditions	75
6.7 Monitoring	76
6.8 Reporting	78
7 Other legal requirements	79
7.1 The EPR 2016 and related Directives	79
7.2 National primary legislation	81
7.3 National secondary legislation	86
7.4 Other relevant legal requirements	88
Annexes	89
Annex 1A: Application of chapter IV of the Industrial Emissions Directive	89
Annex 1B: Compliance with Bat Conclusions	94
Annex 2: Pre-Operational Conditions	98
Annex 3: Improvement Conditions	101
Annex 4: Consultation Responses	105

Glossary of acronyms used in this document

(Please note that this glossary is standard for our decision documents and therefore not all these acronyms are necessarily used in this document.)

AAD	Ambient Air Directive (2008/50/EC)
APC	Air Pollution Control
AQS	Air Quality Strategy
BAT	Best Available Technique(s)
BAT-AEL	BAT Associated Emission Level
BREF	Best Available Techniques (BAT) Reference Documents for Waste Incineration
BAT C	BAT conclusions
CEM	Continuous emissions monitor
CFD	Computerised fluid dynamics
CHP	Combined heat and power
COMEAP	Committee on the Medical Effects of Air Pollutants
CROW	Countryside and rights of way Act 2000
CV	Calorific value
DAA	Directly associated activity – Additional activities necessary to be carried out to allow the principal activity to be carried out
DD	Decision document
EAL	Environmental assessment level
EIAD	Environmental Impact Assessment Directive (85/337/EEC)
ELV	Emission limit value
EMAS	EU Eco Management and Audit Scheme
EMS	Environmental Management System
EPR	Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 (SI 2016 No. 1154) as amended
EQS	Environmental Quality Standard
ES	Environmental standard
EWC	European waste catalogue
FGC	Flue gas cleaning
FPP	Fire prevention plan
FSA	Food Standards Agency
GWP	Global Warming Potential
HHRAP	Human Health Risk Assessment Protocol
HPA	Health Protection Agency (now UKHSA – UK Health Security Agency)
HW	Hazardous waste
HWI	Hazardous waste incinerator
IBA	Incinerator Bottom Ash
IED	Industrial Emissions Directive (2010/75/EU)

I-TEF	Toxic Equivalent Factors set out in Annex VI Part 2 of IED
I-TEQ	Toxic Equivalent Quotient calculated using I-TEF
LCV	Lower calorific value – also termed net calorific value
LfD	Landfill Directive (1999/31/EC)
LADPH	Local Authority Director(s) of Public Health
LOI	Loss on Ignition
MBT	Mechanical biological treatment
MSW	Municipal Solid Waste
MWI	Municipal waste incinerator
NOx	Oxides of nitrogen (NO plus NO ₂ expressed as NO ₂)
OTNOC	Other than normal operating conditions
PAH	Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons
PC	Process Contribution
PCB	Polychlorinated biphenyls
PEC	Predicted Environmental Concentration
PHE	Public Health England (now UKHSA – UK Health Security Agency)
POP(s)	Persistent organic pollutant(s)
PPS	Public participation statement
PR	Public register
PXDD	Poly-halogenated di-benzo-p-dioxins
PXB	Poly-halogenated biphenyls
PXDF	Poly-halogenated di-benzo furans
RDF	Refuse derived fuel
RGN	Regulatory Guidance Note
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SCR	Selective catalytic reduction
SNCR	Selective non-catalytic reduction
SPA(s)	Special Protection Area(s)
SS	Sewage sludge
SSSI(s)	Site(s) of Special Scientific Interest
SWMA	Specified waste management activity
TDI	Tolerable daily intake
TEF	Toxic Equivalent Factors
TGN	Technical guidance note
TOC	Total Organic Carbon
UHV	Upper heating value –also termed gross calorific value

UN_ECE	United Nations Environmental Commission for Europe
US EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
WFD	Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC)
WHO	World Health Organisation
WID	Waste Incineration Directive (2000/76/EC) – now superseded by IED

Links to guidance documents

The table below provides links to the key guidance documents referred to in this document. The links were correct at the time of producing this document.

Name of guidance document	Link
RGN 6: Determinations involving sites of high public interest	RGN 6
CHP Ready Guidance for Combustion and Energy from Waste Power Plants	CHP ready
Risk assessments for your environmental permit	Risk assessments
Guidance to Applicants on Impact Assessment for Group 3 Metals Stack Releases – version 4".	Metals guide
The Incineration of Waste (EPR 5.01)	EPR 5.01
Waste incineration BREF and BAT conclusions	BREF and BAT C
UKHSA: Municipal waste incinerators emissions: impact on health	UKHSA reports

1 Our decision

We have decided to grant the Permit to the Applicant. This will allow it to operate the Installation, subject to the conditions in the Permit.

We consider that, in reaching that decision, we have taken into account all relevant considerations and legal requirements and that the permit will ensure that a high level of protection is provided for the environment and human health.

This Application is to operate an installation which is subject principally to the Industrial Emissions Directive (IED).

The Permit contains many conditions taken from our standard Environmental Permit template including the relevant Annexes. We developed these conditions in consultation with industry, having regard to the legal requirements of the Environmental Permitting Regulations (EPR) and other relevant legislation. This document does not therefore include an explanation for these standard conditions. Where they are included in the permit, we have considered the Application and accepted that the details provided are sufficient and satisfactory to make use of the standard condition acceptable and appropriate. This document does, however, provide an explanation of our use of "tailor-made" or installation-specific conditions, or where our Permit template provides two or more options, an explanation of the reason(s) for choosing the option that has been specified.

2 How we reached our decision

2.1 Receipt of Application

The Application was duly made on 24/11/2023. This means we considered it was in the correct form and contained sufficient information for us to begin our determination but not that it necessarily contained all the information we would need to complete that determination: see section 2.3 below.

The Applicant made no claim for commercial confidentiality. We have not received any information in relation to the Application that appears to be confidential in relation to any party.

2.2 Consultation on the Application

We carried out consultation on the Application in accordance with the EPR, our statutory Public Participation Statement (PPS) and our own internal guidance RGN 6 for Determinations involving Sites of High Public Interest. RGN 6 was withdrawn as external guidance, but it is still relevant as Environment Agency internal guidance.

We consider that this process satisfies, and frequently goes beyond the requirements of the Aarhus Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, which are directly incorporated into the IED, which applies to the Installation and the Application. We have also taken into account our obligations under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (particularly Section 23). This requires us, where we consider it appropriate, to take such steps as we consider appropriate to secure the involvement of representatives of interested persons in the exercise of our functions, by providing them with information, consulting them or involving them in any other way. In this case, we consider that our consultation already satisfies the requirements of the 2009 Act.

We advertised the Application by a notice placed on our website, which contained all the information required by the IED, including telling people where and when they could see a copy of the Application. We also placed an advertisement in the Plymouth Herald that contained the same information.

We made a copy of the Application and all other documents relevant to our determination available to view on our Public Register. Anyone wishing to see these documents could do so and arrange for copies to be made.

We sent copies of the Application to the following bodies, which includes those with whom we have "Working Together Agreements":

- Local Authority Environmental Protection Department
- Local Authority Planning Department
- Food Standards Agency
- Health and Safety Executive
- Director of Public Health and UK Health Security Agency (Previously Public Health England)
- National Grid
- Fire & Rescue Service
- Sewerage Undertaker

These are bodies whose expertise, democratic accountability and/or local knowledge make it appropriate for us to seek their views directly. Note under our Working Together Agreement with Natural England, we only inform Natural England of the results of our assessment of the impact of the installation on designated Habitats sites.

Further details along with a summary of consultation comments and our response to the representations we received can be found in Annex 4. We have taken all relevant representations into consideration in reaching our determination.

2.3 Requests for Further Information

Although we were able to consider the Application duly made, we did in fact need more information in order to determine it, and issued a schedule 5 information notice on 19/06/2024 and 7 requests for information dated, 01/12/2023, 06/12/2023, 06/02/2024, 25/07/2024, 09/08/2024, 10/09/2024 and 24/09/2024 . A copy of each information notice was placed on our public register.

3 The legal framework

The Permit will be granted, under Regulation 13 of the EPR. The Environmental Permitting regime is a legal vehicle which delivers most of the relevant legal requirements for activities falling within its scope. In particular, the regulated facility is:

- an *installation* and a *waste incineration plant* as described by the IED;
- an *operation* covered by the WFD, and
- subject to aspects of other relevant legislation which also have to be addressed.

We address some of the major legal requirements directly where relevant in the body of this document. Other requirements are covered in section 7 towards the end of this document.

We consider that, in granting the Permit, it will ensure that the operation of the Installation complies with all relevant legal requirements and that a high level of protection will be delivered for the environment and human health.

We explain how we have addressed specific statutory requirements more fully in the rest of this document.

4 The Installation

4.1 Description of the Installation and related issues

4.1.1 The permitted activities

The Installation is subject to the EPR because it carries out an activity listed in Part 1 of Schedule 1 to the EPR:

- Section 5.1 Part A(1)(b) – incineration of non-hazardous waste in a waste incineration plant or waste co-incineration plant with a capacity of 3 tonnes or more per hour.

The IED definition of “waste incineration plants” and “waste co-incineration plants” says that it includes:

“all incineration lines or co-incineration lines, waste reception, storage, on-site pre-treatment facilities, waste, fuel and air supply systems, boilers, facilities for the treatment of waste gases, on-site facilities for treatment or storage of residues and waste water, stacks, devices for controlling incineration or co-incineration operations, recording and monitoring incineration or co-incineration conditions.”

Many activities which would normally be categorised as “directly associated activities” (DAA) for EPR purposes, such as air pollution control plant, and the ash storage bunker, are therefore included in the listed activity description.

An installation may also comprise “directly associated activities”, which at this Installation includes the generation of electricity using an Organic Rankine Cycle (ORC) turbine and a back up electricity generator for emergencies. These activities comprise one installation, because the incineration plant and the steam turbine are successive steps in an integrated activity.

Together, these listed activities and directly associated activities comprise the Installation.

4.1.2 The Site

The Installation is located at Units 21-29, Belliver Way, Roborough, Plymouth, Devon, PL6 7BW (National Grid Reference: SX 49890 62378).

The site is within an industrial estate with woodland to the north west.

The closest residential receptors are located 185m to the southeast at Lady Fern road, Belliver.

The following ecological receptors are located within the relevant distances to the site:

South Dartmoor Woods Special Area of Conservation (SAC) 1 distance 3,716m

South Dartmoor Woods SAC 2 distance 3,612m

South Dartmoor Woods SAC 3 distance 4,136m

Plymouth Sound and Estuaries SAC 1 distance 3,757m

Plymouth Sound and Estuaries SAC 2 distance 2,958m
Tamar estuaries complex Special Protection Area (SPA) 1 distance 2,562m
Tamar estuaries complex SPA 2 distance 3,589m
Dartmoor SAC 1 distance 7,733m
Dartmoor SAC 2 distance 10,156m

The Applicant submitted a plan which we consider is satisfactory, showing the site of the Installation and its extent. A plan is included in Schedule 7 to the Permit, and the Operator is required to carry on the permitted activities within the site boundary.

Further information on the site is addressed below at 4.3.

4.1.3 What the Installation does

The Applicant has described the facility as Energy from Waste. Our view is that for the purposes of IED (in particular Chapter IV) and EPR, the installation is a waste incineration plant because:

Notwithstanding the fact that energy will be recovered from the process; the process is never the less 'incineration' because it is considered that its main purpose is the thermal treatment of waste.

The installation is for the incineration of refuse derived fuels (RDF) solid recovered fuels (SRF) as well as mixed (PAS111:2012-Grade A-C) non-hazardous waste wood feedstocks on a single line incineration process, including a single thermal oil boiler serving a single turbine. Generation of electricity is dependent on the use of an Organic Rankine Cycle (ORC). The ORC is a closed thermodynamic cycle which converts heat energy to mechanical energy, to electrical energy. The ORC works on the same principle as a condensing steam turbine, but instead of using steam, it uses vapourised thermal oil. The facility has been designed to incinerate a maximum of 60,000 tonnes of waste annually. However, the site intends to incinerate 50,000 tonnes per annum, at a design capacity of 6.33 tonnes per hour, assuming 7,900 hours availability and waste CV of 10.11 MJ/kg. This will produce 4.64 MWe of electricity. With a parasitic load of 0.75 MWe, there will be 3.9 MWe of electricity available for export.

Waste fuel feedstocks will be delivered by road, directly to the internal reception area in either baled or loose form. Covered HGV's will unload in the tipping area and a visual inspection will take place. It is then transferred through the use of a mechanical shovel to the walking floor storage bunkers. RDF is typically processed and used within 4 days of arrival onsite.

The site will have a single line moving grate combustion system with a fuel feed system to deliver the waste into the incoming metering bins. The waste is then introduced to the grate and combusted for the purposes of heating a thermal fluid through a recovery boiler, which is subsequently passed to a ORC turbine for the production of renewable electricity. The gross electrical output of the plant is up to 4.7MWe.

The thermal oil media is then cooled and condensed before returning to the system. Currently, the design includes air cooled condensers (ACC), but if significant heat offtake is required then these will be replaced by V air blast coolers/radiators using water in a closed system.

Detailed Computational-Fluid-Dynamic modelling (CFD) of the combustion process will be carried out to demonstrate complete combustion of the fuels under varying conditions and also to guarantee the 2 seconds minimum combustion time above 850°C as compliance with IED.

Flue gas cleaning and pollution control consists of Selective Non-Catalytic Reduction (SNCR) through ammonia hydroxide injection within the combustion chambers, followed by bag filtration with upstream sodium bicarbonate injection for acid gas neutralisation and activated carbon powder injection for absorption and removal of heavy metals, dioxins, VOCs and other harmful substances.

- Simultaneously, the Facility is designed with capability to export up to 10 MWth of heat to local consumers. The maximum heat capacity will be subject to the demands of the heat consumers and confirmed during the detailed design stage.

Two main waste streams are produced as a result of the incineration process:

i. Incinerator Bottom Ash (IBA)

IBA is the inert burnt-out residue from the combustion process. IBA will be quenched when it falls from the end of the moving grate, reducing its mobility and limiting fugitive particulate emissions. Following quenching, the IBA will be fed into an enclosed conveyor for transfer to enclosed RoRo skips, which will store the IBA outside prior to transfer off site. IBA is normally a non-hazardous waste that can be recycled. Where possible, the operator intends to transfer IBA from the facility to an off-site processing facility for recycling.

ii. Air Pollution Control Residues (APCr)

APCr comprises fine particles of ash and residue from the flue gas treatment process. APCr is transferred via a fully enclosed conveyor to fully enclosed RoRo skips, to prevent fugitive emissions. APCr is classified as hazardous and requires specialist landfill disposal or treatment. If a suitable recovery option cannot be identified for the APCr, it will be sent to a suitably licenced waste storage facility or landfill for disposal as a hazardous waste.

The key features of the Installation can be summarised in the table below.

Waste throughput, Tonnes/line	60,000/annum	6.33/hour
Waste processed	Wood, RDF, SRF	
Number of lines	1	
Furnace technology	Grate	
Auxiliary Fuel	Gas Oil	
Acid gas abatement	Dry	Sodium bicarbonate
NOx abatement	SNCR	Urea
Reagent consumption	Auxiliary Fuel 32,500 litres/annum Urea : 177 tonnes te/annum Sodium Bicarbonate : 808 tonnes te/annum Activated carbon: 25 tonnes te/annum	
Flue gas recirculation	Yes	
Dioxin abatement	Activated carbon	
Stack	Grid Reference SX 49895 62350	
	Height, 35 m	Diameter, 1 m
Flue gas	Flow, 12.44 Nm ³ /s	Velocity, 15.84m/s
	Temperature 185°C	
Electricity generated	4.64MWe	36,350MWh
Electricity exported	3.9MWe	30,750MWh
Waste heat use	None at present but options to export being explored	

4.1.4 Key Issues in the Determination

The key issues arising during determination of the Application were Emissions to air and their impact and we therefore describe how we determined these issues in greater detail in the body of this document.

4.2 **The site and its protection**

4.2.1 Site setting, layout and history

The application site is located to the north of the city of Plymouth within Belliver Business Park. The surrounding area is a mix of residential to the south and east (Roborough) and woodland to the north and west with farmland beyond. The Business Park houses a number of industrial neighbours including Toshiba Carrier (UK), Burts Potato Chips, Devon and Cornwall Food Action and BD Vacutainer Systems.

The site is immediately bound to the south by Belliver Way, to the east and west by industrial units and to the north by Haxter Close with steeply sloping topography down into the wooded valley of Tamerton Foliot Stream which is located approximately 110m distant.

The site is roughly rectangular in shape and covers an area of approximately 1 hectare. The site is presently occupied by an industrial half clad half brick unit which houses a defunct biomass plant and associated hardstanding yard areas. The nearest residential areas to the site are on Lady Fern Road in Roborough which lies approximately 100m southeast of the site.

The British Geographical survey (BGS) records the underlying bedrock of the site as Upper Devonian Slate. This is described in the BGS lexicon as 'Slate with subsidiary hornfelsed slate and trace mudstone.' Approximately 500m to the southeast of the site is an intrusive dyke comprised of Felsite of Permian age.

The Environment Agency classifies the bedrock at the site as a Secondary A aquifer. This suggests that the bedrock geology contains permeable layers capable of supporting water supplies at a local rather than strategic scale, and in some cases forming an important source of base flow to rivers. The site is not located within a Source Protection Zone (SPZ).

The groundwater vulnerability at the site is identified as high via well connected fractures. There are no active groundwater abstraction licenses within 2 km of the site.

The site is considered to be situated in an area of low sensitivity with respect to groundwater resources as it is situated upon a secondary Aquifer and there are no active groundwater abstractions within 2km.

The nearest surface water features are located to the northwest and southeast, both streams within steeply wooded valleys. The closest is Tamerton Foliot Stream, located approximately 112m northwest of the site, the other is located approximately 200m southeast running through Widewell Wood.

Both streams flow towards the southwest, meeting in confluence approximately 1km from the site and ultimately flow into the River Tamar located approximately 5.3km to the west. Devonport Leat, a manmade watercourse for water transfer, is also located approximately 210m to the east of site.

There is one identified historical surface water abstraction recorded within 2 km of the site, 1745m west of the site and was from Great Trehills Farm Pond for the purposes of spray

irrigation. There are no identified active or potable surface water abstractions within 2 km of the site.

The Environment Agency's flood risk map indicates that the site lies within Flood Zone 1, at low risk of flooding from rivers and the sea. The maximum flood risk (Zone 1) for this area is land assessed as having a chance of flooding of less than 1 in 1000 (<0.1%) chance of flooding each year. There have been no historical recorded flood events recorded within 250m. In addition, the site is in a negligible risk of groundwater flooding.

The site is considered to be in area of low to moderate sensitivity in regard to surface water due to proximity of Tamerton Foliot Stream downslope of the site.

The history of the site appears to be undeveloped agricultural land straddling a field boundary adjacent to Belliver lane from 1865 to 1982 when an industrial unit was constructed onsite with a number of units marked as 'factory.' From 1999 to 2006 there were no onsite buildings but hardstanding was present. From 2010 an industrial unit was present in the western half of the site with an additional building in the southeast corner being added in 2016. A visual inspection at the time of application reveals the site comprises of a disused energy from waste facility, with a preexisting building and hardstanding across the site. Drainage is installed across the site.

4.2.2 Proposed site design: potentially polluting substances and prevention measures

Under Article 22(2) of the IED the Applicant is required to provide a baseline report containing at least the information set out in paragraphs (a) and (b) of the Article before starting operation.

The Applicant has submitted a site condition report which includes a report on the baseline conditions as required by Article 22. We have reviewed that report and consider that it adequately describes the condition of the soil and groundwater prior to the start of operations.

The baseline report is an important reference document in the assessment of contamination that might arise during the operational lifetime of the installation and at cessation of activities at the installation.

4.2.3 Closure and decommissioning

Having considered the information submitted in the Application, we are satisfied that the appropriate measures will be in place for the closure and decommissioning of the Installation, as referred to in the response to Schedule 5 dated 11th July 2024 of the Application. Pre-operational condition PO1 requires the Operator to have an Environmental Management System in place before the Installation is operational, and this will include a site closure plan.

At the definitive cessation of activities, the Operator has to satisfy us that the necessary measures have been taken so that the site ceases to pose a risk to soil or groundwater, taking into accounts both the baseline conditions and the site's current or approved future use. To do this, the Operator will apply to us for surrender of the permit, which we will not grant unless and until we are satisfied that these requirements have been met.

4.3 Operation of the Installation – general issues

4.3.1 Administrative issues

The Applicant is the sole Operator of the Installation.

We are satisfied that the Applicant is the person who will have control over the operation of the Installation after the granting of the Permit; and that the Applicant will be able to operate the Installation so as to comply with the conditions included in the Permit.

4.3.2 Management

The Applicant has stated in the Application that they will implement an Environmental Management System (EMS) that will be certified under ISO14001. A pre-operational condition (PO1) is included requiring the Operator to provide a summary of the EMS prior to commissioning of the plant and to make available for inspection all EMS documentation. The Environment Agency recognises that certification of the EMS cannot take place until the Installation is operational. An improvement condition (IC1) is included requiring the Operator to report progress towards gaining accreditation of its EMS.

