

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

Decision document recording our decision-making process

The Permit Number is: EPR/AP3627SL
The Applicant / Operator is: Viridor Tees Valley Limited

The Installation is located at: Tees Valley Energy Recovery Facility, Grangetown Prairie, Grangetown, Redcar TS6 6TY.

Date Issued: 14th July 2025

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/AP3627SL/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/AP3627SL. We refer to the permit as “the **Permit**” in this document.

The Application was duly made on 31/07/2024.

The applicant is Viridor Tees Valley Limited. We refer to Viridor Tees Valley Limited as “the **Applicant**” in this document. Where we are talking about what would happen after the Permit is granted, we call Viridor Tees Valley Limited “the **Operator**”.

Viridor Tees Valley Limited’s proposed facility is located at Grangetown Priarie, Grangetown, Redcar. We refer to this as “the **Installation**” in this document.

How this document is structured

Contents

Glossary of acronyms used in this document	4
Links to guidance documents	7
1 Our proposed decision.....	8
2 How we reached our decision.....	8
3 The legal framework	10
4 The Installation	11
4.1 Description of the Installation and related issues.....	
4.2 The site and its protection.....	
4.3 Operation of the Installation – general issues.....	
5 Minimising the Installation’s environmental impact	26
5.1 Assessment Methodology.....	
5.2 Assessment of Impact on Air Quality	
5.3 Human health risk assessment.....	
5.4 Impact on Habitats sites, SSSIs, non-statutory conservation sites	
5.5 Impact of abnormal operations	
5.6 Other Emissions	
6 Application of Best Available Techniques	54
6.1 Scope of Consideration	
6.2 BAT and emissions control	
6.3 BAT and global warming potential	
6.4 BAT and POPs	
6.5 Other Emissions to the Environment	
6.6 Setting ELVs and other Permit conditions.....	
6.7 Monitoring.....	
6.8 Reporting	
7 Other legal requirements	84
7.1 The EPR 2016 and related Directives.....	
7.2 National primary legislation.....	
7.3 National secondary legislation	
7.4 Other relevant EU legislation	
7.5 Other relevant legal requirements.....	
Annexes.....	93
Annex 1A: Application of chapter IV of the Industrial Emissions Directive	
Annex 1B: Compliance with Bat Conclusions.....	
Annex 2: Pre-Operational Conditions.....	
Annex 3: Improvement Conditions	
Annex 4: Consultation Responses	

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)

HRA	Human Rights Act 1998
HW	Hazardous waste
HWI	Hazardous waste incinerator
IBA	Incinerator Bottom Ash
IED	Industrial Emissions Directive (2010/75/EU)
IPPCD	Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control Directive (2008/1/EC) – now superseded by IED
I-TEF	Toxic Equivalent Factors set out in Annex VI Part 2 of IED
I-TEQ	Toxic Equivalent Quotient calculated using I-TEF
LCPD	Large Combustion Plant Directive (2001/80/EC) – now superseded by IED
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
NE	Natural England
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
SED	Solvent Emissions Directive (1999/13/EC) – now superseded by IED
SCR	Selective catalytic reduction
SHPI(s)	Site(s) of High Public Interest
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 proposed 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 31/07/2024. 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 Teesside Gazette 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. The application documents were also available view on our Citizen Space portal which was linked from the advert on our website.

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

- Health and Safety Executive
- UK Health Security Agency
- Food Standards Agency
- Director of Public Health Redcar and Cleveland Council
- Planning Department Redcar and Cleveland Council
- Environmental Protection Department Redcar and Cleveland Council
- Cleveland Fire and Rescue Service

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 an Schedule 5 Notice Request for Information on 16/12/2024. A copy of the information notice and response was placed on our public register.

In addition to our information notices, we received additional information during the determination. This information includes:

Date information received	Details
11/10/2024	Confirmation of throughput tonnage risk assessments were based on.
04/12/2024	Information on Habitats Impact. Including proposal to reduce ammonia ELV to 8mg/m ³ (monthly average)
29/01/2025	Isopleth showing air quality dispersion modelling predicted ammonia impact.
04/03/2025	Isopleth showing air quality dispersion modelling predicted nutrient nitrogen impact.

We made a copy of this information available to the public in the same way as the response to our information notice.

Finally, we have consulted on our draft decision from 06/05/2025 to 03/06/2025. A summary of the consultation responses and how we have taken into account all relevant representations is shown in Annex 4B.

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, 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 a steam 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 on land within the South Tees Development Corporation (STDC) area. The installation occupies a 25 -acre site situated at the southwestern corner of the STDC area, within Grangetown Prairie Zone. The site lies 1.2km south of the River Tees and approximately 4 miles to the northeast of Middlesbrough Town centre, at National Grid Reference NZ 5445221363. The installation is surrounded by industrial or former industrial land. The nearest residential properties are approximately 0.4km to the south.

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 Recovery. 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 will incinerate waste to raise steam and generate electricity in a steam turbine/generator. The installation will have two incineration lines, waste reception (or tipping hall), waste bunker, turbine hall, air cooled condensers, boiler hall including boilers and flue gas treatment system, ash handling /storage facility and an 80 meter stack.

The incineration process will utilise moving grate technology which agitates the waste to promote good burnout of waste and a uniform heat release. Waste will be moved from the feed inlet through the furnaces to the ash storage. The furnaces have been designed to ensure exhaust gases are raised to a minimum temperature of 850°C for a minimum of 2 seconds flue gas residence time to ensure destruction of dioxins, furans, PAHs and other organic compounds. Furnace temperatures will be continuously monitored and audible and visual alarms will trigger if the temperature falls towards 850 °C.