We are satisfied that appropriate management systems and management structures will be in place for this Installation, and that sufficient resources are available to the Operator to ensure compliance with all the Permit conditions.

4.3.3 Site security

Having considered the information submitted in the Application, we are satisfied that appropriate infrastructure and procedures will be in place to ensure that the site remains secure. The site is covered by 24 hour security.

4.3.4 Accident management

The Applicant has not submitted an Accident Management Plan. However, having considered other information submitted in the Application, we are satisfied that appropriate measures will be in place to ensure that accidents that may cause pollution are prevented but that, if they should occur, their consequences are minimised. An Accident Management Plan will form part of the Environmental Management System and must be in place prior to commissioning as required by a pre-operational condition (PO1).

The Applicant submitted a Fire Prevention Plan. We are satisfied that the plan will minimise the risk of a fire and limit the impact of a fire in the event that one occurred. Options for firewater containment have been proposed and are acceptable.

4.3.5 Off-site conditions

We do not consider that any off-site conditions are necessary.

4.3.6 Operating techniques

We have specified that the Applicant must operate the Installation in accordance with the following documents contained in the Application:

Description	Parts Included
The Application	Section 3 Part 3 – technical standards EPR permit application support document SOL_21_P024_COG Annex B Sol_21_Po24_COG_EMS Summary Annex D SOL_21__po24_COG_Fire Prevention Plan i1 Annex E Environmental Risk assessment Annex I Noise Impact assessment
Response to Schedule 5 Notice dated 19/06/24	Revised Odour Management Plan (OMP) Dust Emission Management Plan (DEMP) Updated Form Part B3 Question 2 and Question 3c Updated Form Part B6 questions 1-10 Part B2 Question 5a Response to Questions 1-8 dated 11 th July 2024
Additional information	Shutter doors will remain open for delivery/unloading Only
Additional information	Updated site Plan
Additional information	Auxiliary burners will only operate on start up and shut down, Carbon filters to be used when plant not operational. Emergency release valve only to be deployed in an emergency scenario
Additional information	Revised Dust Emission Management Plan (DEMP) V2
Additional information	Clarification that reagent dosage will be separate with continuous dosage

The details set out above describe the techniques that will be used for the operation of the Installation that have been assessed by us as BAT; they form part of the Permit through Permit condition 2.3.1 and Table S1.2 in the Permit Schedules

We have also specified the following limits and controls on the use of raw materials and fuels:

Raw Material or Fuel	Specifications	Justification
Gas Oil	< 0.1% sulphur content	As required by Sulphur Content of Liquid Fuels Regulations.

Article 45(1) of the IED requires that the Permit must include a list of all types of waste which may be treated using at least the types of waste set out in the European Waste List established by Decision 2005/532/EC, EC, if possible, and containing information on the quantity of each type of waste, where appropriate. The Application contains a list of those wastes coded by the European Waste Catalogue (EWC) number, which the Applicant will accept in the waste streams entering the plant and which the plant is capable of burning in an environmentally acceptable way. We have specified the permitted waste types, descriptions and where appropriate quantities which can be accepted at the installation in Table S2.2.

We are satisfied that the Applicant can accept the wastes contained in Table S2.2 of the Permit because: -

- (i) these wastes are categorised as municipal waste in the European Waste Catalogue or are non-hazardous wastes similar in character to municipal waste;
- (ii) the wastes are all categorised as non-hazardous in the European Waste Catalogue and are capable of being safely burnt at the Installation.
- (iii) these wastes are likely to be within the design calorific value (CV) range for the plant;
- (iv) these wastes are unlikely to contain harmful components that cannot be safely processed at the Installation.

We have limited the capacity of the Installation to 60,000 tonnes per annum. This is based on the installation operating 7,900 hours per year at a nominal capacity of 6.33 tonnes per hour

The Installation will be designed, constructed and operated using BAT for the incineration of the permitted wastes. We are satisfied that the operating and abatement techniques are BAT for incinerating these types of waste. Our assessment of BAT is set out later in this document.

4.3.7 Energy efficiency

(i) Consideration of energy efficiency

We have considered the issue of energy efficiency in the following ways:

1. The use of energy within, and generated by, the Installation which are normal aspects of all EPR permit determinations. This issue is dealt with in this section.
2. The extent to which the Installation meets the requirements of Article 50(5) of the IED, which requires "*the heat generated during the incineration and co-incineration process is recovered as far as practicable through the generation of heat, steam or power*". This issue is covered in this section.
3. The combustion efficiency and energy utilisation of different design options for the Installation are relevant considerations in the determination of BAT for the Installation, including the Global Warming Potential of the different options. This aspect is covered in the BAT assessment in section 6 of this Decision Document.

4. The extent to which the Installation meets the requirement of Article 14(5) of the Energy Efficiency Directive which requires new thermal electricity generation installations with a total thermal input exceeding 20 MW to carry out a cost-benefit assessment to "*assess the cost and benefits of providing for the operation of the installation as a high-efficiency cogeneration installation*".

Cogeneration means the simultaneous generation in one process of thermal energy and electrical or mechanical energy and is also known as combined heat and power (CHP)

High-efficiency co-generation is cogeneration which achieves at least 10% savings in primary energy usage compared to the separate generation of heat and power – see Annex II of the Energy Efficiency Directive for detail on how to calculate this. This is not relevant to this installation as the total thermal input is 17.75 MW.

(ii) Use of energy within the Installation

Having considered the information submitted in the Application, we are satisfied that appropriate measures will be in place to ensure that energy is used efficiently within the Installation.

The Application details a number of measures that will be implemented at the Installation in order to increase its energy efficiency;

- Secondary combustion air will be preheated using exhaust fumes;
- Primary and secondary air distribution will be optimised;
- Heat will be recovered from the flue gases by means of boilers integral with the furnaces;
- The boilers will be arranged to minimise flue gas exit temperature to optimise thermal cycle efficiency;
- Boiler heat exchange surfaces will be cleaned on a regular basis to ensure efficient heat recovery.
- All plant and equipment will be individually monitored and controlled using a SCADA monitoring system and PLC controls, optimised for efficiency of operation;
- All aspects of the plant are controlled in real time to ensure maximum thermal efficiency and operational control;
- All plant energy data will be monitored, recorded, and targeted to ensure optimal plant performance; and
- As part of the company's environmental management system, targets will be set regarding the increased thermal efficiency of the plant and the potential export of heat to neighbouring facilities.

Decision document

The Application states that the specific energy consumption, a measure of total energy consumed per unit of waste processed, will be 130 kWh/tonne. The installation capacity is 60,000 t/a.

The BREF says that electricity consumption is typically between 60 kWh/t and 190 kWh/t depending on the LCV of the waste.

The LCV in this case is expected to be 10.11 MJ/kg. The specific energy consumption in the Application is in line with that set out above.

(iii) Generation of energy within the Installation - Compliance with Article 50(5) of the IED

Article 50(5) of the IED requires that *“the heat generated during the incineration and co-incineration process is recovered as far as practicable”*.

Our combined heat and power (CHP) Ready Guidance - February 2013 considers that BAT for energy efficiency for Energy from Waste (EfW) plant is the use of CHP in circumstances where there are technically and economically viable opportunities for the supply of heat from the outset.

The term CHP in this context represents a plant which also provides a supply of heat from the electrical power generation process to either a district heating network or to an industrial / commercial building or process. However, it is recognised that opportunities for the supply of heat do not always exist from the outset (i.e. when a plant is first consented, constructed and commissioned).

In cases where there are no immediate opportunities for the supply of heat from the outset, we consider that BAT is to build the plant to be CHP Ready (CHP-R) to a degree which is dictated by the likely future opportunities which are technically viable and which may, in time, also become economically viable.

The BREF says that 0.4 – 0.8 MWh of electricity can be generated per tonne of waste. Our technical guidance note, EPR S5.01, states that where electricity only is generated, 5-9 MW of electricity should be recoverable per 100,000 tonnes/annum of waste (which equates to 0.4 – 0.72 MWh/tonne of waste).

The Installation will generate electricity only and has been specified to maximise electrical output with little or no use of waste heat. The Sankey diagram in figure 6.1 of the Application Support Document shows 4.64 MW of electricity produced for an annual burn of 60,000 tonnes, which represents 0.733 MW per 100,000 tonnes/yr of waste burned. The Installation is therefore within the indicative BAT range.

The Applicant provided a calculation of the gross electrical efficiency and compared it to the BAT AEEL specified in BAT conclusions BAT 20.

The gross electrical efficiency was calculated as 26.1%.

Decision document

The BAT AEEL for gross electrical efficiency is 25-35 however we expect operators to demonstrate that they are achieving a gross electrical efficiency as far above the minimum specified level as practicable.

When comparing the gross electrical efficiency for this installation against other plants of a similar size processing similar waste types, we noted that the gross electrical efficiency is slightly lower than others. In table 6.2 of the Application Support Document the applicant makes a BAT comparison for electrical generation against steam cycle (gas turbine is not compatible with moving grate combustion systems). We agree with the applicant's assessment that an ORC system is BAT at this site: this is discussed in further detail in section 6.1

In accordance with BAT 2 table S3.4 of the Permit requires the gross electrical efficiency to be measured by carrying out a performance test at full load.

Guidance note EPR 5.01 and Chapter IV of the IED both require that, as well as maximising the primary use of heat to generate electricity; waste heat should be recovered as far as practicable.

The Applicant has identified at this stage that the facility would not export heat from the offset but will be constructed as CHP-ready. The location of the Installation largely determines the extent to which waste heat can be utilised, and this is a matter for the planning authority. The Applicant carried out a feasibility study and provided a CHP-R assessment as part of their application. The assessment showed there was potential to provide district heating to local businesses, exporting up to 10MWth heat. There is only one large scale user identified within a 10km radius. This is owned and operated by Babcock international Ltd and is a Naval Base management service, however this is 8.9KM from the site. Although it is technically feasible to implement a CHP scheme, the cost-benefit analysis indicates that the proposed network does not yield an economically viable scheme in its current configuration.

There is provision within the design of the orc turbine to extract heat for a district heating scheme. Establishing a district heating network to supply local users would involve significant technical, financial and planning challenges such that this is not seen as a practicable proposition at present.

Our CHP-R guidance also states that opportunities to maximise the potential for heat recovery should be considered at the early planning stage, when sites are being identified for incineration facilities.

We consider that, within the constraints of the location of the Installation explained above, the Installation will recover heat as far as practicable, and therefore that the requirements of Article 50(5) are met.

I

(iv) R1 Calculation and the DEFRA Good Quality CHP Scheme

Decision document

The R1 calculation and / or gaining accreditation under the DEFRA Good Quality CHP Scheme does not form part of the matters relevant to our determination. They are however, general indicators that the installation is achieving a high level of energy recovery.

The Applicant has not presented an R1 calculation with this application, nor have we received a separate application for a determination on whether the installation is a recovery or disposal facility.

Note that the availability or non-availability of financial incentives for renewable energy such as the ROC and RHI schemes is not a consideration in determining this application.

(v) Choice of Boiler/Turbine System

The generation of electricity is dependent on the use of an Organic Rankine Cycle (ORC) turbine. This works on the same principle as a condensing steam turbine, however thermal oil is used as the working medium instead of water/steam. Thermal oil vapour expands in the turbine, driving the generator. Choice of system is discussed in further detail in section 6.1.

(vi) Choice of Cooling System

Cooling will be provided by an air-cooling / dump chiller, or by a V air blast cooler / radiator with water in a closed circuit if significant heat offtake is required. The purpose of the coolers is to condense the thermal fluid by dissipating low grade heat to the atmosphere. There will be no cooling towers required, therefore, there will be no use of biocides in any cooling water systems and no release to land. Emissions from the plant will not vary regardless of the final choice of cooling system

We agree that the above systems represent BAT for this facility.

(vii) Compliance with Article 14(5) of the Energy Efficiency Directive

Compliance with Article 14(5) of the Energy Efficiency Directive is not a relevant consideration because the installation's total net thermal input is 17.75MW which is below the threshold specified in the directive.

(viii) Permit conditions concerning energy efficiency

Pre-operational condition PO2 requires the Operator to carry out a comprehensive review of the available heat recovery options prior to commissioning, in order to ensure that waste heat from the plant is recovered as far as possible.

Conditions 1.2.2 and 1.2.3 have also been included in the Permit, which require the Operator to review the options available for heat recovery on an ongoing basis, and to provide and maintain the proposed steam/hot water pass-outs.

Decision document

The Operator is required to report energy usage and energy generated under condition 4.2 and Schedule 5 of the Permit. The following parameters are required to be reported: total electrical energy generated; electrical energy exported; total energy usage and energy exported as heat (if any). Together with the total MSW burned per year, this will enable the us to monitor energy recovery efficiency at the Installation and take action if at any stage the energy recovery efficiency is less than proposed.

There are no site-specific considerations that require the imposition of standards beyond indicative BAT, and so we accept that the Applicant's proposals represent BAT for this Installation.

4.3.8 Efficient use of raw materials

Having considered the information submitted in the Application, we are satisfied that the appropriate measures will be in place to ensure that the Operator will make efficient use of raw materials and water.

The Operator is required to report with respect to raw material usage under condition 4.2. and Schedule 5, including consumption of sodium bicarbonate, activated carbon and urea used per tonne of waste burned. This will enable the Environment Agency to assess whether there have been any changes in the efficiency of the air pollution control plant, and the operation of the SNCR to abate NO_x. These are the most significant raw materials that will be used at the Installation, other than the waste feed itself (addressed elsewhere). The efficiency of the use of auxiliary fuel will be tracked separately as part of the energy reporting requirement under condition 4.2.1. Optimising reagent dosage for air abatement systems and minimising the use of auxiliary fuels is further considered in the section on BAT.

4.3.9 Avoidance, recovery or disposal with minimal environmental impact of wastes produced by the permitted activities

This requirement addresses wastes produced at the Installation and does not apply to the waste being treated there. The principal waste streams the Installation will produce are incinerator bottom ash (IBA) and air pollution control (APC) residues.

The first objective is to avoid producing waste at all. Waste production will be avoided by achieving a high degree of burnout of the ash in the furnace, which results in a material that is both reduced in volume and in chemical reactivity. Condition 3.1.3 and associated Table S3.4 specify limits for total organic carbon (TOC) of <3% in bottom ash. Compliance with this limit will demonstrate that good combustion control and waste burnout is being achieved in the furnaces and waste generation is being avoided where practicable.

IBA will normally be classified as non-hazardous waste. However, IBA is classified on the European List of Wastes as a "mirror entry", which means IBA is a hazardous waste if it possesses a hazardous property relating to the content of dangerous substances. Monitoring of IBA at the Installation will be

Decision document

carried out in accordance with the requirements of Article 53(3) of IED. Classification of IBA for its subsequent use or disposal is controlled by other legislation and so is not duplicated within the Permit.

APC residues from flue gas treatment are hazardous waste and therefore must be sent for disposal to a landfill site permitted to accept hazardous waste, or to an appropriately permitted facility for hazardous waste treatment. The amount of APC residues is minimised through optimising the performance of the air emissions abatement plant.

In order to ensure that the IBA residues are adequately characterised, pre-operational condition PO3 requires the Operator to provide a written plan for approval detailing the IBA sampling protocols. Table S3.4 requires the Operator to carry out an ongoing programme of monitoring.

The Application proposes that, where possible, bottom ash will be transported to a suitable treatment facility, from where it could be re-used in the construction industry as an aggregate.

Having considered the information submitted in the Application, we are satisfied that the waste hierarchy referred to in Article 4 of the Waste Framework Directive (WFD) will be applied to the generation of waste and that any waste generated will be treated in accordance with that Article.

We are satisfied that waste from the Installation that cannot be recovered will be disposed of using a method that minimises any impact on the environment. Standard condition 1.4.1 will ensure that this position is maintained.

5 Minimising the Installation's environmental impact

Regulated activities can present different types of risk to the environment, these include odour, noise and vibration; accidents, fugitive emissions to air and water; as well as point source releases to air, discharges to ground or groundwater, global warming potential (GWP) and generation of waste and other environmental impacts. Consideration may also have to be given to the effect of emissions being subsequently deposited onto land (where there are ecological receptors). All these factors are discussed in this and other sections of this document.

For an installation of this kind, the principal emissions are those to air, although we also consider those to land and water.

The next sections of this document explain how we have approached the critical issue of assessing the likely impact of the emissions to air from the Installation on human health and the environment and what measures we are requiring to ensure a high level of protection.

Decision document

5.1 Assessment Methodology

5.1.1 Application of Environment Agency guidance 'risk assessments for your environmental permit'

A methodology for risk assessment of point source emissions to air, which we use to assess the risk of applications we receive for permits, is set out in our guidance 'Air emissions risk assessment for your environmental permit' and has the following steps:

- Describe emissions and receptors
- Calculate process contributions
- Screen out insignificant emissions that do not warrant further investigation
- Decide if detailed air modelling is needed
- Assess emissions against relevant standards
- Summarise the effects of emissions

The methodology uses a concept of "process contribution (PC)", which is the estimated concentration of emitted substances after dispersion into the receiving environmental media at the point where the magnitude of the concentration is greatest. The methodology provides a simple method of calculating PC primarily for screening purposes and for estimating process contributions where environmental consequences are relatively low. It is based on using dispersion factors. These factors assume worst case dispersion conditions with no allowance made for thermal or momentum plume rise and so the process contributions calculated are likely to be an overestimate of the actual maximum concentrations. More accurate calculation of process contributions can be achieved by mathematical dispersion models, which take into account relevant parameters of the release and surrounding conditions, including local meteorology – these techniques are expensive but normally lead to a lower prediction of PC.

5.1.2 Use of Air Dispersion Modelling

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

Our web guide sets out the relevant ES as:

- Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010 Limit Values
- Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010 Target Values
- UK Air Quality Strategy Objectives

Decision document

- Environmental Assessment Levels

Where a Limit Value exists, the relevant standard is the Limit Value. Where a Limit Value does not exist, 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 limit values, target values and AQS objectives. In a very small number of cases, e.g. for emissions of lead, the AQS objective is more stringent than the Limit Value. In such cases, we use the AQS objective for our assessment.

Target values, AQS objectives and EALs do not have the same legal status as 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** PC is less than **1%** of the relevant ES; and
- the **short-term** PC is less than **10%** of the relevant ES.

The **long term** 1% PC 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 human health and the environment.

The **short term** 10% PC 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 human health and the environment.

Where an emission is screened out in this way, we would normally consider 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

Decision document

proposals. Whether or not exceedances are considered likely, the application is subject to the requirement to operate in accordance with BAT.

This is not the end of the risk assessment, because we also take into account local factors (for example, particularly sensitive receptors nearby such as SSSIs, SACs or SPAs). These additional factors may also lead us to include more stringent conditions than BAT.

If, as a result of reviewing 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.

5.2 Assessment of Impact on Air Quality

The Applicant's assessment of the impact of air quality is set out in Annex H2 of the Application. The assessment comprises:

- A screening assessment using the Environment Agency's risk assessment tool (H1 software tool)
- Dispersion modelling of emissions to air from the operation of the incinerator.
- A study of the impact of emissions on nearby protected conservation areas

This section of the decision document deals primarily with the dispersion modelling of emissions to air from the incinerator chimney and its impact on local air quality. The impact on conservation sites is considered in section 5.4 and potential odour impacts including those during plant shutdowns are considered in section 5.7.

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 air dispersion model software ADMS 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 Plymouth Mount Batten measurement station between 2016 and 2020. The Mount Batten measurement station is approximately 10.2 KM to the south of the site and shows the prevailing winds from the south west quarter. The effect 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:

Decision document

- Oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), expressed as NO₂
 - Total dust
 - Carbon monoxide (CO)
 - Sulphur dioxide (SO₂)
 - Hydrogen chloride (HCl)
 - Hydrogen fluoride (HF)
 - 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 as Total Organic Carbon (TOC)
 - 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 (metals are considered further in section 5.2.3 of this decision document).
 - 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 and are considered further in section 5.2.2.

We are in agreement with this approach. The assumptions underpinning the model have been checked and are a reasonable worst-case .

The Applicant established the background (or existing) air quality against which to measure the potential impact of the incinerator. The consultant's background concentrations, summarised in Table 5 and Table 6 of their report, were obtained from various sources including monitoring and national modelling data maps. We have reviewed all background concentrations, with particular focus on recorded values presented in the Annual Status Report of the Plymouth City Council <https://www.plymouth.gov.uk/air-quality> and the UK Air website <https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/>. We are satisfied with the background concentrations assumed by the consultant, although we have used more conservative background concentrations than the consultant for PM10 and PM2.5.

As well as predicting the maximum ground level concentration of the pollutants within the modelling domain, the Applicant has modelled several discrete receptor locations to represent human and ecological exposure.

The Applicant's use of the dispersion models, selection of input data, use of background data and the assumptions made, have been reviewed by our modelling specialists 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 human health impacts and impact on protected conservation areas. Our audit takes account of modelling uncertainties. We make reasonable

Decision document

worst case assumptions and use the uncertainties (minimum 140%) in analysing the likelihood of exceeding any particular standard.

Our review of the Applicant's assessment leads us to agree with the Applicant's conclusions. We have also audited the air quality and human health impact assessment and similarly agree that the conclusions drawn in the reports were acceptable.

During determination new Environmental Assessment Levels (EALs) were implemented for a few pollutants including some metals. The value were updated on the GOV.UK risk assessment page on 20 November 2023, [Air emissions risk assessment for your environmental permit](#) - GOV.UK. We checked the Applicants modelling against these new EALs and carried out our own screening checks. We are satisfied that the new EALS do not change the conclusions of our audit.

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

5.2.1 Assessment of Air Dispersion Modelling Outputs

The Applicant's modelling predictions are summarised in the tables below.

The Applicant's modelling predicted pollutant concentrations at discreet receptors. The tables below show their predicted ground level concentrations at the most impacted receptor.

As part of our checks, we carry out sensitivity analysis of the data provided and conduct our own check modelling to ensure that the applicant's modelling predictions are reliable.

Whilst we have used the Applicant's modelling predictions in the table below, we have made our own simple verification calculation of the percentage PC and predicted environmental concentration (PEC). 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.

The applicant did not present process contributions or background data for some substances but we checked in our audit and are satisfied that the conclusions drawn by the operator can be relied upon. Where this information was not provided by the applicant, but the pollutant was reviewed by our audit, we have added 'audit' to the table below.

Decision document

Non Metals

Pollutant	Environmental Standards (ES)		Back-ground	Process Contribution (PC)		Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC)	
	µg/m ³	Reference period		µg/m ³	µg/m ³	% of EAL	µg/m ³
NO ₂	40	Annual Mean	8.99	1.24	3.10	10.2	25.6
	200	99.79th %ile of 1-hour means	17.99	7.09	3.5	25.1	12.5
PM ₁₀	40	Annual Mean	9.93	0.052	0.13	10.0	25.0
	50	90.41st %ile of 24-hour means	19.86	0.163	0.33	20.023	40.0
PM _{2.5}	20	Annual Mean	6.36	0.052	0.26	6.41	32.1
SO ₂	266	99.9th %ile of 15-min means	Audit	4.1	1.5	Audit	Audit
	350	99.73rd %ile of 1-hour means	4.32	3.53	1.01	7.85	2.2
	125	99.18th %ile of 24-hour means	2.16	2.38	1.9	4.54	3.6
HCl	750	1-hour average	0.41	3	0.4	3.4	0.45
HF	16	Monthly average	0.003	0.01	0.06	0.013	0.08
	160	1-hour average	0.003	0.5	0.313	0.50	0.3
CO	10000	Maximum daily running 8-hour mean	113	8.0	0.08	121	1.2
	30000	1-hour average	226	Audit	Audit	Audit	Audit

Decision document

Pollutant	Environmental Standards (ES)		Back-ground	Process Contribution (PC)		Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC)	
	µg/m ³	Reference period	µg/m ³	µg/m ³	% of EAL	µg/m ³	% of EAL
TOC	2.25	Annual Mean	0.0497	0.104	4.62	0.15	6.83
	30	24 Hour Mean (Short Term)	0.372	Audit	Audit	Audit	Audit
	2.25	24 Hour Mean (Short Term)	0.0497	Audit	Audit	Audit	Audit
PAH	0.00025	Annual Mean	0.000062	0.0000104	4.16	0.00007	29.0
NH ₃	180	Annual Mean	0.326	0.104	0.06	0.43	0.24
	2500	1-hour average	Audit	5	0.20	5	0.2
PCBs	0.2	Annual Mean	1.366E-05	4.15E-10	0.000000	1.37E-05	0.01
	6	1-hour average	Audit	2E-08	0.00	Audit	Audit
TOC as 1,3 butadiene for long term and benzene for shortterm PAH as benzo[a]pyrene							

Decision document

Metals

Pollutant	Environmental Standard (ES)		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	0.065	0.207	4.1	0.27	5.4
	30	24 hour mean (short term)	Audit	Audit	Audit	Audit	Audit
Hg	600	1-hour mean (short term)	1.3	10	1.67	11.30	1.88
	60	24 hour mean (long term)	Audit	Audit	Audit	0.00	
Sb	5000	Annual mean	Audit	3.1	0.06	Audit	Audit
	150000	1-hour average	Audit	Audit	Audit	Audit	Audit
Pb	250	Annual mean	1.7	3.1	1.24	4.80	1.92
Cu	50	24 hour mean (long term)	Audit	Audit	Audit	0.00	0.000
Mn	150	Annual mean	1.9	3.1	2.07	5.00	3.33
	1500000	1-hour average	Audit	Audit	Audit	Audit	Audit
V	1000	24-hr average	Audit	Audit	Audit	Audit	Audit
As	6	Annual mean	0.41	0.26	4.33	0.67	11.2
Cr (II)(III)	2000	24 hour mean (long term)	Audit	Audit	Audit	Audit	Audit
Cr (VI)	0.25	Annual mean	0.10	0.00134	0.54	0.10	40.5
Ni	20	Annual mean	0.37	3.1	15.50	3.47	17.4
	700	1-hour mean	Audit	Audit	Audit	Audit	Audit

Decision document

(i) Screening out emissions which are insignificant

From the tables above, and following our audit, the following emissions can be screened out as insignificant in that the PC is < 1% of the long term ES (where there is a long term ES) and <10% of the short term ES. These are:

- NO₂ (ST only)
- PM10
- PM2.5
- SO₂
- HCl
- HF
- CO
- TOC (ST as benzene)
- NH₃
- PCBs

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 PEC is less than 100% (taking expected modelling uncertainties into account) of both the long term and short term ES.

- NO₂ (LT only)
- PAH
- TOC (LT as 1.3 butadiene)

For these emissions, we have carefully scrutinised the Applicant's proposals to ensure that they are applying BAT to prevent and minimise emissions of these substances. This is reported in section 6 of this document.

(iii) Emissions requiring further assessment

All emissions either screen out as insignificant or where they do not screen out as insignificant are considered unlikely to give rise to significant pollution. Therefore, we are satisfied that there are no emissions requiring further assessment.

Decision document

5.2.2 Consideration of key pollutants

(i) Nitrogen dioxide (NO₂)

The impact on air quality from NO₂ emissions has been assessed against the ES of 40 µg/m³ as a long term annual average and 200 µg/m³ as a short term hourly average.

The model assumes a 70% NO_x to NO₂ conversion for the long term and 35% for the short term assessment in line with Environment Agency guidance on the use of air dispersion modelling.

The above tables show that the maximum long term PC is greater than 1% of the ES and therefore cannot be screened out as insignificant. However, from the table above, the emission is not expected to result in the ES being exceeded. The maximum short term PC is smaller than 10% of the ES and therefore can be screened out as insignificant.

(ii) Particulate matter PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}

The impact on air quality from particulate emissions has been assessed against the ES for PM₁₀ (particles of 10 microns and smaller) and PM_{2.5} (particles of 2.5 microns and smaller). For PM₁₀, the ES are a long term annual average of 40 µg/m³ and a short term daily average of 50 µg/m³. For PM_{2.5} the ES of 20 µg/m³ as a long-term annual average was used, having changed from 25 µg/m³ in 2020.

The Applicant's predicted impact of the Installation against these ES is shown in the tables above. The assessment assumes that **all** particulate emissions are present as PM₁₀ for the PM₁₀ assessment and that **all** particulate emissions are present as PM_{2.5} for the PM_{2.5} assessment. However the applicant has applied the PM₁₀ PC for PM_{2.5}.

The above assessment is considered to represent a worst case assessment in that it assumes all particulates emitted are below either 10 microns (PM₁₀) or 2.5 microns (PM_{2.5}), when some are expected to be larger.

We have reviewed the Applicant's particulate matter impact assessment and are satisfied in the robustness of the Applicant's conclusions.

The above table shows that the predicted PC for emissions of PM₁₀ is below 1% of the long term ES and below 10% of the short term ES and so can be screened out as insignificant. Therefore, we consider the Applicant's proposals for preventing and minimising the emissions of particulates to be BAT for the Installation.

There is currently no emission limit prescribed nor any continuous emissions monitor for particulate matter specifically in the PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5} fraction. Whilst we are confident that current monitoring techniques will capture the fine particle

Decision document

fraction (PM_{2.5}) for inclusion in the measurement of total particulate matter, an improvement condition (IC2) has been included that will require a full analysis of particle size distribution in the flue gas, and hence determine the ratio of fine to coarse particles. In the light of current knowledge and available data however we are satisfied that the health of the public would not be put at risk by such emissions, as explained in section 5.3.3.

(iii) Acid gases, sulphur dioxide (SO₂), hydrogen chloride (HCl) and hydrogen fluoride (HF)

From the tables above, emissions of HCl and HF can be screened out as insignificant in that the process contribution is <10% of the short term ES. The ES for HCl is 750 µg/m³, this is an hourly short term average, there is no long term ES for HCl. HF has 2 assessment criteria – a 1-hr ES of 160 µg/m³ and a monthly ES of 16 µg/m³ – the process contribution is <1% of the monthly ES and so the emission screens out as insignificant if the monthly ES is interpreted as representing a long term ES.

There is no long term EAL for SO₂ for the protection of human health. Protection of ecological receptors from SO₂ for which there is a long term ES is considered in section 5.4. There are three short term ES, hourly of 350 µg/m³, 15 – minute of 266 µg/m³ and daily of 125 µg/m³.

From the above table, emissions of SO₂ can be screened out as insignificant in that the short term process contribution is <10% of each of the three short term ES values. Therefore, we consider the Applicant's proposals for preventing and minimising the emissions of these substances to be BAT for the Installation.

Whilst SO₂ emissions cannot be screened out as insignificant, the Applicant's modelling shows that the installation is unlikely to result in a breach of the ES. The Applicant is required to prevent, minimise and control SO₂ emissions using BAT, this is considered further in Section 6. We are satisfied that SO₂ emissions will not result in significant pollution.

(iv) Emissions to air of carbon monoxide (CO), Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs), Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs), Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs), Dioxins and ammonia (NH₃)

The above tables show that for VOC emissions, 1,3 Butadiene the maximum long term PC is greater than 1% of the ES and therefore cannot be screened out as insignificant. However, the emission is not expected to result in the ES being exceeded.

The maximum short term PC for CO and VOC (benzene) is less than 10% of the ES and so can be screened out as insignificant

The Applicant has used the ES for 1,3 butadiene for their assessment of the impact of VOC for long term and benzene for short term. This is based on 1,3

Decision document

butadiene having the lowest ES of organic species likely to be present in VOC (other than PAH, PCBs, dioxins and furans).

The above tables show that for PCB emissions, the maximum long term PC is less than 1% of the ES and the maximum short term PC is less than 10% of the ES for PCBs and so can be screened out as insignificant. Therefore, we consider the Applicant's proposals for preventing and minimising the emissions of these substances to be BAT for the Installation.

The above tables show that for PAH emissions, the maximum long term PC for PAH is greater than 1% of the ES and therefore cannot be screened out as insignificant. However, from the table above, the emission is not expected to result in the ES being exceeded

The Applicant has also used the ES for benzo[a]pyrene (BaP) for their assessment of the impact of PAH. We agree that the use of the BaP ES is sufficiently precautionary.

There is no ES for dioxins and furans as the principal exposure route for these substances is by ingestion and the risk to human health is through the accumulation of these substances in the body over an extended period of time. This issue is considered in more detail in section 5.3

From the tables above all the other emissions can be screened out as insignificant in that the PC is < 1% of the long-term ES and <10% of the short term ES.

The ammonia emission is based on a release concentration of 10 mg/m³. We are satisfied that this level of emission is consistent with the operation of a well-controlled SNCR NO_x abatement system.

Whilst all emissions cannot be screened out as insignificant, the Applicant's modelling shows that the installation is unlikely to result in a breach of the ES. The Applicant is required to prevent, minimise and control PAH and VOC emissions using BAT, this is considered further in Section 6. We are satisfied that PAH and VOC emissions will not result in significant pollution.

(V) Summary

For the above emissions to air, for those emissions that have not screened out as insignificant, we have carefully scrutinised the Applicant's proposals to ensure that they are applying the BAT to prevent and minimise emissions of these substances. This is reported in section 6 of this document. Therefore, we consider the Applicant's proposals for preventing and minimising emissions to be BAT for the Installation. Dioxins and furans are considered further in section 5.3.2.

Decision document

5.2.3 Assessment of Emission of Metals

The Applicant has assessed the impact of metal emissions to air, as previously described.

There are three sets of BAT AELs for metal emissions:

- An emission limit value of 0.02 mg/m³ for mercury and its compounds (formerly WID group 1 metals).
- An aggregate emission limit value of 0.02 mg/m³ for cadmium and thallium and their compounds (formerly WID group 2 metals).
- An aggregate emission limit of 0.3 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.

In section 5.2.1 above and following our Audit, the following emissions of metals were screened out as insignificant:

- Cd (ST only)
- Hg
- Sb
- Cu
- Mn (ST only)
- V
- Cr (II)(III)
- Cr (VI)
- Ni (ST only)

Also in section 5.2.1, the following emissions of metals whilst not screened out as insignificant were assessed as being unlikely to give rise to significant pollution:

- Cd (LT only)
- Pb
- Mn (LT only)
- As
- Ni (LT only)

There were no metal emissions requiring further assessment.

The Applicant has concluded that exceedances of the ES for all metals are not likely to occur. The installation has been assessed as meeting BAT for control of metal emissions to air. See section 6 of this document.

Decision document

The Environment Agency's experience of regulating incineration plant is that emissions of metals are in any event below the BAT AELs which are lower than the Annex VI limits set in IED, and that the above assessment is an over prediction of the likely impact. We therefore agree with the Applicant's conclusions.

The installation has been assessed as meeting BAT for control of metal emissions to air. See section 6 of this document.

5.2.4 Consideration of Local Factors

(i) Impact on Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs)

Plymouth city council has declared an AQMA with respect to Nitrogen dioxide NO₂ – Annual Mean.

This is located as follows:



The site is 950m to the Northwest of Plymouth Air Quality Management Area. NO₂ impacts from the installation will be 3.10% in the long term and 3.5% in the short term. Whilst short term emissions cannot be screened out as insignificant, the Applicant's modelling shows that the installation is unlikely to result in a breach of the ES within the AQMA.

5.3 Human health risk assessment

5.3.1 Our role in preventing harm to human health

Decision document

The Environment Agency has a statutory role to protect the environment and human health from all processes and activities it regulates. We assessed the effects on human health for this application in the following ways:

i) Applying Statutory Controls

The plant will be regulated under EPR. The EPR include the requirements of relevant EU Directives, notably, the IED, the WFD, and ADD.

The main conditions in an EfW permit are based on the requirements of the IED. Specific conditions have been introduced to specifically ensure compliance with the requirements of Chapter IV of the IED. The aim of the IED is to prevent or, where that is not practicable, to reduce emissions to air, water and land and prevent the generation of waste, in order to achieve a high level of protection of the environment taken as a whole. IED achieves this aim by setting operational conditions, technical requirements and emission limit values to meet the requirements set out in Articles 11 and 18 of the IED. These requirements may in some circumstances dictate tighter emission limits and controls than those set out in the BAT conclusions (BAT-C) or Chapter IV of IED on waste incineration and co-incineration plants. The assessment of BAT for this installation is detailed in section 6 of this document.

Decision document

ii) Environmental Impact Assessment

Industrial activities can give rise to odour, noise and vibration, accidents, fugitive emissions to air and water, releases to air (including the impact on Photochemical Ozone Creation Potential (POCP)), discharges to ground or groundwater, GWP and the generation of waste. For an installation of this kind, the principal environmental effects are through emissions to air, although we also consider all of the other impacts listed. Section 5.1 and 5.2 above explain how we have approached the critical issue of assessing the likely impact of the emissions to air from the Installation on human health and the environment and any measures we are requiring to ensure a high level of protection.

iii) Expert Scientific Opinion

There is a significant amount of literature on whether there are links between operation of incineration plants and effects on health. We have not referenced them here, but we have included information on one of the most recent studies that was commissioned by the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA), previously Public Health England (PHE). The overall weight of the evidence is that there is not a significant impact on human health.

UKHSA review research undertaken to examine suggested links between emissions from municipal waste incinerators and effects on health. UKHSA's risk assessment is that modern, well run and regulated municipal waste incinerators are not a significant risk to public health. While it is not possible to rule out adverse health effects from these incinerators completely, any potential effect for people living close by is likely to be very small.

UKHSA keep literature on health effects under review and would inform us if there were any changes to the above position. Similarly, we would consult UKHSA if new evidence was provided to us.

In 2012 the UK Small Area Health Statistics Unit (SAHSU) at Imperial College was commissioned by PHE to carry out a study to extend the evidence base and to provide further information to the public about any potential reproductive and infant health risks from municipal waste incineration (MWIs).

A number of papers have been published by SAHSU since 2012 which show no effect on birth outcomes. One paper in the study looked at exposure to emissions from MWIs in the UK and concluded that exposure was low. Subsequent papers found no increased risk of a range of birth outcomes (including stillbirth and infant mortality) in relation to exposure to PM₁₀ emissions and proximity to MWIs, and no association with MWIs opening on changes in risks of infant mortality or sex ratio.

The final part of the study, published on 21/06/19, found no evidence of increased risk of congenital anomalies from exposure to MWI chimney emissions, but a small potential increase in risk of congenital anomalies for children born within ten kilometres of MWIs. The paper does not demonstrate a causal effect, and it acknowledges that the observed results may well be

Decision document

down to not fully adjusting the study for factors such as other sources of pollution around MWIs or deprivation.

UKHSA have stated that 'While the conclusions of the study state that a causal effect cannot be excluded, the study does not demonstrate a causal association and makes clear that the results may well reflect incomplete control for confounding i.e. insufficiently accounting for other factors that can cause congenital anomalies, including other sources of local pollution. This possible explanation is supported by the fact no increased risk of congenital anomalies was observed as a result of exposure to emissions from an incinerator.'

Following this study, UKHSA have further stated that their position remains that modern, well run and regulated municipal waste incinerators are not a significant risk to public health.

We agree with the view stated by the UKHSA. We ensure that permits contain conditions which require the installation to be well-run and regulate the installation to ensure compliance with such permit conditions.

iv) Health Risk Models

Comparing the results of air dispersion modelling as part of the Environmental Impact assessment against European and national air quality standards effectively makes a health risk assessment for those pollutants for which a standard has been derived. These air quality standards have been developed primarily to protect human health via known intake mechanisms, such as inhalation and ingestion. Some pollutants, such as dioxins, furans and dioxin like PCBs, have human health impacts at lower ingestion levels than lend themselves to setting an air quality standard to control against. For these pollutants, a different human health risk model is required which better reflects the level of dioxin intake.

Models are available to predict the dioxin, furan and dioxin like PCBs intake for comparison with the Tolerable Daily Intake (TDI) recommended by the Committee on Toxicity of Chemicals in Food, Consumer Products and the Environment, known as COT. These include the HHRAP model.

HHRAP has been developed by the US EPA to calculate the human body intake of a range of carcinogenic pollutants and to determine the mathematical quantitative risk in probabilistic terms. In the UK, in common with other European countries, we consider a threshold dose below which the likelihood of an adverse effect is regarded as being very low or effectively zero.

The TDI is the amount of a substance that can be ingested daily over a lifetime without appreciable health risk. It is expressed in relation to bodyweight to allow for different body size, such as for adults and children of different ages. In the UK, the COT has set a TDI for dioxins, furans and dioxin like PCBs of 2 picograms WHO-TEQ/kg-body weight/day (a picogram is a millionth of a millionth (10^{-12}) of a gram).

Decision document

In addition to an assessment of risk from dioxins, furans and dioxin like PCBs, the HHRAP model enables a risk assessment from human intake of a range of heavy metals. In principle, the respective ES for these metals are protective of human health. It is not therefore necessary to model the human body intake.

The Committee on the Medical Effects of Air Pollution (COMEAP) developed a methodology based on the results of time series epidemiological studies which allows calculation of the public health impact of exposure to the classical air pollutants (NO₂, SO₂ and particulates) in terms of the numbers of “deaths brought forward” and the “number of hospital admissions for respiratory disease brought forward or additional”. Defra reviewed this methodology and concluded that the use of the COMEAP methodology is not generally recommended for modelling the human health impacts of individual installations.

Our recommended approach is therefore the use of the methodology set out in our guidance for comparison for most pollutants (including metals) and dioxin intake modelling using the HHRAP model as described above for dioxins, furans and dioxin like PCBs. Where an alternative approach is adopted for dioxins, we check the predictions ourselves.

v) Consultations

As part of our normal procedures for the determination of a permit application, we consult with Local Authorities, Local Authority Directors of Public Health, FSA and PHE. We also consult the local communities who may raise health related issues. All issues raised by these consultations are considered in determining the Application as described in Annex 4 of this document.

5.3.2 Assessment of Intake of Dioxins, Furans and Dioxin like PCBs

For dioxins, furans and dioxin like PCBs, the principal exposure route is through ingestion, usually through the food chain, and the main risk to health is through accumulation in the body over the lifetime of the receptor.