Ammonia solution will be injected into the boilers as part of the Selective Non-Catalytic Reduction de-NO_x system. The ammonia reacts with the oxides of nitrogen formed in the combustion process forming water, carbon dioxide and nitrogen. The combustion chamber will be provided with low NO_x auxiliary burners which will combust low sulphur fuel oil or heating gasoil. The burners will raise the combustion chamber temperature to the required minimum of 850°C prior to feeding of waste.


The heat released from the incineration of the waste will be recovered by steam boilers, which are integral to the furnaces and will produce high pressure superheated steam at approximately 430-440°C at approximately 65 Bar. The steam will then feed a high-efficiency steam turbine which will generate electricity.

The installation will have flue gas treatment. Oxides of nitrogen (NOx) will be abated by control of combustion air and selective non-catalytic reduction. Lime and activated carbon will be injected into the flue gas stream to abate acidic compounds, volatile metals, organic compounds and dioxins and furans. Following the injection of lime and activated carbon the flue gas will pass through a bag/fabric filter which will remove the particulates, reaction products and unreacted reagent solids, collectively known as Air Pollution Control residues (APCr).

Bottom ash from the furnace and boiler will be collected, quenched with water and stored in an enclosed building prior to transfer off-site to a suitably licensed waste facility. Air pollution control residues will be collected and transferred in a closed system into storage silos prior to transfer off-site to a suitably licensed waste management facility.

Uncontaminated surface water runoff from buildings, roadways and hardstanding is discharged into the surface water drainage system. The site surface water system transfers the uncontaminated surface water off site via petrol interceptors and a drainage pond. Process effluents are used where practicable within the process. Excess process effluent is tankered off-site for treatment at a suitable licensed waste management facility.

Indicative schematic of the Waste Incineration Process:



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

Waste throughput, Tonnes/line	510,000 tonnes /annum	29te /hour
Waste processed	MSW	
Number of lines	2	
Furnace technology	Grate	
Auxiliary Fuel	Gas Oil	
Acid gas abatement	Dry	Lime
NOx abatement	SNCR	Ammonia
Reagent consumption	Auxiliary Fuel 100 te/annum Ammonia : 4250 te/annum Lime : 8750 te/annum Activated carbon: 125 te/annum Process water: 8.5m ³ /hour	
Flue gas recirculation	No	
Dioxin abatement	Activated carbon	
Stack	Grid Reference: 454470.5, 521454.5	
	Height, 80 m	Diameter, 2.13m (internal)
Flue gas	Flow: 125.16 Nm ³ /s	Velocity: 17.54 m/s
	Temperature: 148 °C	
Electricity generated	48.2 MWe	392,896 MWh (based on approx. 8147 hours operation/year)
Electricity exported	43.6 MWe	355,168 MWh (based on approx. 8147 hours operation/year)
Steam conditions	Temperature, 430-440 °C	Pressure, 65 bar/MPa

4.1.4 Key Issues in the Determination

The key issues arising during determination of the Application were assessment of the impact of air emissions and the assessment of BAT, 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 site occupies a near rectangular 25 acre plot situated at the southwestern corner of the South Tees Development Corporation (STDC) are within the Grangetown Prairie Zone. The sites lies 1.2km south of the River Tees and approximately 6km to the northeast of Middlesborough Town Centre.

The site is bounded to the North by the main Middlesborough to Redcar railway line, to the east by the site of Lackenby steel works, to the south by industrial units and beyond them the A66 road and to the west by various industrial units. Access to the site will be via a new site access on the corner of Eston Road that will serve a new internal highway network for the Grangetown Prairie plots. This access will be constructed as part of the enabling works for all developments by STDC. The site is brownfield land which has been cleared and was once dominated by industrial buildings at the heart of the steel making industry on Teesside. Some industrial buildings/plant still surround the Grangetown Prairie site on its south, east and western boundaries.

The site condition report describes the historical land use from 1857 as largely agricultural land. Eston Iron Works, a small iron works was located to the northwest of the site which occupied a small area within the site area. From 1893 onwards, the significantly larger Cleveland Steel Works occupied the majority of the western half of the site. Further expansion through the early and mid-1990's into the east and south of the site included Cleveland Coke Ovens and by-product plant, Colliery Arch plant and Medium Section Mill. From 1970 onwards, the site saw widespread demolition until 2010 in which the site began usage as a steel stocking yard.

The installation is not within a Groundwater Protection Zone (SPZ).

Remediation works have been undertaken at the site to ensure that, prior to the development of the Installation the site is in a suitable condition to be developed upon. The remediation works carried out were to address the presence of asbestos fibres and non-aqueous phase liquids in soils on the site. These were excavated during earthworks to prepare a development platform for the site's redevelopment.

4.2.2 Proposed site design: potentially polluting substances and prevention measures

We are satisfied appropriate measures are in place to prevent pollution of ground and groundwater. The key features are:

The surfaces of the waste reception, handing and storage areas are designed and will be constructed as impermeable structures and will drain to the process water drainage system. The surface integrity will be periodically inspected.

The ammonia tanker and fuel oil tanker offloading areas at the site will be constructed from an impermeable concrete hardstanding with sealed construction joints. The area will have contained drainage that has appropriate containment capacity to contain a spill during delivery via the use of sumps.

Sumps will be:

- Designed to be impermeable and resistant to the liquids collected within them.
- Subject to regular visual inspection, with any contents removed accordingly after checking for contamination.
- Should any concerns regarding the integrity of sumps be raised following programmed visual inspection or maintenance, this will be extended to water testing.
- Any sub-surface tanks and sumps, where appropriate, will be designed with leak detection systems. Preventative maintenance will be implemented for all subsurface structures. This will include (if appropriate) pressure tests, leak tests, material thickness checks, CCTV etc.

Spillage absorbent materials will be made available at easily accessible location(s) where chemicals are either stored or unloaded.

All liquid chemicals (including ammonia solution and fuel oil) and raw materials will be stored within a tank in a dedicated storage area, with secondary containment. Bulk storage tanks will be bunded up to 110% of the tank's capacity.

The waste bunker will be constructed of reinforced concrete and will be designed as a water retaining structure in accordance with 'BS EN 1992-3:2006, Eurocode 2'. Regular preventative maintenance and integrity checks will be carried out to ensure that liquids do not leak from the bunker.

The surface water attenuation tank will also be designed as a water retaining structure in accordance with 'BS EN 1992-3:2006, Eurocode 2' thereby preventing the release of contaminated water should the tank be required to retain contaminated firewater.

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 not submitted an adequate baseline report. We have therefore set a pre-operational condition (PO7) requiring the Operator to provide this information prior to the commencement 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 2.11 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.

4.3.4 Accident management

The Applicant has not submitted an Accident Management Plan. However, having considered the 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 (FPP). We have reviewed the plan and are satisfied it is appropriate. However, because the design of the site has not been finalised the FPP will need to be updated to ensure it is consistent with the final design of the installation and remains in accordance with the latest version of the FPP guidance. For this reason we have included a pre-operational condition to provide an updated FPP for approval prior to the commencement of commissioning.

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
Application EPR/AP3627SL/A001	Response to questions in Part B3 of the Application Form. Supporting document (Rev 2 dated 25/06/2024) and Appendices
Response to additional information request raised on 14 November 2024	All Parts

Response to Schedule 5 Notice dated 16/12/2024	Response to questions 1-4. Noise Management Plan
---	---

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
Fuel 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 and commercial waste in the European Waste Catalogue or are non-hazardous wastes similar in character to municipal and commercial 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.

The incineration plant will take municipal waste and commercial waste which has not been source-segregated or separately collected or otherwise recovered, recycled or composted. The amount of recyclable material in the waste feed is largely outside the remit of this permit determination with recycling initiatives being a matter for the local authority. However permit conditions 2.3.5 and 2.3.6 limit the burning of separately collected fractions in line with regulation 12 of the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011.

We have limited the capacity of the Installation to 510,000 tonnes per annum. This is based on the installation operating 8760 hours per year at a nominal capacity of 29 tonnes per hour. The Applicant confirmed that their risk assessments were based on this throughput.

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.

(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:

- The Facility will be designed with careful attention being paid to all normal energy efficiency design features, such as high efficiency motors, high efficiency variable speed drives, high standards of cladding and insulation etc.

The Facility will also be designed to achieve a high thermal efficiency. In particular:

- The boilers will be equipped with economisers and superheaters to optimise thermal cycle efficiency without prejudicing boiler tube life, having regard for the nature of the waste fuel that is combusted;
- Unnecessary releases of steam and hot water will be avoided, to avoid the loss of boiler water treatment chemicals and the heat contained within the steam and water;
- Low grade heat will be extracted from the turbine and used to preheat combustion air in order to improve the efficiency of the thermal cycle;
- Steady operation will be maintained as required by using auxiliary fuel firing; and
- Boiler heat exchange surfaces will be cleaned on a regular basis to ensure efficient heat recovery

Based on the Application the specific energy consumption, a measure of total energy consumed per unit of waste processed, will be 88 kWh/tonne. This is based on 430,000 tonnes per annum (at the design capacity of 26.3 tph per line with a design NCV of 10.25 MJ/kg and an availability of approximately 8,147 hours). At the design capacity, the Facility will annually generate approximately 392,896 MWh and export approximately 355,168 MWh of electricity. Note the Applicant has stated that the technology supplier has advised that long term the operation of the boiler can be sustained at 110% of the design fuel throughput, i.e. 29 tonnes per hour per line. Therefore, allowing for the maximum theoretical availability (i.e. 8,760 hours per annum) at the design point, the Facility is capable of processing a total of approximately 510,000 tonnes per annum. However, this does not account for periods of start up, shut down and other periods of non-availability. Allowing for these periods, the Applicant would expect that the maximum capacity of the Facility to be approximately 495,000 tonnes per annum.

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 10.25 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 section 2.8.2 of the Application shows 48.2MW of electricity produced for an annual burn of 430,000 tonnes, which represents 11.2 MW per 100,000 tonnes/yr of waste burned (0.92 MWh/tonne of waste). The Installation is therefore above the indicative BAT range.

The Applicant has calculated the gross electrical efficiency and compared it to the BAT AEEL specified in BAT conclusions BAT 20.

The gross electrical efficiency was calculated by the Applicant as 33.5%.

The BAT AEEL for gross electrical efficiency is 25-35.

The value calculated by the Applicant is towards the top of the BAT AEEL range.

In accordance with BAT 2 table S3.3 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 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, which showed there was potential to provide district heating to local businesses; suitable opportunities are being explored, though there are no firm commitments at this stage. There is provision within the design of the steam turbine to extract low-grade steam 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.

(iv) R1 Calculation

The R1 calculation does not form part of the matters relevant to our determination. It is however a general indicator 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 Steam Turbine

The proposed steam conditions are up to 440°C and 65 Bar. These are at the higher end of the range seen for similar plants, which will maximise energy recovery.