The human health risk assessment calculates the dose of dioxins and furans that would be received by local receptors if their food and water were sourced from the locality where the deposition of dioxins, furans and dioxin like PCBs is predicted to be the highest. This is then assessed against the Tolerable Daily Intake (TDI) levels established by the COT of 2 picograms WHO-TEQ / kg body weight/ day.

The results of the Applicant's assessment of dioxin intake are detailed in the table below (worst case results for each category are shown). The results showed that the predicted daily intake of dioxins, furans and dioxin like PCBs at all receptors, resulting from emissions from the proposed facility, were significantly below the recommended TDI levels.

Decision document

Table 15 Maximum Exposure to Dioxins and PCBs at Specific Receptors in the Vicinity of the Facility

Receptor Number	Distance from Source (metres)	Dioxins Alone		Dioxins and PCBs	
		Percentage of Tolerable Daily Intake (Adult)	Percentage of Tolerable Daily Intake (Child)	Percentage of Tolerable Daily Intake (Adult)	Percentage of Tolerable Daily Intake (Child)
Maximum	239	0.64%	3.94%	0.96%	5.91%
1	185	0.28%	1.41%	0.41%	2.12%
2	310	0.24%	1.16%	0.36%	1.74%
3	293	0.23%	1.09%	0.35%	1.63%
4	493	0.37%	2.07%	0.55%	3.11%
5	541	0.24%	1.18%	0.36%	1.78%
6	441	0.16%	0.59%	0.24%	0.88%
7	654	0.13%	0.38%	0.19%	0.57%
8	813	0.12%	0.30%	0.17%	0.45%
9	1,165	0.11%	0.30%	0.17%	0.45%
10	1,245	0.15%	0.57%	0.23%	0.85%
11	845	0.13%	0.38%	0.19%	0.57%
12	1,062	0.12%	0.35%	0.18%	0.53%
13	557	0.23%	1.10%	0.35%	1.65%
14	708	0.28%	1.44%	0.42%	2.16%
15	924	0.13%	0.40%	0.20%	0.61%
16	1,247	0.13%	0.41%	0.19%	0.61%
17	1,046	0.11%	0.30%	0.17%	0.45%
18	1,445	0.10%	0.20%	0.15%	0.30%
19	2,327	0.09%	0.17%	0.14%	0.25%

Table 5 Specific Receptors Included in Dioxin Deposition Modelling

Receptor Number	Receptor Location	OS Coordinates		Distance from Source (metres)
		X	Y	
1	Lady Fern Road, Belliver	250080	062343	185
2	Claytonia Close, Belliver	250180	062227	310
3	Hessary Drive, Belliver	250097	062138	293
4	45, Leat Walk, Woolwell	250380	062438	493
5	3, Tavistock Road, Woolwell	250414	062197	541
6	Legis Walk, Belliver	249928	061910	441
7	Beverston Way, Belliver	249758	061711	654
8	Highclere Gardens, Belliver	249596	061594	813
9	Langley Crescent, Southway	249078	061520	1,165
10	Soper's Hill, Bickleigh - North north-west	248678	062088	1,245
11	Soper's Hill, Bickleigh - North-west	249225	062865	845
12	Soper's Hill, Bickleigh - West	249350	063262	1,062
13	Tamerton Road, Woolwell	249841	062904	557
14	Roborough House, Woolwell	250231	062973	708
15	White Oaks, Widewell Lane, Belliver	250090	061447	924
16	Bickleigh Down CofE Primary School	250777	061469	1,247
17	Widewell Primary Academy, Belliver	249860	061305	1,046
18	Oakwood Primary Academy, Derriford,	249470	060969	1,445
19	Notre Dame RC School, Southway	249052	060181	2,327

The consultant has not assessed the separate dioxin and furan congener profiles but have instead calculated the exposure using the total dioxins and furans ELV concentration of 0.04 ng/Nm³ for new plant, which does not account for the variable toxicities of the congeners. We have not been able to replicate the consultant's emission rates and have instead calculated the mass emissions for each congener in terms of Toxic Equivalent (WHO-TEQ) as a proportion of the ELV, factored by the Toxic Equivalent Factors (WHO-TEF).

Our HHRA modelling checks indicate that the predicted intake of dioxins, furans and dioxin-like-PCBs are likely to be well within the 10% insignificance criterion

Decision document

agreed with UKHSA. This also applies to any increased emissions of dioxin, furans and dioxin-like PCBs during abnormal operation.

In 2010, the FSA studied the levels of chlorinated, brominated and mixed (chlorinated-brominated) dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs in fish, shellfish, meat and eggs consumed in the UK. It asked COT to consider the results and to advise on whether the measured levels of these PXDDs, PXDFs and PXBs indicated a health concern ('X' means a halogen). COT issued a statement in December 2010 and concluded that "The major contribution to the total dioxin toxic activity in the foods measured came from chlorinated compounds. Brominated compounds made a much smaller contribution, and mixed halogenated compounds contributed even less (1% or less of TDI). Measured levels of PXDDs, PXDFs and dioxin-like PXBs do not indicate a health concern". COT recognised the lack of quantified TEFs for these compounds but said that "even if the TEFs for PXDDs, PXDFs and dioxin-like PXBs were up to four fold higher than assumed, their contribution to the total TEQ in the diet would still be small. Thus, further research on PXDDs, PXDFs and dioxin-like PXBs is not considered a priority."

In the light of this statement, we assess the impact of chlorinated compounds as representing the impact of all chlorinated, brominated and mixed dioxins / furans and dioxin like PCBs.

5.3.3 Particulates smaller than 2.5 microns

The Operator will be required to monitor particulate emissions using the method set out in Table S3.1 of Schedule 3 of the Permit. This method requires that the filter efficiency must be at least 99.5 % on a test aerosol with a mean particle diameter of 0.3 μm , at the maximum flow rate anticipated. The filter efficiency for larger particles will be at least as high as this. This means that particulate monitoring data effectively captures everything above 0.3 μm and much of what is smaller. It is not expected that particles smaller than 0.3 μm will contribute significantly to the mass release rate / concentration of particulates because of their very small mass, even if present. This means that emissions monitoring data can be relied upon to measure the true mass emission rate of particulates.

Nano-particles are considered to refer to those particulates less than 0.1 μm in diameter ($\text{PM}_{0.1}$). Questions are often raised about the effect of nano-particles on human health, in particular on children's health, because of their high surface to volume ratio, making them more reactive, and their very small size, giving them the potential to penetrate cell walls of living organisms. The small size also means there will be a larger number of small particles for a given mass concentration. However, the UKHSA statement (referenced below) says that due to the small effects of incinerators on local concentration of particles, it is highly unlikely that there will be detectable effects of any particular incinerator on local infant mortality.

The UKHSA addresses the issue of the health effects of particulates in their September 2009 statement 'The Impact on Health of Emissions to Air from Municipal Incinerators'. It refers to the coefficients linking PM_{10} and $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ with

Decision document

effects on health derived by COMEAP and goes on to say that if these coefficients are applied to small increases in concentrations produced, locally, by incinerators; the estimated effects on health are likely to be small. UKHSA note that the coefficients that allow the use of number concentrations in impact calculations have not yet been defined because the national experts have not judged that the evidence is sufficient to do so. This is an area being kept under review by COMEAP.

In December 2010, COMEAP published a report on The Mortality Effects of Long-Term Exposure to Particulate Air Pollution in the United Kingdom. It says that “a policy which aims to reduce the annual average concentration of PM_{2.5} by 1 µg/m³ would result in an increase in life expectancy of 20 days for people born in 2008.” However, “The Committee stresses the need for careful interpretation of these metrics to avoid incorrect inferences being drawn – they are valid representations of population aggregate or average effects, but they can be misleading when interpreted as reflecting the experience of individuals.”

UKHSA also point out that in 2007 incinerators contributed 0.02% to ambient ground level PM₁₀ levels compared with 18% for road traffic and 22% for industry in general. UKHSA noted that in a sample collected in a day at a typical urban area the proportion of PM_{0.1} is around 5-10% of PM₁₀. It goes on to say that PM₁₀ includes and exceeds PM_{2.5} which in turn includes and exceeds PM_{0.1}. The National Atmospheric Emissions Inventory (NAEI) figures show that in 2016 municipal waste incineration contributed 0.03% to ambient ground level PM₁₀ levels and 0.05% to ambient ground level PM_{2.5} levels. The 2016 data also shows that road traffic contributed to 5.35% of PM₁₀ and 4.96% of PM_{2.5} and that domestic wood burning contributed 22.4% to PM₁₀ and 34.3% of PM_{2.5} levels.

This is consistent with the assessment of this Application which shows emissions of PM₁₀ to air to be insignificant.

A 2016 a paper by Jones and Harrison concluded that ‘ultrafine particles (<100nm) in flue gases from incinerators are broadly similar to those in urban air and that after dispersion with ambient air ultrafine particle concentrations are typically indistinguishable from those that would occur in the absence of the incinerator.

We take the view, based on the foregoing evidence, that techniques which control the release of particulates to levels which will not cause harm to human health will also control the release of fine particulate matter to a level which will not cause harm to human health.

5.3.4 Assessment of Health Effects from the Installation

Our assessment of health impacts is summarised below

- i. We have applied the relevant requirements of the Environmental legislation in imposing the permit conditions. We are satisfied that compliance with these conditions will ensure protection of the environment and human health.

Decision document

- ii. In carrying out air dispersion modelling as part of the environmental impact assessment and comparing the PC and PEC with the ES, the Applicant has effectively made a health risk assessment for many pollutants. The ES have been developed primarily to protect human health. The Applicant's assessment of the impact from NO₂, PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, SO₂ (ST only), HCl (ST only), HF (ST only), CO (ST only) TOC (as benzene), NH₃, PCBs, Cd (ST only), Hg, Sb, Cu, Mn (ST only), V, CR(II)(III), Cr (Vi), Ni (ST Only) have all indicated that the Installation emissions screen out as insignificant; where the impact of emissions of NO₂ (LT only), PAH, TOC (as 1.3 butadiene), Pb, As, have not been screened out as insignificant, the assessment still shows that the PEC are well within the ES.
- iii. We have assessed the health effects from the operation of this installation in relation to the above (sections 5.3.1 to 5.3.3).
- iv. We have reviewed the methodology employed by the Applicant to carry out the health impact assessment.

Overall, taking into account the conservative nature of the impact assessment (i.e. that it is based upon an individual exposed for a life-time to the effects of the highest predicted relevant airborne concentrations and consuming mostly locally grown food), it was concluded that the operation of the proposed facility will not pose a significant risk to human health.

- v. We agree with the conclusion reached by UKHSA that modern, well run and regulated municipal waste incinerators are not a significant risk to public health. While it is not possible to rule out adverse health effects from these incinerators completely, any potential effect for people living close by is likely to be very small.
- vi. UKHSA the UK Health Security Agency and Plymouth city council public protection office were consulted on the Application. UKHSA and Plymouth city council public protection office that they had no significant concerns regarding the risk to the health of humans from the installation. The Food Standards Agency was also consulted during the permit determination process and did not provide a response to our consultation. Details of the responses provided by UKHSA, the Local Authority Director of Public Health to the consultation on this Application can be found in Annex 4.

We are therefore satisfied that the Applicant's conclusions presented above are reliable and we conclude that the potential emissions of pollutants including dioxins, furans and metals from the proposed facility are unlikely to have a significant impact on human health.

Decision document

5.4 Impact on protected conservation areas (SPAs, SACs, Ramsar sites and SSSIs and local nature sites)

5.4.1 Sites Considered

The following Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Areas (SPA) and Ramsar sites are located within 10 km of the Installation:

- Dartmoor SAC (UK0012929)
- Plymouth Sound and Estuaries SAC (UK0013111)
- South Dartmoor Woods SAC (UK0012749)
- Tamar Estuaries Complex SPA (UK9010141)

5.4.2 Habitats Assessment

The Applicant's habitats assessment was reviewed by our technical specialists for air dispersion modelling and assessment who agreed with the assessment's conclusions, that there would be no likely significant effect on the interest features of the protected sites.

The exact numerical data presented by the consultant was not the correct assessment criteria. However, we have remodelled the data and agree with their conclusions.

Annex H2 – AQA – 16122022 states Critical Loads are defined as: "a quantitative estimate of exposure to one or more pollutants below which significant harmful effects on specified sensitive elements of the environment do not occur according to present knowledge". Critical Loads are assigned for deposited levels of nutrient Nitrogen and acid where they may impact on the designated features of sensitive ecological habitats and an assessment has therefore been made of the likely levels of deposition and the potential impact on the receptor Critical Loads.

Tables 29 to 31 of the Document Annex H2 – AQA - 16122022 present the calculated deposition of nutrient Nitrogen and acid to each discrete specified receptor location, with multiple points modelled across the South Dartmoor Woods SAC, Plymouth Sound and Estuaries SAC, Tamar Estuaries Complex SPA, and Dartmoor SAC, as detailed in Table 4.

Levels of Nitrogen deposited from NO_x have been reduced to 70 % of the total, as NO does not deposit to any significant extent and as such the reduced levels represent the likely deposited NO₂ fraction.

The results show that contributions to nutrient Nitrogen deposition at all sites equate to less than 1 % of the site-specific Critical Load and can therefore be screened as insignificant.

Contributions of acid deposition to the South Dartmoor Woods SAC and the Dartmoor SAC also remain within 1 % of the site-specific Critical Loads and are

Decision document

screened, as do the Southway Valley Local Nature Reserve and many of the local and ancient woodlands. The three exceptions are Hele Wood, Coombe Wood, and West Wood which are predicted to receive deposited levels of acid between 1 and 1.5 % of the Critical Loads. However, as the assessment of local nature sites such as woodland areas is different from national designated sites and simply requires that the PC remains within 100 % of the environmental standard, the contributions are screened as insignificant, and no further assessment is required.

Tables 32 – 34 present the deposition levels from the cumulative assessment in order to demonstrate that, when considered with other locally proposed or recently consented developments, the contributions to nutrient Nitrogen and acid deposition continue to be screened as insignificant. Although contributions from Nitrogen based pollutants (NO_x and Ammonia) do increase when considering the Biomass No. 4 plant in combination with other local sites, and more of the local sites receive deposits of nutrient Nitrogen (Receptors E11 – E14 and E19 – E23) and acid (Receptors E11, E13, E19, E20 and E22) equating to more than 1 % of the assessment level, with a maximum deposition level of 5.75 % of the Critical Load for nutrient Nitrogen reported at E11 all contributions remain well within 100 % of the environmental standards and hence are screened as insignificant. Cumulative levels of nutrient Nitrogen and acid deposition equate to less than 1 % of the site-specific Critical Loads at all designated, National Site Network receptors, and hence are screened as insignificant.

Our assessment

Deposition assessment

The consultant's predictions indicate:

- PCs for nitrogen deposition and acid deposition are below 1% of the relevant critical loads (0.31% and 0.53%, respectively) for European sites. PCs are below 100% of the relevant critical loads (0.98% and 1.48%, respectively) for the local nature sites. Even considering nearby plant in the consultant's cumulative assessment, the PCs are still considered insignificant.
- PCs are either insignificant, or PECs are below the relevant critical levels for all other pollutants and receptors.

Our recommendation is that the consultant's conclusions for assessment of ecological receptors against critical levels and loads can be used for permit determination and that the operation of the facility is unlikely to make a significant contribution to or cause exceedances of any critical levels and critical loads set for the protection of ecological receptors.

The consultant concludes that for all pollutants, either the process contributions (PCs) are insignificant, or the predicted environmental concentrations (PECs) are well within the critical loads or levels for all ecological receptors.

Decision document

We have audited the consultants AQA and have made observations on their methodology and assumptions. We have conducted our own checks on the modelling and have analysed modelling sensitivities.

As a result we find that:

For all pollutants, PCs either screen out as insignificant or PECs are within the critical loads and levels at all relevant ecological sites.

Abnormal emissions will not have a significant impact on air quality.

We therefore agree with the consultants conclusions with respect to ecological receptors.

Acidification

Although we do not agree with the consultant's absolute numerical predictions, we agree with the consultant's conclusions regarding normal operations. For all pollutants, the facility is predicted to have insignificant PCs or the PECs are predicted to be within environmental standards.

The contribution from the facility is unlikely to cause significant impacts at any local nature sites or European habitat sites.

Our audit indicates that these conclusions extend to short-term emissions and emissions from the facility during abnormal operations.

Change in nutrients

Although we do not agree with the consultant's absolute numerical predictions, we agree with the consultant's conclusions regarding normal operations. For all pollutants, the facility is predicted to have insignificant PCs or the PECs are predicted to be within environmental standards.

The contribution from the facility is unlikely to cause significant impacts at any local nature sites or European habitat sites.

Our audit indicates that these conclusions extend to short-term emissions and emissions from the facility during abnormal operations.

Habitats Loss

Although we do not agree with the consultant's absolute numerical predictions, we agree with the consultant's conclusions regarding normal operations. For all pollutants, the facility is predicted to have insignificant PCs or the PECs are predicted to be within environmental standards.

The contribution from the facility is unlikely to cause significant impacts at any local nature sites or European habitat sites.

Decision document

Our audit indicates that these conclusions extend to short-term emissions and emissions from the facility during abnormal operations.

The assessment of the indirect emissions from NO_x, SO₂, HF and NH₃, nutrient deposition and acid deposition all screen out therefore we can conclude that there is not likely to be any indirect habitat loss

Toxic contamination

Although we do not agree with the consultant's absolute numerical predictions, we agree with the consultant's conclusions regarding normal operations. For all pollutants, the facility is predicted to have insignificant PCs or the PECs are predicted to be within environmental standards.

The contribution from the facility is unlikely to cause significant impacts at any local nature sites or European habitat sites.

Our audit indicates that these conclusions extend to short-term emissions and emissions from the facility during abnormal operations.

The assessment of the emissions from NO_x, SO₂, HF and NH₃, nutrient deposition and acid deposition all screen out therefore we can conclude that there is not likely to be any toxic contamination.

5.4.4 Assessment of local nature sites

Conservation sites are protected in law by legislation which provides the highest level of protection for SACs and SPAs, and also for protection of protection for SSSIs. Finally, the Environment Act 1995 provides more generalised protection for flora and fauna rather than for specifically named conservation designations. It is under the Environment Act 1995 that we assess other sites (such as ancient woodlands, local wildlife sites and national and local nature reserves) which prevents us from permitting something that will result in significant pollution; and which offers levels of protection proportionate with other European and national legislation. However, it should not be assumed that because levels of protection are less stringent for these other sites, that they are not of considerable importance. Local sites link and support EU and national nature conservation sites together and hence help to maintain the UK's biodiversity resilience.

For SACs SPAs, Ramsars and SSSIs we consider the PC and the background levels in making an assessment of impact. In assessing the local nature sites under the Environment Act 1995 we look at the impact from the Installation alone to determine whether it would cause significant pollution. This is a proportionate approach, in line with the levels of protection offered by the conservation legislation to protect these other sites (which are generally more numerous than Natura 2000 or SSSIs) whilst ensuring that we do not restrict development.

Decision document

Critical levels and loads are set to protect the most vulnerable habitat types. Thresholds change in accordance with the levels of protection afforded by the legislation. Therefore, the thresholds for SAC SPA and SSSI features are more stringent than those for local nature sites.

Therefore, we would generally conclude that the Installation is not causing significant pollution at these other sites if the PC is less than the relevant critical level or critical load, provided that the Applicant is using BAT to control emissions.

5.5 Impact of abnormal operations

Article 50(4)(c) of the 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 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 during abnormal operation. 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 mg/m³ (as a half hourly average) 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 hours 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.

Decision document

In making an assessment of abnormal operations the consultant provided an abnormal emissions assessment for long term emissions only *“assuming a doubling of the short-term process contributions for most species, the quadrupling of contributions of CO, and a maximum PM₁₀ release of 150 mg Nm⁻³ in the event of a failure of the abatement plant”*. We have modelled abnormal short-term emissions, using emission concentrations derived from comparable facilities, the EPR ELVs and the Reference Documents on the Best Available Techniques (BREF) published in 2005 and 2019.

In accordance with the EPR (Article 46 (6) of the Industrial Emissions Directive), the facility would be permitted to operate unabated above ELVs for a continuous period of no more than 4 hours and up to 60 hours per year, thus short-term impacts are of most concern during abnormal operations. The consultant has provided an abnormal emissions assessment for long-term emissions only, *“assuming a doubling of the short-term process contributions for most species, the quadrupling of contributions of CO, and a maximum PM10 release of 150 mg Nm³ in the event of a failure of the abatement plant”*. We have modelled abnormal short-term emissions, using emission concentrations derived from comparable facilities, the EPR ELVs and the Reference Documents on the Best Available Techniques (BREF) published in 2005 and 2019.

Our audit indicates that the conclusions made by the operator for the facility's short-term emissions and emissions from the facility during abnormal operations can be relied upon.

Our HHRA modelling checks indicate that the predicted intake of dioxins, furans and dioxin-like-PCBs are likely to be well within the 10% insignificance criterion agreed with UKHSA. This also applies to any increased emissions of dioxin, furans and dioxin-like PCBs during abnormal operation.