(vi) Choice of Cooling System

An Air Cooled Condenser (ACC) will be used to condense the steam output from the turbine with return of the condensate to the boiler. The Applicant justified this choice as follows:

The Applicant has considered other options including once through cooling (OTC) or by a recirculating water supply to condense steam. Both cooling systems require significant quantities of water, and a receiving watercourse for the off-site discharge of the cooling water. An abstraction source is also required as main water is considered not an economically viable option. The Applicant has stated that the closest suitable watercourse is the River Tees which lies approximately 1.2km northwest of the site, with the Darlington to Saltburn Network Rail Line and potential new industrial developments located in-between the Facility and the River. As such, the required groundworks (including culverts for the flow from and return of water to the river) required to enable water cooling would be significant. Furthermore, the cost associated with the use of potable water within water cooling systems is significant. Therefore, the Applicant has considered the water cooling option as not being an 'available' technology for the Facility.

Evaporative condenser (EC) systems have also been considered by the Applicant. They have stated that these systems also require significant volumes of water. They can also create a visible plume from the condenser which will have a visual impact. For this reason and the absence of an available source of water for abstraction and the discharge of cooling water, as discussed above, the Applicant does not consider EC represents BAT for the installation.

The Applicant has stated that ACCs do not require significant quantities of water and do not create of visible plume. They have acknowledged that ACCs produce more noise than the other options however mitigation can be applied to the design to ensure that the noise impacts due to the ACCs can be reduced to an acceptable level. The Applicant considers the ACCs represent BAT for the installation.

We are satisfied that the use of ACC is BAT for this site.

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

The operator has submitted a cost-benefit assessment of opportunities for high efficiency co-generation within 15 km of the installation in which they calculated net present value. If the NPV is positive (i.e. any number more than zero) it means that the investors will make a rate of return that makes the scheme commercially viable. A negative NPV means that the project will not be commercially viable. The Applicant's assessment showed a net present value of -5.02 which demonstrates that operating as a high-efficiency cogeneration installation will not be financially viable. We agree with the applicant's assessment and will not require the installation to operate as a high-efficiency cogeneration installation.

(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.

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. 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 4, including consumption of lime, activated carbon and ammonia 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 4.2.2. 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), air pollution control (APC) residues and recovered metals.

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 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.

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.

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
- 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 exceedences of the relevant ES are likely. This is done through detailed audit and review of the Applicant's air dispersion modelling taking background concentrations and modelling uncertainties into account. Where an exceedance of an AAD limit value is identified, we may require the applicant to go beyond what would normally be considered BAT for the Installation or we may refuse the application if the applicant is unable to provide suitable proposals. Whether or not exceedences 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 a 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 the 'EP Application Dispersion Modelling Assessment' report in the Application. The assessment comprises:

- 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.

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 6.0 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 Durham Tees Valley Airport between 2015 and 2019. The Applicant stated that this is the closest and most representative meteorological station

available. 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:
 - 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.

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 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.

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 peak ground level exposure to pollutants in ambient air. The tables below show the Applicant's modelling results.

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 tables 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.

Dispersion modelling results – Point of maximum impact – Operation at Daily ELVs.

Pollutant	ES		Back-ground	Process Contribution (PC)		Predicted Environmental	
	µg/m ³	Reference period	µg/m ³	µg/m ³	% of EAL	µg/m ³	% of EAL
NO ₂	40	Annual mean	19.2	1.48	3.70	20.7	51.7
	200	99.79th %ile of 1 hour means	38.4	9.96	<10		
PM ₁₀	40	Annual mean	18	0.11	<1		
	50	90.41st %ile of 24 hour means	36	0.37	<10		
PM _{2.5}	20	Annual mean	10	0.11	<1		
SO ₂	266	99.9th %ile of 15-min means	2	9.34	<10		
	350	99.73rd %ile of 1 hour means	2	8.49	<10		
	125	99.18th %ile of 24 hour means	2	4.9	<10		
HCl	750	1-hour mean	1.42	2.04	<10		
HF	16	Monthly mean	2.35	0.02	<1		
	160	1 hour mean	4.7	0.34	<10		
CO	10000	Maximum daily running 8 hour mean	750	14.5	<10		
	30000	1 hour mean	750	16.99	<10		
VOC as benzene	5	Annual mean	0.66	0.21	4.20	0.87	17.40
	30	Daily mean	1.32	2.67	<10		
PAH	0.00025	Annual mean	0.00018	4.23E-06	1.69	0.00018	73.7
NH ₃	180	Annual mean	2.09	0.21	<1		
	2500	1 hour mean	4.18	3.4	<10		
PCBs	0.2	Annual mean	0.000129	0.00011	<1		
	6	1 hour mean	0.000258	0.0017	<10		

Dispersion Modelling Results – point of maximum impact – Short Term ELVs

Pollutant	ES		Back-ground	Process Contribution (PC)		Predicted Environmental	
	µg/m ³	Rererence period	µg/m ³	µg/m ³	% of EAL	µg/m ³	% of EAL
NO2	200	99.79th %ile of 1 hour means	38.4	39.85	19.9	78.25	39.1
SO ₂	266	99.9th %ile of 15-min means	2	62.28	23.4	64.28	24.2
	350	99.73rd %ile of 1 hour means	2	56.59	16.17	58.59	16.7
HCl	750	1-hour mean	1.42	20.38	<10		
HF	160	1 hour mean	4.7	1.36	<10		
CO	10000	Maximum daily running 8 hour mean	750	43.5	<10		
	30000	1 hour mean	750	50.96	<10		