In carrying out our audit of the operator's conclusions, we used a worst case scenario whereby a number of different equipment failures would occur at the same time, 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.

6 Application of Best Available Techniques

6.1 Scope of Consideration

In this section, we explain how we have determined whether the Applicant's proposals are BAT for this Installation.

- The first issue we address is the fundamental choice of incineration technology. There are a number of alternatives, and the Applicant has explained why it has chosen one particular kind for this Installation.
- We then consider in particular control measures for the emissions which were not screened out as insignificant in the previous section on minimising the installation's environmental impact. They are:
 - NO₂ (LT only)
 - PAH.
 - TOC (LT as 1.3 butadiene)
 - Cd (LT only)
 - Pb
 - Mn (LT only)
 - As
 - Ni (LT only)
- We also have to consider the combustion efficiency and energy utilisation of different design options for the Installation, which are relevant considerations in the determination of BAT for the Installation, including the GWP of the different options.
- Finally, the prevention and minimisation of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) must be considered, as we explain below.

Chapter IV of the IED specifies a set of maximum ELV. Although these limits are designed to be stringent, and to provide a high level of environmental protection, they do not necessarily reflect what can be achieved by new plant. Article 14(3) of the IED says that BAT-C shall be the reference for setting the permit conditions. The BAT-C were published on 03/12/2019 and set BAT AELs for various substances mainly as daily average values which are in many cases lower than the chapter IV limits.

Operational controls complement the ELV and should generally result in emissions below the maximum allowed; whilst the limits themselves provide headroom to allow for unavoidable process fluctuations. Actual emissions are therefore almost certain to be below emission limits in practice, because any Operator that sought to operate its installation continually at the maximum permitted limits would almost inevitably breach those limits regularly, simply by virtue of normal fluctuations in plant performance, resulting in enforcement

Decision document

action (including potentially prosecution, suspension or revocation) being taken. Assessments based on BAT AELs or Chapter IV limits are therefore “worst-case” scenarios.

We are satisfied that emissions at the permitted limits would ensure a high level of protection for human health and the environment in any event.

6.1.1 Consideration of Furnace Type

The prime function of the furnace is to achieve maximum combustion of the waste. Chapter IV of the IED requires that the plant (furnace in this context) should be designed to deliver its requirements. The main requirements of Chapter IV in relation to the choice of a furnace are compliance with air emission limits for CO and TOC and achieving a low TOC/LOI level in the bottom ash.

The BREF states that Municipal Waste can be incinerated in traveling grates, rotary kilns and fluidised bed technology. Fluidised bed technology requires MSW to be of a certain particle size range, which usually requires some degree of pre-treatment even when the waste is collected separately.

The BREF describes other process such as gasification and pyrolysis. The BREF notes that some of the processes have encountered technical and economic problems when scaled up to commercial, industrial sizes. Some are used on a commercial basis in Japan and are being tested in demonstration plants in Europe but still only have a small share of overall capacity.

Section 4.3 of the BREF provides a comparison of combustion and thermal treatment technologies, used in Europe and factors affecting their applicability and operational suitability for various waste types. There is also some information on the comparative costs. The table below has been extracted from the BREF tables. This table is also in line with the Guidance Note “The Incineration of Waste (EPR 5.01)”. However, it should not be taken as an exhaustive list nor that all technologies listed have found equal application across Europe.

Overall, any of the furnace technologies identified in the BREF would be considered as BAT provided the Applicant has justified it in terms of:

- nature/physical state of the waste and its variability
- proposed plant throughput which may affect the number of incineration lines
- preference and experience of chosen technology including plant availability
- nature and quantity/quality of residues produced.
- emissions to air – usually NO_x as the furnace choice could have an effect on the amount of unabated NO_x produced
- energy consumption – whole plant, waste preparation, effect on GWP
- Need, if any, for further processing of residues to comply with TOC
- Costs

Summary comparison of thermal treatment technologies (reproduced from the Waste Incineration BREF)

Technique	Key waste characteristics and suitability	Throughput per line	Advantages	Disadvantages / Limitations of use	Bottom Ash Quality	Cost
Moving grate (air-cooled)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low to medium heat values (LCV 5 – 16.5 GJ/t) • Municipal and other heterogeneous solid wastes • Can accept a proportion of sewage sludge and/or medical waste with municipal waste • Applied at most modern • MSW installations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 to 50 t/h with most projects 5 to 30 t/h. • Most industrial applications not below 2.5 or 3 t/h. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widely proven at large scales. • Robust • Low maintenance cost • Long operational history • Can take heterogeneous wastes without special • preparation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally not suited to powders, liquids or materials that melt through the grate 	TOC 0.5% to 3%	High capacity reduces specific cost per tonne of waste
Moving grate (liquid Cooled)	Same as air-cooled grates except: LCV 10 – 20 GJ/t	Same as air-cooled grates	As air-cooled grates but: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • higher heat value waste is treatable • Better combustion control possible. 	As air-cooled grates but: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • risk of grate damage/ leaks • higher complexity 	TOC 0.5% to 3%	Slightly higher capital cost than air-cooled

Decision document

Technique	Key waste characteristics and suitability	Throughput per line	Advantages	Disadvantages / Limitations of use	Bottom Ash Quality	Cost
Rotary Kiln	<p>Can accept liquids and pastes as well as gases</p> <p>Solid feeds more limited than grate (due to refractory damage)</p> <p>often applied to hazardous Wastes</p>	<16 t/h	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very well proven • Broad range of wastes • Good burn out even of HW 	Throughputs lower than grates	TOC <3 %	Higher specific cost due to reduced capacity
Fluid bed - bubbling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wide range of CV (5-25 MJ/kg) • Only finely divided consistent wastes. • Limited use for raw MSW • Often applied to sludges co fired with RDF, shredded MSW, sludges, poultry manure 	Up to 25 t/h	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good mixing • Fly ashes of good leaching quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Careful operation required to avoid clogging bed. • Higher fly ash quantities. 	TOC <1%	<p>FGT cost may be lower.</p> <p>Costs of waste preparation</p>
Fluid bed - circulating	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wide range of CV (6-25 MJ/kg) • Only finely divided consistent wastes. • Limited use for raw MSW • Often applied to sludges co-fired with RDF, coal, wood waste 	Up to 70 t/h	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good mixing • High steam parameters up to 500°C • Greater fuel flexibility than BFB • Fly ashes of good leaching quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cyclone required to conserve bed material • Higher fly ash quantities 	TOC <1%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FGT cost may be lower. • Costs of waste preparation

Decision document

Technique	Key waste characteristics and suitability	Throughput per line	Advantages	Disadvantages / Limitations of use	Bottom Ash Quality	Cost
Spreader - stoker combustor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RDF and other particle feeds • Poultry manure • Wood wastes 	No information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple grate construction • Less sensitive to particle size than FB 	Only for well defined mono-streams	No information	No information
Gasification - fixed bed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixed plastic wastes • Other similar consistent streams • Gasification less widely used/proven than incineration 	Up to 20 t/h	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low leaching residue • Good burnout if oxygen blown • Syngas available • Reduced oxidation of recyclable metals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited waste feed • Not full combustion • High skill level • Tar in raw gas • Less widely proven 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low leaching bottom ash • Good burnout with oxygen 	High operating/ maintenance costs
Gasification - entrained flow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixed plastic wastes • Other similar consistent streams • Not suited to untreated MSW • Gasification less widely used/proven than incineration 	Up to 10 t/h	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low leaching slag • Reduced oxidation of recyclable metals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited waste feed • Not full combustion • High skill level • Less widely proven 	low leaching slag	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High operation/ maintenance costs • High pre-treatment costs
Gasification - fluidised bed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixed plastic wastes • Shredded MSW • Shredder residues • Sludges • Metal rich wastes • Other similar consistent streams • Gasification less widely used/proven than incineration 	5 – 20 t/h	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can use low reactor temperatures e.g. for Al recovery • Separation of main non combustibles • Can be combined with ash melting • Reduced oxidation of recyclable metals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited waste size (<30cm) • Tar in raw gas • Higher UHV raw gas • Less widely proven 	If combined with ash melting chamber ash is vitrified	Lower than other gasifiers

Decision document

Technique	Key waste characteristics and suitability	Throughput per line	Advantages	Disadvantages / Limitations of use	Bottom Ash Quality	Cost
Pyrolysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-treated MSW • High metal inert streams • Shredder residues/plastics • Pyrolysis is less widely used/proven than incineration 	~ 5 t/h (short drum) 5 – 10 t/h (medium drum)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No oxidation of metals • No combustion energy for metals/inert • In reactor acid neutralisation possible • Syngas available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited wastes • Process control and engineering critical • High skill level • Not widely proven • Need market for syngas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dependent on process temperature • Residue produced requires further processing and sometimes combustion 	High pre-treatment, operation and capital costs

Decision document

The Applicant has carried out a review of the following candidate furnace types:

- Moving Grate Furnace
- Fluidised Bed
- Pyrolysis / Gasification

The Applicant has proposed to use a furnace technology comprising comprising moving grate, which is identified in the tables above as being considered BAT in the BREF for this type of waste feed.

The Applicant proposes to use gasoil/diesel (<0.1% sulphur content) as support fuel for start-up, shut down and for the auxiliary burners. The choice of support fuel is based on the fact that 'the auxiliary boiler should not be fed with fuels which can cause higher emissions than those resulting from the burning of gas oil as defined in Article 2(2) of Council Directive 1999/32/EC of 26 April 1999 relating to a reduction in the sulphur content of certain liquid fuels, liquefied gas, or natural gas'.

Boiler Design

In accordance with BAT 30 of the BAT-C and our guidance, EPR 5.01, the Applicant has confirmed that the boiler design will include the following features to minimise the potential for reformation of dioxins within the de-novo synthesis range:

- ensuring that the steam/metal heat transfer surface temperature is a minimum where the exhaust gases are within the de-novo synthesis range;
- design of the boilers using computerised fluid dynamics (CFD) to ensure no pockets of stagnant or low velocity gas;
- boiler passes are progressively decreased in volume so that the gas velocity increases through the boiler; and
- Design of boiler surfaces to prevent boundary layers of slow moving gas.

Any of the options listed in the BREF and summarised in the table above can be BAT. The Applicant has chosen a furnace technique that is listed in the BREF and we are satisfied that the Applicant has provided sufficient justification to show that their technique is BAT. This is not to say that the other techniques could not also be BAT, but that the Applicant has shown that their chosen technique is at least comparable with the other BAT options. We believe that, based on the information gathered by the BREF process, the chosen technology will achieve the requirements of Chapter IV of the IED for the air emission of TOC/CO and the TOC/LOI on bottom ash. We are also satisfied that the proposed boiler design will be BAT

Decision document

6.2 BAT and emissions control

The prime function of flue gas treatment is to reduce the concentration of pollutants in the exhaust gas as far as practicable. The techniques which are described as BAT individually are targeted to remove specific pollutants, but the BREF notes that there is benefit from considering the Flue Gas Cleaning System (FGC) system as a whole unit. Individual units often interact, providing a primary abatement for some pollutants and an additional effect on others.

The BREF lists the general factors requiring consideration when selecting FGC systems as:

- type of waste, its composition and variation
- type of combustion process, and its size
- flue-gas flow and temperature
- flue-gas content, including magnitude and rate of composition fluctuations
- target emission limit values
- restrictions on discharge of aqueous effluents
- plume visibility requirements
- land and space availability
- availability and cost of outlets for residues accumulated/recovered
- compatibility with any existing process components (existing plants)
- availability and cost of water and other reagents
- energy supply possibilities (e.g. supply of heat from condensing scrubbers)
- reduction of emissions by primary methods
- noise
- arrangement of different flue-gas cleaning devices if possible with decreasing flue-gas temperatures from boiler to stack

Taking these factors into account the BREF points to a range of technologies being BAT subject to circumstances of the Installation.

6.2.1 Particulate Matter

Particulate matter				
Technique	Advantages	Disadvantages	Optimisation	Defined as BAT in BREF or TGN for:
Bag / Fabric filters (BF)	Reliable abatement of particulate matter to below 5mg/m ³	Max temp 250°C Higher energy use than ESP Sensitive to condensation and corrosion	Multiple compartments Bag burst detectors	Most plants

Decision document

Wet scrubbing	May reduce acid gases simultaneously.	Not normally BAT. Liquid effluent produced	Require reheat to prevent visible plume and dew point problems.	Where scrubbing required for other pollutants
Ceramic filters	High temperature applications Smaller plant.	May "blind" more than fabric filters		Small plant. High temperature gas cleaning required.
Electrostatic precipitators (ESP)	Low pressure gradient. Use with BF may reduce the energy consumption of the induced draft fan.	Not normally BAT by itself Risk of dioxin formation if used in 200-400°C range		When used with other particulate abatement plant

The Applicant proposes to use ceramic filters for the abatement of particulate matter.

Ceramic Filters – this technique can be used at higher flue gas temperatures than fabric filters, but filters are more likely to blind. This technique can be BAT for smaller plant or where high temperature gas cleaning is needed.

Emissions of particulate matter have been previously screened out as insignificant, and so we agree that the Applicant's proposed technique is BAT for the installation.

In this case, it is not considered that any of the alternate techniques offer any advantage in comparison with the Applicant's preferred option of ceramic filters and so agrees that the Applicant's proposed technique is BAT for the installation.

Commented [cT1]: Check this as Consultatnt states that this was in email dated 9th may or 5th sept but im not sure if she has mixed this up with the carbon filters at start up and shut down

Decision document

6.2.2 Oxides of Nitrogen

Oxides of Nitrogen : Primary Measures				
Technique	Advantages	Disadvantages	Optimisation	Defined as BAT in BREF or TGN for:
Low NOx burners	Reduces NOx at source		Start-up, supplementary firing.	Where auxiliary burners required.
Starved air systems	Reduce CO simultaneously.			Pyrolysis, Gasification systems.
Optimise primary and secondary air injection				All plant.
Flue Gas Recirculation (FGR)	Reduces the consumption of reagents used for secondary NOx control. May increase overall energy recovery	Some applications experience corrosion problems. Can result in elevated CO and other products of incomplete combustion		Justify if not used

Oxides of Nitrogen : Secondary Measures (BAT is to apply Primary Measures first)				
Technique	Advantages	Disadvantages	Optimisation	Defined as BAT in BREF or TGN for:
Selective catalytic reduction (SCR)	NOx emissions 40-150mg/ m ³ Reduces CO, VOC, dioxins	Expensive. Re-heat required – reduces plant efficiency		All plant
SCR by catalytic filter bags	50-120 mg/m ³			Applicable to new and existing plants with or without existing SNCR. Can be used with NH ₃ as slip catalyst with SNCR

Decision document

Selective non-catalytic reduction (SNCR)	NO _x emissions 80 -180 mg/m ³ Lower energy consumption than SCR Lower costs than SCR	Relies on an optimum temperature around 900 °C, and sufficient retention time for reduction May lead to Ammonia slip	Port injection locations	All plant unless lower NO _x release required for local environmental protection.
Reagent Type: Ammonia	Likely to be BAT	More difficult to handle Lower nitrous oxide formation Narrower temperature window		All plant
Reagent Type: Urea	Likely to be BAT	Higher N ₂ O emissions than ammonia, optimisation particularly important		All plant

The Applicant proposes to implement the following primary measures:

- Low NO_x burners – this technique reduces NO_x at source and is defined as BAT where auxiliary burners are required.
- Optimise primary and secondary air injection – this technique is BAT for all plant.
- Flue gas recirculation – this technique reduces the consumption of reagents for secondary NO_x control and can increase overall energy recovery, although in some applications there can be corrosion problems

There are three recognised techniques for secondary measures to reduce NO_x. These are Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR), SCR by catalytic filter bags and Selective Non-Catalytic Reduction (SNCR) with or without catalytic filter bags. For each technique, there is a choice of urea or ammonia reagent.

SCR can reduce NO_x levels to below 50 mg/m³ and can be applied to all plant, it is generally more expensive than SNCR and requires reheating of the waste gas stream which reduces energy efficiency, periodic replacement of the catalysts also produces a hazardous waste. The use of SCR by catalytic filter bags can reduce emissions to 50 -120 mg/m³ with low investment costs. SNCR can typically reduce NO_x levels to between 80 and 180 mg/m³, it relies on an optimum temperature of around 900 °C and sufficient retention time for reduction. SNCR is more likely to have higher levels of ammonia slip. The technique can be applied to all plant unless lower NO_x releases are required for local environmental protection. Urea or ammonia can be used as the reagent

Decision document

with either technique, urea is somewhat easier to handle than ammonia and has a wider operating temperature window, but tends to result in higher emissions of N₂O. Both reagents are BAT, and the use of one over the other is not normally significant in environmental terms.

The Applicant proposes to use SNCR with urea as the reagent.

Emissions of NO_x are shown as greater than 1% of the ES and therefore cannot be screened out as insignificant. However, the maximum short term Process Contribution (PC) is smaller than 10% of the Environmental Standards (ES) and therefore can be screened out as insignificant. It is not expected to result in the ES being exceeded. It has been previously screened out as insignificant, and so the Environment Agency agrees that the Applicant's proposed technique is BAT for the installation.

that the maximum long term PC is greater than 1% of the ES and therefore cannot be screened out as insignificant. However, from the table above, the emission is not expected to result in the ES being exceeded. The maximum short term PC is smaller than 10% of the ES and therefore can be screened out as insignificant. However, it is not expected to result in the ES being exceeded.

The amount of urea / ammonia used for NO_x abatement will need to be optimised to maximise NO_x reduction and minimise NH₃ slip. Improvement condition IC5 requires the Operator to report to the Environment Agency on optimising the performance of the NO_x abatement system. The BAT AEL for ammonia has been set and the Operator is also required to monitor and report on N₂O emissions every 6 months.

6.2.3 Acid Gases, SO_x, HCl and HF

Acid gases and halogens : Primary Measures				
Technique	Advantages	Disadvantages	Optimisation	Defined as BAT in BREF or TGN for:
Low sulphur fuel, (< 0.1% S gasoil or natural gas)	Reduces SO _x at source		Start-up, supplementary firing.	Where auxiliary fuel required.
Management of waste streams	Disperses sources of acid gases (e.g. PVC) through feed.	Requires closer control of waste management		All plant with heterogeneous waste feed

Decision document

Acid gases and halogens : Secondary Measures (BAT is to apply Primary Measures first)				
Technique	Advantages	Disadvantages	Optimisation	Defined as BAT in BREF or TGN for:
Wet	<p>High reaction rates</p> <p>Low solid residues production</p> <p>Reagent delivery may be optimised by concentration and flow rate</p>	<p>Large effluent disposal and water consumption if not fully treated for recycle</p> <p>Effluent treatment plant required</p> <p>May result in wet plume</p> <p>Energy required for effluent treatment and plume reheat</p>		<p>Used for wide range of waste types</p> <p>Can be used as polishing step after other techniques where emissions are high or variable</p>
Dry	<p>Low water use</p> <p>Higher reagent consumption to achieve emissions of other FGC techniques but may be reduced by recycling in plant</p> <p>Lower energy use</p> <p>Higher reliability</p> <p>Lowest visible plume potential</p>	<p>Higher solid residue production</p> <p>Reagent consumption controlled only by input rate</p>		All plant

Decision document

Semi-dry (also described as semi-wet in the Bref)	Medium reaction rates Reagent delivery may be varied by concentration and input rate	Higher solid waste residues than wet but lower than dry system		All plant
Direct injection into boiler	Reduced acid loading to subsequent cleaning stages. Reduced peak emissions and reduced reagent usage			Generally applicable to grate and rotary kiln plants.
Direction desulphurisation	Reduced boiler corrosion	Does not improve overall performance. Can affect bottom ash quality. Corrosion problems in flue gas cleaning system.		Partial abatement upstream of other techniques in fluidised beds
Reagent Type: Sodium Hydroxide	Highest removal rates Low solid waste production	Corrosive material ETP sludge for disposal		HWIs
Reagent Type: Lime	Very good removal rates Low leaching solid residue	Corrosive material May give greater residue volume	Wide range of uses	MWIs, CWIs

Decision document

	Temperature of reaction well suited to use with bag filters	if no in-plant recycle		
Reagent Type: Sodium Bicarbonate	Good removal rates Easiest to handle Dry recycle systems proven	Efficient temperature range may be at upper end for use with bag filters Leachable solid residues Bicarbonate more expensive	Not proven at large plant	CWIs

The Applicant proposes to implement the following primary measures:

- Use of low sulphur fuels for start-up and auxiliary burners – gas should be used if available, where fuel oil is used, this will be low sulphur (i.e. <0.1%), this will reduce SO_x at source. The Applicant has justified its choice of gasoil/diesel as the support fuel on the basis that the auxiliary boiler should not be fed with fuels which can cause higher emissions than those resulting from the burning of gas oil as defined in Article 2(2) of Council Directive 1999/32/EC of 26 April 1999 relating to a reduction in the sulphur content of certain liquid fuels, liquefied gas, or natural gas' and we agree with that assessment.
- Management of heterogeneous wastes – this will disperse problem wastes such as PVC by ensuring a homogeneous waste feed.

There are five recognised techniques for secondary measures to reduce acid gases, all of which can be BAT. These are wet, dry, semi-dry, boiler sorbent injection and direct desulphurisation. Wet scrubbing produces an effluent for treatment and disposal in compliance with Article 46(3) of IED. It will also require reheat of the exhaust to avoid a visible plume. Wet scrubbing is unlikely to be BAT except where there are high acid gas and metal components in the exhaust gas as may be the case for some hazardous waste incinerators. In this case, the Applicant does not propose using wet scrubbing, and we agree that wet scrubbing is not appropriate in this case. Direct desulphurisation is only applicable for fluidised bed furnaces.

Decision document

The Applicant has considered both dry and semi dry methods of secondary measures for acid gas abatement. Any of these methods can be BAT for this type of facility.

Both dry and semi-dry methods rely on the dosing of powdered materials into the exhaust gas stream. Semi-dry systems (i.e. hydrated reagent) offer reduced material consumption through faster reaction rates, but reagent recycling in dry systems can offset this.

In both dry and semi-dry systems, the injected powdered reagent reacts with the acid gases and is removed from the gas stream by the bag filter system. The powdered materials are either lime or sodium bicarbonate. Both are effective at reducing acid gases, and dosing rates can be controlled from continuously monitoring acid gas emissions. The decision on which reagent to use is normally economic. Lime produces a lower leaching solid residue in the APC residues than sodium bicarbonate and the reaction temperature is well suited to bag filters, it tends to be lower cost, but it is a corrosive material and can generate a greater volume of solid waste residues than sodium bicarbonate. Both reagents are BAT, and the use of one over the other is not significant in environmental terms in this case.

Direct boiler injection is applicable for all plants and can improve overall performance of the acid gas abatement system as well as reducing reagent usage.

In this case, the Applicant proposes to use a dry scrubbing system. We are satisfied that this is BAT

6.2.4 Carbon monoxide and volatile organic compounds (VOCs)

The prevention and minimisation of emissions of carbon monoxide and volatile organic compounds is through the optimisation of combustion controls, where all measures will increase the oxidation of these species.

Carbon monoxide and volatile organic compounds (VOCs)				
Technique	Advantages	Disadvantages	Optimisation	Defined as BAT in BREF or TGN for:
Optimise combustion control	All measures will increase oxidation of these species.		Covered in section on furnace selection	All plants

Decision document

6.2.5 Dioxins and furans (and other POPs)

Dioxins and furans				
Technique	Advantages	Disadvantages	Optimisation	Defined as BAT in BREF or TGN for:
Optimise combustion control	All measures will increase oxidation of these species.		Covered in section on furnace selection	All plants
Avoid de novo synthesis			Covered in boiler design	All plant
Effective Particulate matter removal			Covered in section on particulate matter	All plant
Activated Carbon injection	Can be combined with acid gas absorber or fed separately. Metallic mercury is also absorbed.	Combined feed rate usually controlled by acid gas content.		All plant. Separate feed normally BAT unless feed is constant and acid gas control also controls dioxin release.
Catalytic filter bags	High destruction efficiency	Does not remove mercury. Higher cost than non-catalytic filter bags		

The prevention and minimisation of emissions of dioxins and furans is achieved through:

- optimisation of combustion control including the maintenance of permit conditions on combustion temperature and residence time, which has been considered in 6.1.1 above;
- avoidance of de novo synthesis, which has been covered in the consideration of boiler design;
- the effective removal of particulate matter, which has been considered in 6.2.1 above;
- injection of activated carbon. This can be combined with the acid gas reagent or dosed separately. Where the feed is combined, the combined feed rate will be controlled by the acid gas concentration in the exhaust. Therefore, separate feed of activated carbon would normally be considered BAT unless the feed was relatively constant. Effective

Decision document

control of acid gas emissions also assists in the control of dioxin releases.

- Use of catalytic filter bags. These can achieve low levels of emissions but mercury is not removed

In this case the Applicant proposes separate feed with continuous dosage and we are satisfied their proposals are BAT.

6.2.6 Metals

Metals				
Technique	Advantages	Disadvantages	Optimisation	Defined as BAT in BREF or TGN for:
Effective Particulate matter removal			Covered in section on particulate matter	All plant
Activated Carbon injection for mercury recovery	Can be combined with acid gas absorber or fed separately. Can be impregnated with bromine or sulphur to enhance reactivity, for use during peak emissions.	Combined feed rate usually controlled by acid gas content.		All plant. Separate feed normally BAT unless feed is constant and acid gas control also controls dioxin release.
Fixed or moving bed adsorption	Mainly for mercury and other metals, as well as organic compounds			Limited applicability due to pressure drop
Boiler bromine injection	Injection during mercury peaks. Oxidation of mercury leading to improved removal in downstream removal method.	Consumption of aqueous bromine. Can lead to formation of polybrominated dioxins. Can damage bag filter. Effects can be limited use is restricted to dealing with peak emissions		Not suitable for pyrolysis or gasification. Can deal with mercury peaks.

Decision document

The prevention and minimisation of metal emissions is achieved through the effective removal of particulate matter, and this has been considered in 6.2.1 above.

Unlike other metals however, mercury if present will be in the vapour phase. BAT for mercury removal is one or a combination of the techniques listed above. The Applicant has proposed dosing of activated carbon into the exhaust gas stream. This can be combined with the acid gas reagent or dosed separately. Where the feed is combined, the combined feed rate will be controlled by the acid gas concentration in the exhaust. Therefore, separate feed of activated carbon would normally be considered BAT unless the feed was relatively constant.

In this case the Applicant proposes separate feed and we are satisfied their proposals are BAT. We are satisfied that

6.3 BAT and global warming potential

This section summarises the assessment of greenhouse gas impacts which has been made in the determination of this Application. Emissions of carbon dioxide (CO₂) and other greenhouse gases differ from those of other pollutants in that, except at gross levels, they have no localised environmental impact. Their impact is at a global level and in terms of climate change. Nonetheless, CO₂ is clearly a pollutant for IED purposes.

The principal greenhouse gas emitted is CO₂, but the plant also emits small amounts of N₂O arising from the operation of secondary NO_x abatement. N₂O has a global warming potential 310 times that of CO₂. The Applicant will therefore be required to optimise the performance of the secondary NO_x abatement system to ensure its GWP impact is minimised.

The major source of greenhouse gas emissions from the installation is however CO₂ from the combustion of waste. There will also be CO₂ emissions from the burning of support fuels at start up, shut down and should it be necessary to maintain combustion temperatures. BAT for greenhouse gas emissions is to maximise energy recovery and efficiency.

The electricity that is generated by the Installation will displace emissions of CO₂ elsewhere in the UK, as virgin fossil fuels will not be burnt to create the same electricity.

The Installation is not subject to the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Trading Scheme Regulations 2012 therefore it is a requirement of the IED to investigate how emissions of greenhouse gases emitted from the installation might be prevented or minimised.

Decision document

Factors influencing GWP and CO₂ emissions from the Installation are:

On the debit side

- CO₂ emissions from the burning of the waste;
- CO₂ emissions from burning auxiliary or supplementary fuels;
- CO₂ emissions associated with electrical energy used;
- N₂O from the de-NO_x process.

On the credit side

- CO₂ saved from the export of electricity to the public supply by displacement of burning of virgin fuels;

The GWP of the plant will be dominated by the emissions of carbon dioxide that will be released as a result of waste combustion. This will be constant for all options considered in the BAT assessment. Any differences in the GWP of the options in the BAT appraisal will therefore arise from small differences in energy recovery and in the amount of N₂O emitted.

The Applicant considered energy efficiency and BAT for the de-NO_x process in its BAT assessment. This is set out in sections 4.3.7, 6.1.1 and 6.2.2 of this document.

Note: avoidance of methane which would be formed if the waste was landfilled has not been included in this assessment. If it were included due to its avoidance it would be included on the credit side.

Taking all these factors into account, the Operator's assessment shows their preferred option is best in terms of GWP.

We agree with this assessment and that the chosen option is BAT for the installation.

6.4 BAT and POPs

International action on Persistent Organic pollutants (POPs) is required under the UN's Stockholm Convention, which entered into force in 2004. The EU implemented the Convention through the POPs Regulation (2019/1021), which is directly applicable in UK law. We are required by national POPs Regulations (SI 2007 No 3106) to give effect to Article 6(3) of the EC POPs Regulation when determining applications for environmental permits.

However, it needs to be borne in mind that this application is for a particular type of installation, namely a waste incinerator. The Stockholm Convention distinguishes between intentionally-produced and unintentionally-produced POPs. Intentionally-produced POPs are those used deliberately (mainly in the past) in agriculture (primarily as pesticides) and industry. Those intentionally-produced POPs are not relevant where waste incineration is concerned, as in fact high-temperature incineration is one of the prescribed methods for destroying POPs.

Decision document

The unintentionally-produced POPs addressed by the Convention are:

- dioxins and furans;
- HCB (hexachlorobenzene)
- PCBs (polychlorobiphenyls) and
- PeCB (pentachlorobenzene)

The UK's national implementation plan for the Stockholm Convention, published in 2007, makes explicit that the relevant controls for unintentionally-produced POPs, such as might be produced by waste incineration, are delivered through the requirements of the IED. That would include an examination of BAT, including potential alternative techniques, with a view to preventing or minimising harmful emissions. These have been applied as explained in this document, which explicitly addresses alternative techniques and BAT for the minimisation of emissions of dioxins.

Our legal obligation, under regulation 4(b) of the POPs Regulations, is, when considering an application for an environmental permit, to comply with article 6(3) of the POPs Regulation:

"Member States shall, when considering proposals to construct new facilities or to significantly modify existing facilities using processes that release chemicals listed in Annex III, give priority consideration to alternative processes, techniques or practices that have similar usefulness but which avoid the formation and release of substances listed in Annex III, without prejudice to Directive 2010/75/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council"

The 1998 Protocol to the Convention recommended that unintentionally produced POPs should be controlled by imposing emission limits (e.g 0.1 ng/m³ for MWIs) and using BAT for incineration. UN Economic Commission for Europe (Executive Body for the Convention) (ECE-EB) produced BAT guidance for the parties to the Convention in 2009. This document considers various control techniques and concludes that primary measures involving management of feed material by reducing halogenated substances are not technically effective. This is not surprising because halogenated wastes still need to be disposed of and because POPs can be generated from relatively low concentrations of halogens. In summary, the successful control techniques for waste incinerators listed in the ECE-EB BAT are:

- maintaining furnace temperature of 850°C and a combustion gas residence time of at least 2 seconds
- rapid cooling of flue gases to avoid the *de novo* reformation temperature range of 250-450°C
- use of bag filters and the injection of activated carbon or coke to adsorb residual POPs components.

Using the methods listed above, the UN-ECE BAT document concludes that incinerators can achieve an emission concentration of 0.1 ng TEQ/m³.

Decision document

We believe that the Permit ensures that the formation and release of POPs will be prevented or minimised. As we explain above, high-temperature incineration is one of the prescribed methods for destroying POPs. Permit conditions are based on the use of BAT and Chapter IV of the IED and incorporate all the above requirements of the UN-ECE BAT guidance and deliver the requirements of the Stockholm Convention in relation to unintentionally produced POPs.

The release of **dioxins and furans** to air is required by the IED to be assessed against the International Toxic Equivalence (I-TEQ) limit of 0.1 ng/m³. Further development of the understanding of the harm caused by dioxins has resulted in the World Health Organisation (WHO) producing updated factors to calculate the WHO-TEQ value. Certain **PCBs** have structures which make them behave like dioxins (dioxin-like PCBs), and these also have toxic equivalence factors defined by the WHO to make them capable of being considered together with dioxins. The UK's independent health advisory committee, the Committee on Toxicity of Chemicals in Food, Consumer Products and the Environment (COT) has adopted WHO-TEQ values for both dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs in their review of Tolerable Daily Intake (TDI) criteria. The Permit requires that, in addition to the requirements of the IED, the WHO-TEQ values for both dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs should be monitored for reporting purposes, to enable evaluation of exposure to dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs to be made using the revised TDI recommended by the COT. The release of dioxin-like PCBs and PAHs is expected to be low where measures have been taken to control dioxin releases. The Permit also requires monitoring of a range of PAHs and dioxin-like PCBs at the same frequency as dioxins are monitored. We have included a requirement to monitor and report against these WHO-TEQ values for dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs and the range of PAHs as listed in the Permit. We are confident that the measures taken to control the release of dioxins will also control the releases of dioxin-like PCBs and PAHs. Section 5.2.1 of this document details the assessment of emissions to air, which includes dioxins and concludes that there will be no adverse effect on human health from either normal or abnormal operation.

Hexachlorobenzene (HCB) is released into the atmosphere as an accidental product from the combustion of coal, waste incineration and certain metal processes. It has also been used as a fungicide, especially for seed treatment although this use has been banned in the UK since 1975. Natural fires and volcanoes may serve as natural sources. Releases of (HCB) are addressed by the European Environment Agency (EEA), which advises that:

"due to comparatively low levels in emissions from most (combustion) processes special measures for HCB control are usually not proposed. HCB emissions can be controlled generally like other chlorinated organic compounds in emissions, for instance dioxins/furans and PCBs: regulation of time of combustion, combustion temperature, temperature in cleaning devices, sorbents application for waste gases cleaning etc." [reference http://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/EMEPCORINAIR4/sources_of_HCB.pdf]

Decision document

Pentachlorobenzene (PeCB) is another of the POPs list to be considered under incineration. PeCB has been used as a fungicide or flame retardant, there is no data available however on production, recent or past, outside the UN-ECE region. PeCBs can be emitted from the same sources as for PCDD/F: waste incineration, thermal metallurgic processes and combustion plants providing energy. As discussed above, the control techniques described in the UN-ECE BAT guidance and included in the permit, are effective in controlling the emissions of all relevant POPs including PeCB.

We have assessed the control techniques proposed for dioxins by the Applicant and have concluded that they are appropriate for dioxin control. We are confident that these controls are in line with the UN-ECE BAT guidance and will minimise the release of HCB, PCB and PeCB.

We are therefore satisfied that the substantive requirements of the Convention and the POPs Regulation have been addressed and complied with.

6.5 Other Emissions to the Environment

6.5.1 Emissions to water

There will be no process effluent emissions to water from the installation. The facility is designed as zero-discharge with all process effluent being reused for IBA quenching.

Due to the nature of the plant (oil-based ORC, dry gas treatment etc) process water emissions are limited to process area wash down, contaminated rain water etc, and harvested for use within the ash quench system.

To minimise the consumption of water the process, including the air-cooled condensers and the fire suppression system, uses rainwater from the process building roof rainwater harvesting system to reduce the need for mains water. Most of the rainfall upon the roof of the site is available for use within the process through this recovery system.

Based upon the information in the Application we are satisfied that appropriate measures will be in place to prevent and /or minimise emissions to water.

6.5.2 Emissions to sewer

Beyond the release of treated domestic effluent, there are no site discharges to sewer arising from the installation.

Based upon the information in the Application we are satisfied that appropriate measures will be in place to prevent and /or minimise emissions to sewer.

6.5.3 Fugitive emissions

Decision document

The IED specifies that plants must be able to demonstrate that the plant is designed in such a way as to prevent the unauthorised and accidental release of polluting substances into soil, surface water and groundwater. In addition storage requirements for waste and for contaminated water under Article 46(5) of the IED must be arranged.

The below table describes the applicants proposals

Indicative BAT	Justification
Dust controls	
Covering of skips and vessels	There will be no open skips or vessels at the facility which could give rise to fugitive emissions.
Avoidance of outdoor or uncovered stockpiles (where possible)	There will be no outdoor or uncovered stockpiles which could give rise to fugitive emissions.
Where dust creation is unavoidable, use of sprays, binders, stockpile management techniques, windbreaks and so on	N/A
Regular wheel and road cleaning (avoiding transfer of pollution to water and wind blow)	Due to the nature of the operations, problems with wheel contamination are not expected to be significant. All areas of the site will have hardstanding.
Closed conveyors, pneumatic or screw conveying (noting the higher energy needs), minimising drops. Filters on the conveyors to clean the transport air prior to release	Feed systems are simple and enclosed.
Regular housekeeping	The site staff will be fully trained and regularly audited through the EMS to ensure that housekeeping measures are appropriate to the nature and scale of the activities and that there is minimum possibility of uncontrolled emissions.
The recycling of by-products	All waste will be removed from site by covered vehicles.
Enclosed containers or sealed bags used for smaller quantities of fine materials	No materials will be stored outside. Small volumes of materials for maintenance etc. shall be stored in appropriate containers, sealed so as to prevent fugitive emissions.
Mobile and stationary vacuum cleaning	Mobile and stationary vacuum cleaning will be used if necessary.
Closed storage with automatic handling system	All storage is closed and transferred using an automated handling system.
Sealed charging system	The charging system is fully enclosed.
VOC control measures	N/A

Based upon the information in the Application we are satisfied that appropriate measures will be in place to prevent and /or minimise fugitive emissions.

6.5.4 Odour

Based upon the information in the Application we are satisfied that the appropriate measures will be in place to prevent or where that is not practicable to minimise odour and to prevent pollution from odour.

Waste accepted at the installation will be delivered in covered vehicles or within containers and bulk storage of waste will only occur in the installation's waste reception. A roller shutter door will be used to close the entrance to the tipping hall outside of the waste delivery periods and combustion air will be drawn from

Decision document

above the waste storage bunker in order to prevent odours and airborne particulates from leaving the facility building.

During shut-down the Applicant had proposed to extract air via an alternative system comprising of carbon filters.

6.5.5 Noise and vibration

A noise impact assessment has been carried out as part of the permit application which demonstrates that the noise impacts from site will have an insignificant effect on existing residential receptors due to the appropriate design, mitigation, and intervening distances to the nearest residential receptors.

All operational measures provided within the guidance will be carried out with noise attenuation being used where necessary.

In line with BAT the following techniques will be used on site:

- Appropriate location of equipment and buildings;
- Operational measures;
- Low-noise equipment;
- Noise Attenuation; and
- Noise-control equipment / infrastructure

Based upon the information in the Application we are satisfied that the appropriate measures will be in place to prevent or where that is not practicable to minimise noise and vibration and to prevent pollution from noise and vibration outside the site. We have included pre-operational condition PO10 which requires an updated NMP to be submitted for our approval following final design.

The Application contained a noise impact assessment which identified local noise-sensitive receptors, potential sources of noise at the proposed plant and noise attenuation measures. Measurements were taken of the prevailing ambient noise levels to produce a baseline noise survey and an assessment was carried out in accordance with BS 4142:2014 to compare the predicted plant rating noise levels with the established background levels.

6.6 **Setting ELVs and other Permit conditions**

6.6.1 Translating BAT into Permit conditions

Article 14(3) of the IED states that BAT-C shall be the reference for permit conditions. Article 15(3) further requires that under normal operating conditions; emissions do not exceed the emission levels associated with the BAT as laid down in the decisions on BAT-C.

BAT-C for waste incineration or co-incineration were published on 03/12/2019

The use of BAT AELs and IED Chapter IV emission limits for air dispersion modelling sets the worst case scenario. If this shows emissions are insignificant

Decision document

then we have accepted that the Applicant's proposals are BAT, and that there is no justification to reduce ELVs below the BAT AELs and Chapter IV limits.

Below we consider whether, for those emissions not screened out as insignificant, different conditions are required as a result of consideration of local or other factors, so that no significant pollution is caused (Article 11(c)) or to comply with environmental quality standards (EQS) (Article 18).

(i) Local factors

We have considered the location when assessing BAT, including proximity of human and ecological receptors, and the AQMA for Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂) – Annual Mean covering Plymouth City. We are satisfied that the BAT measures described will ensure a high level of protection for the environment and human health.

(ii) National and European Ess

We have assessed emissions against National and European environmental quality standards, determining that the Installation can comply without requiring stricter conditions than BAT.

(iii) Global Warming

CO₂ is an inevitable product of the combustion of waste. The amount of CO₂ emitted will be essentially determined by the quantity and characteristics of waste being incinerated, which are already subject to conditions in the Permit. It is therefore inappropriate to set an ELV for CO₂, which could do no more than recognise what is going to be emitted. The gas is not therefore targeted as a key pollutant under Annex II of the IED, which lists the main polluting substances that are to be considered when setting ELVs in permits.

We have therefore considered setting equivalent parameters or technical measures for CO₂. However, provided energy is recovered efficiently (see section 4.3.7 above), there are no additional equivalent technical measures (beyond those relating to the quantity and characteristics of the waste) that can be imposed that do not run counter to the primary purpose of the plant, which is the destruction of waste/recovery of energy from waste. Controls in the form of restrictions on the volume and type of waste that can be accepted at the Installation and Permit conditions relating to energy efficiency effectively apply equivalent technical measures to limit CO₂ emissions.

(iv) Commissioning

Short narrative needed linking to Commissioning Conditions

6.7 Monitoring

6.7.1 Monitoring during normal operations

Decision document

We have decided that monitoring should be carried out for the parameters listed in Schedule 3 using the methods and to the frequencies specified in those tables. These monitoring requirements have been imposed in order to demonstrate compliance with ELVs and to enable correction of measured concentration of substances to the appropriate reference conditions; to gather information about the performance of the SNCR system; to establish data on the release of dioxin-like PCBs and PAHs from the incineration process and to deliver the requirements of Chapter IV of the IED for monitoring of residues and temperature in the combustion chamber.