Dispersion Modelling Results – point of maximum impact – metals

Pollutant	ES		Back-ground ng/m ³	Process Contribution		Predicted Environmental	
	ng/m ³	Reference period		ng/m ³	% of EAL	ng/m ³	% of EAL
Cd	5	Annual mean	0.12	0.42	8.4	0.54	10.8
	30	24 hour mean (short term)	0.24	6.79	22.6	7.03	23.4
Hg	600	1 hour mean	4.2	6.79	<10		
	60	24 hour mean (long term)	4.2	5.35	8.9		
Sb	5000	Annual mean	1.3	6.35	<1		
	150000	1 hour mean	2.6	101.91	<1		
Pb	250	Annual mean	4.3	6.35	2.5	10.65	4.26
Cu	50	24 hour mean (long term)	4.4	80.19	160.4	84.59	169.180
Mn	150	Annual mean	4.1	6.35	4.2	10.45	6.97
	1500000	1 hour mean	8.2	101.91	<1		
V	1000	24 hr average (short term)	1.3	80.19	<10		
As	6	Annual mean	0.39	6.35	105.8	6.74	112.3
Cr (II)(III)	2000	24 hour mean (long term)	3.2	80.19	4.0	83.39	4.170
Cr (VI)	0.25	Annual mean	0.32	6.35	2540.0	6.67	2668.0
Ni	20	Annual mean	0.51	6.35	31.8	6.86	34.3
	700	1 hour mean	1.02	101.91	14.6	102.93	14.7

(i) Screening out emissions which are insignificant

From the tables above the following 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. These are:

- *PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, HCl, HF, CO, NH₃, PCBs, Sb, V.*

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, SO₂, PAH, VOC (as Benzene), Cd, Hg, Pb, Mn, Cr(II) (III), Ni.*

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

From the tables above the following emissions are considered to have the potential to give rise to significant pollution in that the Predicted Environmental Concentration exceeds 100% of the long term or short term ES.

- *Cu, As, Cr(VI).*

These pollutants required further assessment, see Section 5.2.3 for details of the assessment.

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 greater than 10% of the ES and

therefore cannot be screened out as insignificant. However, it is not expected to result in the ES being exceeded.

The Applicant has modelled the impact at nearby sensitive receptors. The results showed that the maximum impact was as follows:

Maximum Annual Mean Nitrogen Dioxide Impact at a Sensitive Receptor.

Receptor & Grid Reference	Process contribution		Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC)	
	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	% of EAL	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	% of EAL
Strauss Road (453770, 520709)	0.19	<1		

The above table shows that maximum long-term PC at a sensitive receptor is <1% of the ES, so can therefore be considered 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 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and a short-term daily average of 50 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. For PM_{2.5} the ES of 20 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ as a long-term annual average was used, having changed from 25 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ 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.

The above assessment is considered to represent a worst-case assessment in that:

- It assumes that the plant emits particulates continuously at the IED Annex VI limit for total dust, whereas actual emissions from similar plant are normally lower.
- 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.

The above table also shows that the predicted PC for emissions of PM_{2.5} is also below 1% of the ES. Therefore, the Environment Agency concludes that particulate emissions from the installation, including emissions of PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5}, will not give rise to significant pollution.

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 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, 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 CO 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 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 VOC emissions, 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 Applicant has used the ES for Benzene for their assessment of the impact of VOC in line with our Air Quality guidance.

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 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 impact from VOCs was based on the emission limit set in the permit for total organic carbon

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 was initially based on a release concentration of 10 mg/m³, however the Applicant was required to propose a lower ammonia release concentration in order to reduce impact on a nearby habitat site. The proposed concentration was reduced to 8mg/m³ (monthly average). We are satisfied that this level of emission is consistent with the operation of a well controlled SNCR NO_x abatement system. See section 5.4 below for further details of the impact on habitat sites.

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.

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, the following emissions of metals were screened out as insignificant:

- *Sb, V.*

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, Hg, Pb, Mn, Cr(II)(III), Ni.*

This left emissions of Cu, As & Cr(VI) requiring further assessment. For all other metals, the Applicant has concluded that exceedences of the EAL for all metals are not likely to occur.

Where the BREF sets an aggregate limit, the Applicant's assessment assumes that each metal is emitted individually at the relevant aggregate emission limit value. This is a something which can never actually occur in practice as it would inevitably result in a breach of the said limit and so represents a very much worst-case scenario.

For metals Cu, As & Cr(VI) the Applicant Used representative emissions data from other municipal waste incinerators using our guidance note Please refer

to “Guidance to Applicants on Impact Assessment for Group 3 Metals Stack Releases – version 4”. Measurement of Chromium (VI) at the levels anticipated at the stack emission points is expected to be difficult, with the likely levels being below the level of detection by the most advanced methods. Data for Cr (VI) was based on total Cr emissions measurements and the proportion of total Cr to Cr (VI) in APC residues.

Based on the above, the following emissions of metals were screened out as insignificant:

- *Cr(VI)*

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

- *Cu & As*

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

The Applicant’s air quality modelling has assessed cumulative impacts of the installation with several proposed. They were as follows:

- TeesREP Biomass Plant
- Teesside Combined Cycle Power Plant
- Grangetown Peaking Plant
- Peak African Minerals Resources Refinery
- Redcar Energy Centre
- Circular Fuels Arboretum Renewable Gas Plant
- CSG Wilton Waste Treatment Plant

Only emissions with the potential for significant cumulative effects with the Installation were included in the cumulative dispersion modelling. The assessment considered impacts at sensitive receptors. For annual mean impacts the assessment concentrated on cadmium, as all other pollutants were screened out as insignificant irrespective of the PEC. The assessment showed that despite the cumulative impact the PEC remains well below the ES.