For emissions to air, the methods for continuous and periodic monitoring are in accordance with our guidance for monitoring of stack emissions to air.

Based on the information in the Application and the requirements set in the conditions of the Permit we are satisfied that the Operator's techniques, personnel and equipment will have either MCERTS certification or MCERTS accreditation as appropriate.

6.7.2 Monitoring under abnormal operations arising from the failure of the installed CEMS

The Operator has stated that they will provide back-up CEMS working in parallel to the operating CEMS. These will be switched into full operation immediately in the event that there is any failure in the regular monitoring equipment. The back-up CEMS measure the same parameters as the operating CEMS. In the unlikely event that the back-up CEMS also fail Condition 2.3.10 of the permit requires that the abnormal operating conditions apply.

6.7.3 Continuous emissions monitoring for dioxins and heavy metals

The BAT-C specify either manual extractive monitoring or long term monitoring for dioxins. For mercury either continuous or long term monitoring is specified, manual extractive monitoring is specified for other metals.

For dioxins long term monitoring does not apply if emissions are stable, and for mercury long term monitoring can be used instead of continuous if the mercury content of the waste is low and stable.

Based on the waste types and control measures proposed in the Application we expect that emissions of dioxins will be stable and that the mercury content of the waste will be low and stable. We have therefore set manual extractive monitoring in the Permit. However, the Permit requires the stable and low criteria to be demonstrated through Improvement conditions IC8 and IC9 and we can require long term monitoring for dioxins and continuous monitoring for mercury if required.

Drafting note: The above paragraph will be needed or similar amended text. Seek advice before finalising this section

Decision document

6.8 Reporting

We have specified the reporting requirements in Schedule 5 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 us to ensure compliance with the Permit conditions and to monitor the efficiency of material use and energy recovery at the installation.

7 Other legal requirements

In this section we explain how we have addressed other relevant legal requirements, to the extent that we have not addressed them elsewhere in this document.

7.1 The EPR 2016 and related Directives

The EPR delivers the requirements of a number of European and national laws.

7.1.1 Schedules 1 and 7 to the EPR 2016 – IED Directive

We address the requirements of the IED in the body of this document above and the specific requirements of Chapter IV in Annex 1 of this document.

There is one requirement not addressed above, which is that contained in Article 5(3) IED. Article 5(3) requires that “In the case of a new installation or a substantial change where Article 4 of Directive 85/337/EC (now Directive 2011/92/EU) (the EIA Directive) applies, any relevant information obtained or conclusion arrived at pursuant to articles 5, 6 and 7 of that Directive shall be examined and used for the purposes of granting the permit.”

- Article 5 of EIA Directive relates to the obligation on developers to supply the information set out in Annex IV of the Directive when making an application for development consent.
- Article 6(1) requires Member States to ensure that the authorities likely to be concerned by a development by reason of their specific environmental responsibilities are consulted on the Environmental Statement and the request for development consent.
- Article 6(2)-6(6) makes provision for public consultation on applications for development consent.
- Article 7 relates to projects with transboundary effects and consequential obligations to consult with affected Member States.

The grant or refusal of development consent is a matter for the relevant local planning authority. The Environment Agency’s obligation is therefore to examine and use any relevant information obtained or conclusion arrived at by the local planning authorities pursuant to those EIA Directive articles.

In determining the Application we have considered the following documents: -

- The Environmental Statement submitted with the planning application (which also formed part of the Environmental Permit Application).
- The response of the Environment Agency to the local planning authority in its role as consultee to the planning process.

We have complied with our obligation under Article 9(2) so far as we are able in that no conclusion has yet been arrived at. From consideration of the Environmental Statement and our response as consultee to the planning

Decision document

process we are satisfied that no additional or different permit conditions are necessary.

The Environment Agency has also carried out its own consultation on the Environmental Permitting Application which includes the Environmental Statement submitted to the local planning authority. The results of our consultation are described elsewhere in this decision document.

7.1.2 Schedule 9 to the EPR 2016 – Waste Framework Directive

As the Installation involves the treatment of waste, it is carrying out a *waste operation* for the purposes of the EPR 2016, and the requirements of Schedule 9 therefore apply. This means that we must exercise our functions so as to ensure implementation of certain articles of the WFD.

We must exercise our relevant functions for the purposes of ensuring that the waste hierarchy referred to in Article 4 of the Waste Framework Directive is applied to the generation of waste and that any waste generated is treated in accordance with Article 4 of the Waste Framework Directive. (See also section 4.3.9)

The conditions of the permit ensure that waste generation from the facility is minimised. Where the production of waste cannot be prevented it will be recovered wherever possible or otherwise disposed of in a manner that minimises its impact on the environment. This is in accordance with Article 4.

We must also exercise our relevant functions for the purposes of implementing Article 13 of the Waste Framework Directive; ensuring that the requirements in the second paragraph of Article 23(1) of the Waste Framework Directive are met; and ensuring compliance with Articles 18(2)(b), 18(2)(c), 23(3), 23(4) and 35(1) of the Waste Framework Directive.

Article 13 relates to the protection of human health and the environment. These objectives are addressed elsewhere in this document.

Article 23(1) requires the permit to specify:

- (a) the types and quantities of waste that may be treated;
- (b) for each type of operation permitted, the technical and any other requirements relevant to the site concerned;
- (c) the safety and precautionary measures to be taken;
- (d) the method to be used for each type of operation;
- (e) such monitoring and control operations as may be necessary;
- (f) such closure and after-care provisions as may be necessary.

These are all covered by permit conditions.

The permit does not allow the mixing of hazardous waste so Article 18(2) is not relevant.

Decision document

We consider that the intended method of waste treatment is acceptable from the point of view of environmental protection so Article 23(3) does not apply.

Energy efficiency is dealt with elsewhere in this document but we consider the conditions of the permit ensure that the recovery of energy take place with a high level of energy efficiency in accordance with Article 23(4).

Article 35(1) relates to record keeping and its requirements are delivered through permit conditions.

7.1.3 Schedule 22 to the EPR 2016 – Water Framework and Groundwater Directives

To the extent that it might lead to a discharge of pollutants to groundwater (a “groundwater activity” under the EPR 2016), the Permit is subject to the requirements of Schedule 22, which delivers the requirements of EU Directives relating to pollution of groundwater. The Permit will require the taking of all necessary measures to prevent the input of any hazardous substances to groundwater, and to limit the input of non-hazardous pollutants into groundwater so as to ensure such pollutants do not cause pollution, and satisfies the requirements of Schedule 22.

No releases to groundwater from the Installation are permitted. The Permit also requires material storage areas to be designed and maintained to a high standard to prevent accidental releases.

7.1.4 Directive 2003/35/EC – The Public Participation Directive

Regulation 60 of the EPR 2016 requires the Environment Agency to prepare and publish a statement of its policies for complying with its public participation duties. We have published our public participation statement.

This Application has been consulted upon in line with this statement, as well as with our guidance RGS6 on Sites of High Public Interest, which addresses specifically extended consultation arrangements for determinations where public interest is particularly high. This satisfies the requirements of the Public Participation Directive.

Our decision in this case has been reached following a programme of extended public consultation, on the original application. The way in which this has been done is set out in Section 2. A summary of the responses received to our consultations and our consideration of them is set out in Annex 2.

7.2 National primary legislation

7.2.1 Environment Act 1995

- (i) Section 4 (Pursuit of Sustainable Development)

Decision document

We are required to contribute towards achieving sustainable development, as considered appropriate by Ministers and set out in guidance issued to us. The Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs has issued *The Environment Agency's Objectives and Contribution to Sustainable Development: Statutory Guidance (December 2002)*. This document:

"provides guidance to the Agency on such matters as the formulation of approaches that the Agency should take to its work, decisions about priorities for the Agency and the allocation of resources. It is not directly applicable to individual regulatory decisions of the Agency".

In respect of regulation of industrial pollution through the EPR, the Guidance refers in particular to the objective of setting permit conditions "*in a consistent and proportionate fashion based on Best Available Techniques and taking into account all relevant matters...*". The Environment Agency considers that it has pursued the objectives set out in the Government's guidance, where relevant, and that there are no additional conditions that should be included in this Permit to take account of the Section 4 duty.

(ii) Section 5 (Preventing or Minimising Effects of Pollution of the Environment)

We are satisfied that our pollution control powers have been exercised for the purpose of preventing or minimising, remedying or mitigating the effects of pollution.

(iii) Section 6(1) (Conservation Duties with Regard to Water)

We have a duty to the extent we consider it desirable generally to promote the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty and amenity of inland and coastal waters and the land associated with such waters, and the conservation of flora and fauna which are dependent on an aquatic environment.

We consider that no additional or different conditions are appropriate for this Permit.

(iv) Section 6(6) (Fisheries)

We have a duty to maintain, improve and develop fisheries of salmon, trout, eels, lampreys, smelt and freshwater fish.

We consider that no additional or different conditions are appropriate for this Permit.

Decision document

(v) Section 7 (General Environmental Duties)

This places a duty on us, when considering any proposal relating to our functions, to have regard amongst other things to any effect which the proposals would have on sites of archaeological, architectural, or historic interest; the economic and social well-being of local communities in rural areas; and to take into account any effect which the proposals would have on the beauty or amenity of any rural or urban area or on any such flora, fauna, features, buildings, sites or objects.

We considered whether we should impose any additional or different requirements in terms of our duty to have regard to the various conservation objectives set out in Section 7, but concluded that we should not.

(vi) Section 39 (Costs and Benefits)

We have a duty to take into account the likely costs and benefits of our decisions on the applications ('costs' being defined as including costs to the environment as well as any person). This duty, however, does not affect our obligation to discharge any duties imposed upon us in other legislative provisions.

In so far as relevant we consider that the costs that the permit may impose on the applicant are reasonable and proportionate in terms of the benefits it provides.

(viii) Section 81 (National Air Quality Strategy)

We have had regard to the National Air Quality Strategy and consider that our decision complies with the Strategy, and that no additional or different conditions are appropriate for this Permit.

We have also had regard to the clean air strategy 2019 and consider that our decision complies with the Strategy, and that no additional or different conditions are appropriate for this Permit.

We have had regard to the National Air Pollution Control Programme (set under the National Emissions Ceiling Regulations 2018) and consider that our decision complies with the Strategy, and that no additional or different conditions are appropriate for this Permit.

7.2.2 Section 108 Deregulation Act 2015 – Growth duty

We 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

Decision document

the guidance issued under section 110 of that Act in deciding whether to grant this permit.

Paragraph 1.3 of the statutory guidance issued by the Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy in March 2017 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 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. It also ensures that any pollution that may arise from the regulated facility does not adversely affect local businesses.

7.2.3 Human Rights Act 1998

We have considered potential interference with rights addressed by the European Convention on Human Rights in reaching our decision and consider that our decision is compatible with our duties under the Human Rights Act 1998. In particular, we have considered the right to life (Article 2), the right to a fair trial (Article 6), the right to respect for private and family life (Article 8) and the right to protection of property (Article 1, First Protocol). We do not believe that Convention rights are engaged in relation to this determination.

7.2.4 Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW 2000)

Section 85 of this Act imposes a duty on Environment Agency to have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty (AONB). There is no AONB which could be affected by the Installation.

7.2.5 Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981

Under section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 the Environment Agency has a duty to take reasonable steps to further the conservation and

Decision document

enhancement of the flora, fauna or geological or physiographical features by reason of which a site is of special scientific interest. Under section 28I the Environment Agency has a duty to consult Natural England in relation to any permit that is likely to damage SSSIs.

The Wildlife and Countryside Act (CRoW) assessment is summarised in greater detail in section 5.4 of this document. A copy of the full Appendix 4 Assessment can be found on the public register.

7.2.6 Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006

Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 has been amended with effect from 1 January 2023 to require consideration of the general biodiversity objective, which is to further the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity through the exercise of our functions. We have considered the general biodiversity objective when carrying out our permit application determination and, consider that no different or additional conditions are required in the permit.

7.2.7 Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009

Section 58 of this Act requires us to act in accordance with appropriate marine policy documents, unless relevant considerations indicate otherwise.

Section 125 of this Act requires that, so far as is consistent with their proper exercise, we exercise our functions in a manner that we consider best furthers the conservation objectives stated for Marine Conservation Zone(s) (MCZs) certain features of which are capable of being affected by our determination (to more than an insignificant degree) or else, where this is not possible, which least hinders the achievement of those objectives.

Section 126 of this Act requires that, before granting a Permit for an Installation capable of affecting certain features of a MCZ(s) (to more than an insignificant degree), we consult with Natural England and that we are satisfied that there is no significant risk of the operation of the Installation hindering the achievement of the conservation objectives stated for any relevant MCZ(s).

We have considered the Application and are satisfied that it would not affect, to more than an insignificant degree, the protected features of MCZs or the ecological or geomorphological process on which the conservation of such features are dependent

7.2.8 Countryside Act 1968

Decision document

Section 11 imposes a duty on the Environment Agency to exercise its functions relating to any land, having regard to the desirability of conserving the natural beauty and amenity of the countryside including wildlife. We have done so and consider that no different or additional conditions in the Permit are required.

7.2.9 National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949

Section 11A and section 5(1) imposes a duty on the Environment Agency when exercising its functions in relation to land in a National Park, to have regard to the purposes of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the areas, and of promoting opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of National Parks by the public.

We have done so and consider that no different or additional conditions in the Permit are required. There is no National Park which could be affected by the Installation.

7.3 National secondary legislation

7.3.1 Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017

We have assessed the Application in accordance with our guidance and concluded that there will be no likely significant effects on any European Site.

We consulted Natural England on the appropriate assessment, and they agreed with our conclusion, that the operation of the Installation would not have adverse effects on the interest features of European sites.

The Habitats Regulations Assessment is summarised in greater detail in section 5.4 of this document. A copy of the Habitats Regulations Assessment can be found on the public register.

We have also considered our general duties under Regulation 9(3) to have regard to the requirements of the Habitats Directive in the exercise of our powers and under Regulation 10 in relation to wild bird habitat to take such steps in the exercise of their functions as they consider appropriate so far as lies within our powers to secure preservation, maintenance and re-establishment of a sufficient diversity and area of habitat for wild birds.

We considered whether we should impose any additional or different requirements in the permit in terms of these duties but concluded that we should not.

7.3.2 Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) Regulations 2017

Decision document

Consideration has been given to whether any additional requirements should be imposed in terms of the Environment Agency's duty under regulation 3 to secure compliance with the requirements of the Water Framework Directive, Groundwater Directive and the EQS Directive through, amongst other things, environmental permits, and its obligation in regulation 33 to have regard to the river basin management plan (RBMP) approved under regulation 31 and any supplementary plans prepared under regulation 32. However, it is felt that existing conditions are sufficient in this regard and no other appropriate requirements have been identified.

We are satisfied that granting this application with the conditions proposed would not cause the current status of the water body to deteriorate, and that it will not compromise the ability of this water body to achieve good status

With respect to shellfish waters designated in accordance with Regulation 9, the RBMP contains measures to ensure water quality necessary or desirable to improve or protect those shellfish waters in order to support shellfish life and growth and to contribute to the high quality of shellfish products suitable for human consumption.

We consider that no additional or different conditions are appropriate for this Permit to achieve these shellfish water objectives

7.3.3 The Persistent Organic Pollutants Regulations 2007

We have explained our approach to these Regulations, which give effect to the Stockholm Convention on POPs and the EU's POPs Regulation, above.

7.3.4 Bathing Water Regulations 2013

We have considered our duty, under regulation 5 of these Regulations, to exercise our relevant functions to ensure compliance with the Bathing Water Directive, and in particular to take realistic and proportionate measures with a view to increasing the number of bathing waters classified as "good" or "excellent".

We consider that no additional or different conditions are appropriate for this Permit.

7.3.5 Marine Strategy Regulations 2010

In relation to Regulation 9 of the Marine Strategy Regulations 2010 we have had regard to the marine strategy (in so far as it has been developed and published to date) and consider that there is nothing in it which would lead us to any different conclusions from those we have already reached through our other marine assessments.

Decision document

7.4 Other relevant legal requirements

7.4.1 Duty to Involve

Section 23 of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 require us where we consider it appropriate to take such steps as we consider appropriate to secure the involvement of interested persons in the exercise of our functions by providing them with information, consulting them or involving them in any other way. Section 24 requires us to have regard to any Secretary of State guidance as to how we should do that.

The way in which the Environment Agency has consulted with the public and other interested parties is set out in section 2.2 of this document. The way in which we have taken account of the representations we have received is set out in Annex 4. Our public consultation duties are also set out in the EP Regulations, and our statutory Public Participation Statement, which implement the requirements of the Public Participation Directive. In addition to meeting our consultation responsibilities, we have also taken account of our guidance in Environment Agency Guidance Note RGS6.

Annexes

Annex 1A: Application of chapter IV of the Industrial Emissions Directive

IED Article	Requirement	Delivered by
45(1)(a)	The permit shall include a list of all types of waste which may be treated using at least the types of waste set out in the European Waste List established by Decision 2000/532/EC, if possible, and containing information on the quantity of each type of waste, where appropriate.	Condition 2.3.4(a) and Table S2.2 in Schedule 2 of the Permit.
45(1)(b)	The permit shall include the total waste incinerating or co-incinerating capacity of the plant.	Condition 2.3.4(a) and Table S2.2 in Schedule 2 of the Permit.
45(1)(c)	The permit shall include the limit values for emissions into air and water.	Conditions 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 and Tables S3.1, S3.1(a) in Schedule 3 of the Permit.
45(1)(d)	The permit shall include the requirements for pH, temperature and flow of waste water discharges.	Not Applicable
45(1)(e)	The permit shall include the sampling and measurement procedures and frequencies to be used to comply with the conditions set for emissions monitoring.	Conditions 3.6.1 to 3.6.54 and Tables S3.1, S3.1(a), S3.3 and S3.4 in Schedule 3 of the Permit.
45(1)(f)	The permit shall include the maximum permissible period of unavoidable stoppages, disturbances or failures of the purification devices or the measurement devices, during which the emissions into the air and the discharges of waste water may exceed the prescribed emission limit values.	Conditions 2.3.14 and 2.3.15.
45(2)(a)	The permit shall include a list of the quantities of the different categories of hazardous waste which may be treated.	Not Applicable

Decision document

IED Article	Requirement	Delivered by
45(2)(b)	The permit shall include the minimum and maximum mass flows of those hazardous waste, their lowest and maximum calorific values and the maximum contents of polychlorinated biphenyls, pentachlorophenol, chlorine, fluorine, sulphur, heavy metals and other polluting substances.	Not Applicable
46(1)	Waste gases shall be discharged in a controlled way by means of a stack the height of which is calculated in such a way as to safeguard human health and the environment.	Condition 2.3.1(a) and Table S1.2 of Schedule 1 of the Permit.
46(4)	Relates to conditions for water discharges from the cleaning of exhaust gases.	There are no such discharges as condition 3.1.1 prohibits this.
46(5)	Prevention of unauthorised and accidental release of any polluting substances into soil, surface water or groundwater. Adequate storage capacity for contaminated rainwater run-off from the site or for contaminated water from spillage or fire-fighting.	The application explains the measures to be in place for achieving the directive requirements. The permit requires that these measures are used. Various permit conditions address this and when taken as a whole they ensure compliance with this requirement.
46(6)	Limits the maximum period of operation when an ELV is exceeded to 4 hours uninterrupted duration in any one instance, and with a maximum cumulative limit of 60 hours per year. Limits on dust (150 mg/m ³), CO and TOC not to be exceeded during this period.	Conditions 2.3.14 and 2.3.15
47	In the event of breakdown, reduce or close down operations as soon as practicable.	Condition 2.3.13

Decision document

IED Article	Requirement	Delivered by
	Limits on dust (150 mg/m ³), CO and TOC not to be exceeded during this period.	
48(1)	Monitoring of emissions is carried out in accordance with Parts 6 and 7 of Annex VI.	Conditions 3.6.1 to 3.6.4, 3.2.1, 3.2.2, tables S3.1, S3.1(a). Reference conditions are defined in Schedule 6 of the Permit.
48(2)	Installation and functioning of the automated measurement systems shall be subject to control and to annual surveillance tests as set out in point 1 of Part 6 of Annex VI.	Conditions 3.6.1, 3.6.3, table S3.1, S3.1(a), and S3.4
48(3)	The competent authority shall determine the location of sampling or measurement points to be used for monitoring of emissions.	Conditions 3.6.1. Pre-operational condition PO6
48(4)	All monitoring results shall be recorded, processed and presented in such a way as to enable the competent authority to verify compliance with the operating conditions and emission limit values which are included in the permit.	Conditions 4.1.1 and 4.1.2, and Tables S4.1 and S4.4
49	The emission limit values for air and water shall be regarded as being complied with if the conditions described in Part 8 of Annex VI are fulfilled.	Conditions 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.2.1, 3.2.2 and tables S3.1, S3.1(a)
50(1)	Slag and bottom ash to have Total Organic Carbon (TOC) < 3% or loss on ignition (LOI) < 5%.	Conditions 3.6.1 and Table S3.5
50(2)	Flue gas to be raised to a temperature of 850°C for two seconds, as measured at representative point of the combustion chamber.	Condition 2.3.9, Pre-operational condition PO6 and Improvement condition IC4 and Table S3.3
50(3)	At least one auxiliary burner which must not be fed with fuels which can cause higher emissions than those resulting from the burning of gas oil liquefied gas or natural gas.	Condition 2.3.14