The assessment also considered short-term impacts. It concluded that the only cumulative source with the potential for a significant short-term impact was the Circular Fuels Arboretum Renewable Gas Plant. The assessment showed that there is no risk of an exceedance of ES and therefore no significant cumulative short-term effects will occur.

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

No AQMAs have been declared within an area likely to be affected by emissions from the Installation.

5.3 Human health risk assessment

5.3.1 Our role in preventing harm to human health

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.

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 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).

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 (NO_2 , SO_2 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.

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 (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 PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} with 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.
- 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 PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, HCl, HF, CO, NH₃, PCBs, Sb & V have all indicated that the Installation emissions screen out as insignificant; where the impact of emissions of NO₂, SO₂, PAH, VOC (as Benzene), Cd/Tl, Hg, Pb, Mn, Cr(II) (III) and Ni have not been screened out as insignificant, the assessment still shows that the PEC are well within the ES. Cu, As & Cr(VI) were not initially screened out as the PEC was above 100% however further assessment showed that impacts would not be significant and impacts would not lead to an exceedance of an ES.
- ii. 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).
- iii. 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.

- iv. 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.
- v. UKHSA and the Local Authority Director of Public Health were consulted on the Application. The UKHSA concluded that they had no significant concerns regarding the risk to the health of humans from the installation. The Local Authority Director of Public Health did not provide a response. The Food Standards Agency was also consulted during the permit determination process but did not provide a response to our consultation. Details of the responses provided by UKHSA 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.

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:

- Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast Ramsar & SPA
- North York Moors SAC & SPA

The following Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) are located within 2 km of the Installation:

- Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SSSI

There are no local nature sites (ancient woods, local wildlife sites and national and local nature reserves within 2Km of the proposed Installation.

5.4.2 Habitats Assessment

The Applicant's AQ assessment predicted the following impacts:

The Applicant assessed impacts against the following critical levels, which were derive from the Air Pollution Information System (APIS) website.

Oxides of nitrogen: 30 µg/m³ annual mean, 75 µg/m³ 24 hour mean

Sulphur dioxide: 10 µg/m³ annual mean

Hydrogen fluoride: 0.5 µg/m³ weekly mean, 5 µg/m³ 24 hour mean

Ammonia: 3 µg/m³ annual mean for Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast; 1 µg/m³ for North York Moors.

Table 1(a) Process contributions compared to critical levels (CI)

	NOx		SO ₂	HF		NH ₃
	Annual mean PC as % CI	Daily mean PC as % CI	Annual mean PC as % CI	Weekly mean PC as % CI	Daily mean PC as % CI	Annual mean PC as % CI
Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA/Ramsar	1.85	<10	<1	<10	<1	1.85
North York Moors (SPA/Ramsar)	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1

	NO_x	NH₃
	Annual mean PEC as % Cl	Annual mean PEC as % Cl
Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA/Ramsar	124	62.5

Table 2 nitrogen deposition

Site	Habitat type	Critical load (kgN/ha/yr)	PC (kgN/ha/yr)	PC % CLo	PEC % CLo
Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA/Ramsar	Coastal sand dunes	10	0.11	1.12	134%
	Saltmarsh	10	0.13	1.32	127%
North York Moors (SPA/Ramsar)	European dry heath	5	0.03	<1	

Table 3 acid deposition

Site	Habitat type	Critical load (keq/ha/yr)	PC (keq/ha/yr)	PC % CLo	PEC % CLo
Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA/Ramsar	No species sensitive to acid deposition				
North York Moors (SPA/Ramsar)	European dry heath	MinCL _{min} N – 0.295 MinCL _{max} N – 0.725 MinCL _{max} S – 0.430	0.00437	<1	

The Applicant's habitats assessment was reviewed by our technical specialists for air dispersion modelling and assessment and specialists for habitats and conservation.

The Applicant's assessment showed that impacts at the North York Moors SPA & Ramsar impacts can be considered insignificant and no further analysis is required. However, for the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA & Ramsar the PC from annual mean NO_x and annual mean NH₃ is predicted to exceed 1% the critical level and therefore could not be screened out as insignificant.

Further analysis of the PEC showed that for annual mean NH₃ the PEC is predicted to be 62% of the critical level and therefore the emission will not result in the NH₃ critical level being exceeded. So the impact can be considered insignificant.

The PEC for NO_x was calculated at 124% of the critical level as the background NO_x levels already exceeds the NO_x critical level. The Applicant provided a detailed assessment of the potential impact which showed that the only priority habitat present in the area where the PC of NO_x exceeds 1% of the critical level is the mudflat habitat which is not sensitive to additional loading of NO_x. Therefore, there is no potential for a significant effect.

With regards to nutrient nitrogen deposition the Applicant's assessment predicted the PC would exceed 1% of the critical load and the PEC is above 100% of the critical load at the saltmarsh and coastal sand dune habitats within the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA & Ramsar. Therefore, the impacts could not be screened out as insignificant.

The Applicant provided further analysis of nutrient nitrogen deposition which showed that the areas of saltmarsh impacted by emissions from the installation are considered to be pioneer saltmarsh habitat. Information on the APIS website showed that pioneer saltmarsh habitat has a higher critical load of 20 kgN/ha/yr. Using the higher critical load meant that the PC is predicted to be <1% of the critical load and therefore impacts can be screened out as insignificant.

For the coastal sand dune habitat the Applicant provided some justification for why the predicted PC would not damage the features of the habitat. However, we did not agree with the justification provided and therefore we required the Applicant to reduce emissions of pollutants that would contribute to nutrient nitrogen deposition. In response the Applicant proposed a monthly average ammonia ELV of 8mg/m³, which when modelled resulted in a reduction of predicted nutrient nitrogen deposition PC to <1% of the critical load (10 kgN/ha/yr) and therefore the impact can be screened out as insignificant.

With regard to in-combination effects an assessment was carried out of any permission, plan or project (PPP) that could act in combination with the Installation. Following the assessment we concluded no adverse effect on the integrity of the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA & Ramsar.

We completed a stage 1 and stage 2 Habitat Risk Assessment (HRA) and this was sent to Natural England for consultation. The HRA detailed the relevant impacts on the habitat sites listed above from the proposed installation and concluded that the proposed installation will have no adverse effect on the integrity of the habitat sites either alone or in-combination.

Natural England provided a consultation response which did not agree with our conclusion and raised concern about the potential impact from noise impacts and process effluent.

With regard to noise, we explained to Natural England that the Applicant has provided a noise impact assessment (NIA), which predicted noise impacts at the closest sensitive receptors. Whilst the NIA did not model noise impact at the habitat site, we were able to use the information from the NIA to ascertain that noise impacts at the habitat site would be well below the level that is likely

to cause disturbance of the sensitive species that are present in the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA and Ramsar.

With regard to impacts from process effluent their concern was based on Viridor not specifying that any discharges will be outside of the Tees Catchment as discharging into Sewage Treatment Works or other facilities in the Tees catchment would result in additional Nitrogen being added to the system. Due to this they did not agree with the conclusion of no-adverse effect on the site integrity.

In response we clarified to Natural England that the Applicant's proposal was to re-use process effluents within the process where possible and in the unlikely event that excess effluents are produced they will be tankered off site for treatment at a suitably licensed third party waste management facility. Assessment of the impact following treatment will therefore be the responsibility of the operator of the licensed waste management facility in line with the conditions of their Environmental Permit. Also, if the Applicant wants to discharge the process effluents to sewer, the permit will not allow this and they will be required to apply for a permit variation at which point we would assess the impacts from the discharge.

Following our response Natural England's position remained that they did not agree with the conclusion of the HRA2. Natural England's view was that the HRA should consider the impact on water quality at the designated sites even if they involve elements that fall beyond the scope of the permit itself. We considered Natural England's comments, however we are satisfied that the scope of the assessment is appropriate and in accordance with our duties. Therefore, no further assessment was required.

Natural England also raised concern that an isopleth provided by the Applicant to show the impact from nutrient nitrogen deposition on the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA and Ramsar showed that the impact on a small area on the edge of the coastal sand dune habitat was predicted to be above 1% of the relevant nutrient nitrogen deposition critical load.

We had already considered this and we are satisfied that any potential exceedance of the 1% threshold would be small and on a very small area of the habitat. It is also noted that the modelling assessment is based on worst case assumptions, and actual impacts are likely to be lower than predicted. Therefore, our conclusion of no-adverse effect on the site integrity remains unchanged.

A copy of the full HRA1, HRA2 and Natural England's response is available on public register.

5.4.3 SSSI Assessment

The Applicant's assessment of SSSIs was reviewed by the Environment Agency's technical specialists for modelling, air quality, conservation and

ecology technical services, who agreed with the assessment's conclusions, that the proposal does not damage the special features of the SSSI.

Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SSSI – The geographical area that this site covers is also designated as the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA and Ramsar. Therefore, the assessment and our conclusions are the same as those detailed above. As per the requirements of Countryside and Rights of Way Act (CROW) 2000 we have completed an Appendix 4 notice which details our assessment and conclusions and have sent this to Natural England.

A copy of the Appendix 4 assessment and Natural England's response is available on public register.

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.

In making an assessment of abnormal operations the following worst case scenario has been assumed by the Applicant:

- Dioxin emissions of 6ng/m³ (100 x normal ELV)
- NO_x emissions of 500 mg/m³ (1.25 x normal ELV)
- Particulate emissions of 150 mg/m³ (5 x normal ELV)
- Cadmium emissions of 0.3 mg/m³ (15 x group ELV)
- Metal emissions other than mercury for which there is a short term or long term ES are 30 times the emission concentrations detailed in the EA guidance document 'Guidance on assessing group 3 metal stack emissions from incinerators v4' (the EA metals guidance).
- SO₂ emissions of 450mg/m³ (2.25 x normal ELV)
- HCl emissions of 900mg/m³ (15x normal ELV)
- PCBs of 0.5mg/m³(100 x normal)
- Mercury emissions of 6mg/m³, the Waste Incineration BREF states that for carbon injections systems mercury absorbed usually to about a 95% efficiency to result in emissions to air of below 0.03mg/m³. Therefore based on the Waste Incineration BREF the unabated mercury emission concentration due to a failure of the carbon injection system would be 0.6mg/m³. This equates to 30 times the modelled emission limit of 0.02mg/m³ which was used in the dispersion modelling.

This is a worst-case scenario in that these abnormal conditions include a number of different equipment failures not all of which will necessarily result in an adverse impact on the environment (e.g. a failure of a monitoring instrument does not necessarily mean that the incinerator or abatement plant is malfunctioning). This analysis assumes that any failure of any equipment results in all the negative impacts set out above occurring simultaneously.

The result on the Applicant's short-term environmental impact is summarised in the table below.