Decision document

IED Article	Requirement	Delivered by
50(4)(a)	Automatic shut-down to prevent waste feed if at start up until the specified temperature has been reached.	Condition 2.3.10
50(4)(b)	Automatic shut-down to prevent waste feed if the combustion temperature is not maintained.	Condition 2.3.10
50(4)(c)	Automatic shut-down to prevent waste feed if the CEMs show that ELVs are exceeded due to disturbances or failure of waste cleaning devices.	Condition 2.3.10 and 2.3.14
50(5)	Any heat generated from the process shall be recovered as far as practicable.	(a) The plant will generate electricity (b) Operator to review the available heat recovery options prior to commissioning (Condition PO2) and then every 2 years (Conditions 1.2. 1 to 1.2.3)
50(6)	Relates to the feeding of infectious clinical waste into the furnace.	No infectious clinical waste will be burnt
50(7)	Management of the Installation to be in the hands of a natural person who is competent to manage it.	Conditions 1.1.1 to 1.1.3 and 2.3.1 of the Permit.
51(1)	Different conditions than those laid down in Article 50(1), (2) and (3) and, as regards the temperature Article 50(4) may be authorised, provided the other requirements of this chapter are met.	No such conditions Have been allowed
51(2)	Changes in operating conditions do not cause more residues or residues with a higher content of organic polluting substances compared to those residues which could be expected under the conditions laid down in Articles 50(1), (2) and (3). <i>are applied under Article 51(1).></i>	No such conditions Have been allowed
51(3)	Changes in operating conditions shall include emission limit values for CO and TOC set out in Part 3 of Annex VI.	No such conditions Have been allowed

Decision document

IED Article	Requirement	Delivered by
52(1)	Take all necessary precautions concerning delivery and reception of Wastes, to prevent or minimise pollution.	Conditions 2.3.1, 2.3.3, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5 and 3.7
52(2)	Determine the mass of each category of wastes, if possible according to the EWC, prior to accepting the waste.	Condition 2.3.4(a) and Table S2.2 in Schedule 3 of the Permit.
52(3)	Prior to accepting hazardous waste, the operator shall collect available information about the waste for the purpose of compliance with the permit requirements specified in Article 45(2).	Not Applicable
52(4)	Prior to accepting hazardous waste, the operator shall carry out the procedures set out in Article 52(4).	Not Applicable
52(5)	Granting of exemptions from Article 52(2), (3) and (4).	Not Applicable
53(1)	Residues to be minimised in their amount and harmfulness, and recycled where appropriate.	Conditions 1.4.1, 1.4.2 and 3.6.1 with Table S3.4
53(2)	Prevent dispersal of dry residues and dust during transport and storage.	conditions 1.4.1 2.3.1, 2.3.2 and 3.3.1.
53(3)	Test residues for their physical and chemical characteristics and polluting potential including heavy metal content (soluble fraction).	Condition 3.6.1 and Table S3.4 and pre-operational condition PO3.
55(1)	Application, decision and permit to be publicly available.	All documents are accessible from the Environment Agency Public Register.
55(2)	An annual report on plant operation and monitoring for all plants burning more than 2 tonne/hour waste.	Condition 4.2.2 and 4.2.3.

Decision document

Annex 1B: Compliance with Bat Conclusions

BAT conclusion	Criteria	Delivered by
1	Implement environmental management system	Condition 1.1 and Pre-operational condition PO1
2	Determine gross electrical efficiency	Section 4.3.7 of this decision document. Permit table S3.3
3	Monitor key process parameters	Condition 3.5.1 and table S3.3
4	Monitoring emissions to air	Condition 3.5.1 and table S3.1
5	Monitoring emissions to air during OTNOC	Condition 1.1.1 and pre-operational condition PO1
6	Monitoring emissions to water from flue gas treatment and/or bottom ash treatment	There are no such emissions from the installation
7	Monitor unburnt substances in slags and bottom ashes	Conditions 3.1.3 and 3.6.1, and table S3.4
8	Analysis of hazardous waste	Not applicable
9	Waste stream management techniques	The Application explains the measures that will be used. Permit condition 2.3.1, table S1.2 and pre-operational condition PO5
10	Quality management system for bottom ash treatment plant	Not applicable
11	Monitor waste deliveries as part of waste acceptance procedures	The Application explains the measures that will be used. Permit condition 2.3.1, table S1.2 and pre-operational condition PO5
12	Reception, handling and storage of waste	Measures are described in the Application and FPP. Permit conditions 2.3.1, table S1.2 and 3.8.1
13	Storage and handling of clinical waste	Not applicable

Decision document

BAT conclusion	Criteria	Delivered by
14	Improve overall performance of plant including BAT-AELs for TOC or LOI	Techniques described in the Application. Permit condition 2.3.1, table S1.2, 3.1.3, 3.6.1 and table S3.4
15	Procedures to adjust plant settings to control performance	Measures described in the Application condition 2.3.1 and table S1.2
16	Procedures to minimise start-up and shut down	Measures described in the Application
17	Appropriate design, operation and maintenance of FGC system	FGC measures described in Application. Operation and maintenance procedures will form part of the EMS
18	OTNOC management plan	Pre-operational condition PO1
19	Use of heat recovery boiler	Described in the Application. Permit condition 2.3.1, table S1.2
20	Measures to increase energy efficiency and BAT AEEL	Measures described in the Application. Permit condition 2.3.1, table S1.2 Section 4.3.7 of this decision document.
21	Measures to prevent or reduce diffuse emissions including odour	Measures described in the Application. Permit conditions 2.3.1, table S1.2, 3.4.1, 3.3.1, 3.3.2. Sections 4.2.2, 6.5.3 and 6.5.4 of this decision document.
22	Handling of gaseous and liquid wastes	Not applicable
23	Management system to prevent or reduce dust emissions from treatment of slags and ashes	Not applicable
24	Techniques to prevent or reduce diffuse emissions to air from treatment of slags and ashes	Not applicable

Decision document

BAT conclusion	Criteria	Delivered by
25	Minimisation of dust and metal emissions and compliance with BAT AEL	Section 5.2 of this decision document. Permit conditions 2.3.1, table S1.2, 3.4.1, 3.3.1, 3.3.2. 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 and table S3.1
26	Techniques and BAT AEL for dust emissions from enclosed slags and ashes treatment	Not applicable
27	Techniques to reduce emissions of HCl, HF and SO ₂	Measures described in the Application. Permit condition 2.3.1 and table S1.2 Permit condition 2.3.1 and table S1.2 Section 5.2 of this decision document.
28	Techniques to reduce peak emissions of HCl, HF and SO ₂ , optimise reagent use and BAT AELs	Measures described in the Application. Permit conditions 2.3.1, table S1.2, 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 and table S3.1
29	Techniques to reduce emissions of NO ₂ , N ₂ O, CO and NH ₃ and BAT AELs	Measures described in the Application. Section 5.2 of this decision document. Permit conditions 2.3.1, table S1.2, 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 and table S3.1
30	Reduce emissions of organic compounds including dioxins/furans and PCBs. BAT AELs	Measures described in the Application. Section 5.2 of this decision document. Permit conditions 2.3.1, table S1.2, 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 and table S3.1
31	Reduce emissions of mercury. BAT AEL	Measures described in the Application. Section 5.2 of this decision document. Permit conditions 2.3.1, table S1.22.3.1, table S1.2, 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 and table S3.1

Decision document

BAT conclusion	Criteria	Delivered by
32	Segregate waste water streams to prevent contamination	Measures described in the Application Sections 4.2.2, 6.5.1 and 6.5.3 of this decision document. Permit conditions 2.3.1, table S1.2, 3.1.1, 3.1.2 and table S3.2
33	Techniques to reduce water usage and prevent or reduce waste water	Measures described in the Application. Sections 4.2.2 and 4.3.8 of this decision document Permit conditions 1.3.1, 2.3.1, table S1.2
34	Reduce emissions to water from FGC and/or from treatment or storage of bottom ashes. BAT AELs	Not applicable
35	Handle and treat bottom ashes separately from FGC residues	Permit condition 2.3.15
36	Techniques for treatment of slags and bottom ashes	No treatment carried out on site
37	Techniques to prevent or reduce noise emissions.	Measures are described in the Application. Section 6.5.5 of this decision document. Permit conditions 2.3.1, table S1.2, 3.5.1, 3.5.2

Decision document

Annex 2: Pre-Operational Conditions

Based on the information on the Application, we consider that we do need to impose pre-operational conditions. These conditions are set out below and referred to, where applicable, in the text of the decision document. We are using these conditions to require the Operator to confirm that the details and measures proposed in the Application have been adopted or implemented prior to the operation of the Installation.

Reference	Pre-operational measures
PO1	<p>Prior to the commencement of commissioning, the Operator shall send a summary of the site Environment Management System (EMS) to the Environment Agency and obtain the Environment Agency's written approval to the EMS summary. The summary shall include a copy of the full other than normal operating conditions (OTNOC) management plan which shall be prepared in accordance with BAT 18 of the BAT conclusions and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• a list of potential OTNOC situations that are considered to be abnormal operation under the definition in Schedule 6 of this permit.• a definition of start-up and shut-down conditions having regard to any Environment Agency guidance on start-up and shut-down.• any updates on the design of critical equipment to minimise OTNOC since the permit application <p>The Operator shall make available for inspection all documents and procedures which form part of the EMS. The EMS shall be developed in line with the requirements set out in Environment Agency web guide on developing a management system for environmental permits (found on www.gov.uk) and BAT 1 of the incineration BAT conclusions. The EMS shall include the approved OTNOC management plan.</p> <p>The documents and procedures set out in the EMS shall form the written management system referenced in condition 1.1.1 (a) of the permit.</p>
PO2	<p>Prior to the commencement of commissioning, the Operator shall send a report to the Environment Agency, and obtain the Environment Agency's written approval to it, which will contain a comprehensive review of the options available for utilising the heat generated, including operating as CHP or supplying district heating, by the waste incineration process in order to ensure that it is recovered as far as practicable. The review shall detail any identified proposals for improving the recovery and utilisation of heat and shall provide a timetable for their implementation.</p>
PO3	<p>Prior to the commencement of commissioning, the Operator shall submit to the Environment Agency, and obtain the Environment Agency's written approval to it, a protocol for the sampling and testing of incinerator bottom ash for the purposes of assessing its hazard status. Sampling and testing shall be carried out in accordance with the protocol as approved.</p>

Decision document

Table S1.4A Pre-operational measures	
Reference	Pre-operational measures
PO4	Prior to the commencement of commissioning, the Operator shall submit to the Environment Agency, and obtain the Environment Agency's written approval to it, a written commissioning plan, including timelines for completion, for approval by the Environment Agency. The commissioning plan shall include the expected emissions to the environment during the different stages of commissioning, the expected durations of commissioning activities and the actions to be taken to protect the environment and report to the Environment Agency in the event that actual emissions exceed expected emissions. Commissioning shall be carried out in accordance with the commissioning plan as approved.
PO5	Prior to the commencement of commissioning, the Operator shall submit a written report to the Agency, and obtain the Environment Agency's written approval to it, detailing the waste acceptance procedure to be used at the site. The waste acceptance procedure shall include the process and systems by which wastes unsuitable for incineration at the site will be controlled. The procedure shall be implemented in accordance with the written approval from the Agency.
PO6	No later than one month after the final design of the furnace and combustion chamber, the operator shall submit a written report to the Environment Agency, and obtain the Environment Agency's written approval to it, of the details of the computational fluid dynamic (CFD) modelling. The report shall explain how the furnace has been designed to comply with the residence time and temperature requirements as defined by Chapter IV and Annex VI of the IED whilst operating under normal load and the most unfavourable operating conditions (including minimum turn down and overload conditions), and that the design includes sufficient monitoring ports to support subsequent validation of these requirements during commissioning.
PO7	At least three months before (or other date agreed in writing with the Environment Agency) the commencement of commissioning, the Operator shall submit a written report to the Environment Agency, and obtain the Environment Agency's written approval to it, specifying arrangements for continuous and periodic monitoring of emissions to air to comply with Environment Agency guidance notes M1, M2 and M20. The report shall include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plant and equipment details, including accreditation to MCERTS • Methods and standards for sampling and analysis • Details of monitoring locations, access and working platforms
PO8	At least 3 months before the commencement of commissioning, the Operator shall submit an updated written Noise Management Plan to the Environment Agency for assessment and written approval. The plan must follow Environment Agency Noise Management Plan guidance. The Operator must implement the proposals in the plan as agreed with the Environment Agency.

Decision document

Table S1.4A Pre-operational measures	
Reference	Pre-operational measures
PO9	At least 3 months before the commencement of commissioning (or other date agreed in writing with the Environment Agency) the Operator shall submit, for approval by the Environment Agency, a methodology (having regard to Technical Report P4-100/TR Part 2 Validation of Combustion Conditions) to verify the residence time, minimum temperature and oxygen content of the gases in the furnace whilst operating under normal load, minimum turn down and overload conditions.

Decision document

Annex 3: Improvement Conditions

Based in the information in the Application we consider that we need to set improvement conditions. These conditions are set out below - justifications for these is provided at the relevant section of the decision document. We are using these conditions to require the Operator to provide the Environment Agency with details that need to be established or confirmed during and/or after commissioning.

Reference	Requirement	Date
IC1	The Operator shall submit a written report to the Environment Agency on the implementation of its Environmental Management System (EMS) and the progress made in the certification of the system by an external body or if appropriate submit a schedule by which the EMS will be certified. The report shall also include details of a review of the OTNOC management plan and any updates to the plan following the review.	Within 12 months of the completion of commissioning.
IC2	The Operator shall submit a written proposal to the Environment Agency to carry out tests to determine the size distribution of the particulate matter in the exhaust gas emissions to air from emission point A1, identifying the fractions within the PM ₁₀ , and PM _{2.5} ranges. On receipt of written approval from the Environment Agency to the proposal and the timetable, the Operator shall carry out the tests and submit to the Environment Agency a report on the results.	Within 6 months of the completion of commissioning.
IC3	The Operator shall submit a written report to the Environment Agency on the commissioning of the installation. The report shall summarise the environmental performance of the plant as installed against the design parameters set out in the Application. The report shall also include a review of the performance of the facility against the conditions of this permit and details of procedures developed during commissioning for achieving and demonstrating compliance with permit conditions and confirm that the Environmental Management System (EMS) has been updated accordingly.	Within 4 months of the completion of commissioning.
IC4	The operator shall notify the Environment Agency of the proposed date(s) that validation testing is planned for.	Notification at least 3 weeks prior to validation testing
	During commissioning the operator shall carry out validation testing to validate the residence time, minimum temperature and oxygen content of the gases in the furnace whilst operating under normal load and most unfavourable operating conditions. The validation shall be to the methodology as approved through pre-operational condition PO9.	Validation tests completed before the end of commissioning

Decision document

Table S1.3 Improvement programme requirements		
Reference	Requirement	Date
	<p>The operator shall submit a written report to the Environment Agency on the validation of residence time, oxygen and temperature whilst operating under normal load, minimum turn down and overload conditions.</p> <p>The report shall identify the process controls used to ensure residence time and temperature requirements are complied with during operation of the incineration plant</p>	Report submitted within 2 months of the completion of commissioning.
IC5	<p>The Operator shall submit a written report to the Environment Agency describing the performance and optimisation of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The [lime/sodium bicarbonate] injection system for minimisation of acid gas emissions • The carbon injection system for minimisation of dioxin and heavy metal emissions. • The Selective Non Catalytic Reduction (SNCR) system and combustion settings to minimise oxides of nitrogen (NOx). The report shall include an initial assessment of the level of NOx, N₂O and NH₃ emissions that can be achieved under optimum operating conditions. 	Within 4 months of the completion of commissioning.
IC6	<p>The Operator shall submit a written summary report to the Environment Agency to confirm that the performance of Continuous Emission Monitors for parameters as specified in Table S3.1 and Table S3.1(a) complies with the requirements of EN 14181, specifically the requirements of QAL1, QAL2 and QAL3. The report shall include the results of calibration and verification testing,</p>	<p>Initial calibration report to be submitted to the Agency within 3 months of completion of commissioning.</p> <p>Full summary evidence compliance report to be submitted within 18 months of completion of commissioning.</p>
IC7	<p>During commissioning, the operator shall carry out tests to demonstrate whether the furnace combustion air will ensure that negative pressure is achieved throughout the reception hall. The tests shall demonstrate whether air is pulled through the reception hall and bunker area and into the furnace with dead spots minimised. The operator shall also carry out tests of methods used to maintain negative pressure during shut-down periods to ensure that adequate extraction will be achieved. The operator shall submit a report to the Environment Agency, for approval, summarising the findings along with any proposed improvements if required</p>	Within 6 months of completion of commissioning.

Decision document

Table S1.3 Improvement programme requirements		
Reference	Requirement	Date
IC8	The operator shall carry out a programme of dioxin and dioxin like PCB monitoring over a period and frequency agreed with the Environment Agency. The operator shall submit a report to the Environment Agency with an analysis of whether dioxin emissions can be considered to be stable.	Within 6 months of completion of commissioning or as agreed in writing with the Environment Agency
IC9	The operator shall carry out a programme of mercury monitoring over a period and frequency agreed with the Environment Agency. The operator shall submit a report to the Environment Agency with an analysis of whether the waste feed to the plant can be proven to have a low and stable mercury content.	Within 6 months of completion of commissioning or as agreed in writing with the Environment Agency
IC10	<p>During commissioning, the operator shall carry out tests to assess whether the air monitoring location(s) meet the requirements of BS EN 15259 and supporting Method Implementation Document (MID).</p> <p>A written report shall be submitted for approval setting out the results and conclusions of the assessment including where necessary proposals for improvements to meet the requirements. The report shall specify the design of the ports for PM10 and PM2.5 sampling.</p> <p>Where notified in writing by the Environment Agency that the requirements are not met, the operator shall submit proposals or further proposals for rectifying this in accordance with the time scale in the notification. The proposals shall be implemented in accordance with the Environment Agency's written approval.</p>	Report to be submitted to the Agency within 3 months of completion of commissioning.
IC11	<p>The operator shall submit a written report to the Environment Agency for assessment and written approval.</p> <p>The report must contain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An assessment of noise during normal operations in accordance with the procedures given in BS4142:2014 (Rating industrial noise affecting mixed residential and industrial areas) and BS7445: 2003 (Description and measurement of environmental noise) or other methodology as agreed with the Environment Agency • The assessment shall include, but not be limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A review of the noise sources from the facility. Where any noise source(s) are identified as exhibiting tonal contributions, they shall be quantified by means of frequency analysis. - A review of noise levels from static plant. - Considerations of on-site vehicle movements. • A review of the noise assessment against the noise impact assessment ref P2251-REP01-BDH provided within the application EPR/BP3124SC/A001 to validate the application 	Report to be submitted to the Agency within 6 months of completion of commissioning.

Decision document

Table S1.3 Improvement programme requirements		
Reference	Requirement	Date
	assessment or any amended noise impact assessment as approved under PO8- You must implement the proposals in the report in line with the timescales agreed with the Environment Agency	

Decision document

Annex 4: Consultation Responses

A) Advertising and Consultation on the Application

The Application has been advertised and consulted upon in accordance with the Environment Agency's Public Participation Statement. The way in which this has been carried out along with the results of our consultation and how we have taken consultation responses into account in reaching our draft decision is summarised in this Annex. Copies of consultation responses have been placed on the Environment Agency public register.

The Application was advertised on the Environment Agency website from 01/02/2024 to 29/02/2024 and in the Plymouth Herald on 01/02/2024.

The following statutory and non-statutory bodies were consulted: -

- Local Authority Environmental Protection Department
- Local Authority Planning Department
- Food Standards Agency
- Health and Safety Executive
- Director of Public Health and UK Health Security Agency (Previously Public Health England)
- National Grid
- Fire & Rescue
- Sewerage

1) Consultation Responses from Statutory and Non-Statutory Bodies

Response Received from UKHSA	
Brief summary of issues raised:	Summary of action taken / how this has been covered
Concern that the applicant measures PM ₁₀ and not PM _{2.5} Request that PM _{2.5} emission values and relative mitigation measures should be included in the risk assessment	We have audited the applicants modelling data and modelled ourselves using a more conservative background concentration for PM _{2.5} and calculated short term emission rates. Although we do not agree with the consultants absolute numerical predictions, we agree with the conclusions regarding normal operations and these conclusions extend to short term emissions and emissions during abnormal operations.

Response Received from Public Protection Service, Plymouth City Council	
Brief summary of issues raised:	Summary of action taken / how this has been covered
No Issues raised	