Pollutant	EQS/EAL		Process Contribution (PC)		
	µg/m3		µg/m3	% of EAL	% of PEC
NO ₂	200	99.79th %ile of 1-hour means	49.82	24.9	44.1
PM ₁₀	50	90.41st %ile of 24-hour means	2.14	4.28	
SO ₂	125	99.18th %ile of 24-hour means	16.32	13.1	14.7
	266	99.9th %ile of	140.12	52.7	53.4

		15-min means			
	350	99.73rd %ile of 1-hour means	127.33	36.4	37.0
HCl	750	1-hour average	305.7	40.1	41.0
HF	160	1-hour average	6.79	4.25	
Hg	0.6	1-hour average	0.203	33.8	34.7
Sb	150	1-hour average	0.117	0.08	
Ni	0.7	1-hour average	0.540	77.2	77.3
Cu	0.05	24-hr average	0.0452	90.4	99.2
Mn	1500	1-hour average	0.611	0.04	
V	1	24-hr average	0.0094	0.94	
Cr (II) (III)	2	24-hr average	0.143	7.1	

From the table above the emissions of the following substances can still be considered insignificant, in that the PC is still <10% of the short-term ES.

- PM₁₀, HF, Sb, Mn, V, Cr(II)(III)

Also, from the table above emissions of the following emissions (which were not screened out as insignificant) have been assessed as being unlikely to give rise to significant pollution in that the predicted environmental concentration is less than 100% of short-term ES.

- SO₂, HCl, Hg, Ni, Cu.

We are therefore satisfied that it is not necessary to further constrain the conditions and duration of the periods of abnormal operation beyond those permitted under Chapter IV of the IED.

We have not assessed the impact of abnormal operations against long term ESs for the reasons set out above except for dioxin/furans. Our checks indicate the dioxin, furan and dioxin-like PC intakes are below 10% of the COT TDI and are not considered a significant risk to health. This also applies to any increased emissions of dioxins, furans and dioxin-like PCBs during worst-case abnormal operations.

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, SO₂, PAH, VOCs and some metals.
- 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 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
Rotary Kiln	Can accept liquids and pastes as well as gases Solid feeds more limited than grate (due to refractory damage) often applied to hazardous Wastes	<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

Technique	Key waste characteristics and suitability	Throughput per line	Advantages	Disadvantages / Limitations of use	Bottom Ash Quality	Cost
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%	FGT cost may be lower. Costs of waste preparation
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
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

Technique	Key waste characteristics and suitability	Throughput per line	Advantages	Disadvantages / Limitations of use	Bottom Ash Quality	Cost
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

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

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

- Moving Grate Furnace
- Fixed Hearth
- Pulsed Hearth
- Rotary & Oscillating Kiln
- Fluidised Bed
- Pyrolysis / Gasification

The Applicant's assessment is summarised below:

Moving Grate Furnaces

Designed to handle large volumes of waste. The leading technology in the UK and Europe for the combustion of biomass and non-hazardous waste fuels, such as that proposed to be treated at the Installation.

Fixed Hearth

Not considered suitable for large volumes of waste. Best suited to low volumes of consistent waste.

Pulsed Hearth

Has been used for waste fuels, such as those proposed at the Installation as well as other solid wastes. However, there have been difficulties in achieving reliable and effective burnout of the waste and it is considered that the burnout criteria required by Article 50(1) of the IED would be difficult to achieve.

Rotary & Oscillating Kiln

Rotary Kilns are widely used by the cement industry which uses a consistent fuel feedstock and is widely used within the healthcare sector. However they have not been used in the UK for large volumes of waste derived fuels.

Oscillating kilns are not widely used for incineration of municipal waste. The energy conversion efficiency in these systems is lower than of other thermal treatment technologies. Also the maximum processing capacity is relatively low (approx. 8 tonnes per hour) meaning multiple kilns would be required for this application which is considered impractical and would lead to efficiency losses.

Fluidised Bed

Designed for relatively homogeneous wastes. Therefore, MSW wastes require pre-processing. Fluidised bed can lead to slightly lower NO_x generation, however the injection of a NO_x reagent is still required to achieve the relevant emission limits specified in IED. Fluidised bed can have elevated nitrous oxide emissions, a potent greenhouse gas.

Pyrolysis/Gasification

Various suppliers are developing pyrolysis and gasification systems for the incineration of wastes such as that proposed for this Installation, however, the systems are not considered to be a robust proven technology for the treatment of residual MSW and C&I waste at the proposed waste throughput for this installation. Therefore, these systems are not appropriate for this Installation.

The Applicant concluded that fixed hearth, pulsed hearth, rotary & oscillating kiln and pyrolysis/gasification are not suitable. Moving grate and fluidised bed were considered in more detail. The Applicant's assessment is summarised below:

- The combustion technologies will produce similar quantities of residues, although fluidised bed produces more residue due to the losses of sand from the furnace.
- The material costs are approximately 7% higher for fluidised bed than for moving grate, whereas the moving grate system will have a slightly higher power revenue.
- The moving grate system will be able to process the varying waste composition compared to a fluidised bed system which requires a consistent and homogenous waste and therefore requiring additional treatment of the waste.
- Moving Grate systems are designed for large quantities of heterogenous waste, whereas fluidised bed systems are more sensitive to inconsistencies within the waste.

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

The Applicant proposes to use gasoil as support fuel for start-up, shut down and for the auxiliary burners. The Applicant has stated that gas oil does not pose the same type of safety risk as those associated with gas storage and pipework. Emissions of SO₂ will be minimised through the use of low sulphur fuel oil.

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;
- Minimisation of volume in the critical cooling sections to ensure high gas velocities; 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.

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
Wet scrubbing	May reduce acid gases simultaneously.	Not normally BAT.	Require reheat to prevent visible plume	Where scrubbing required for

		Liquid effluent produced	and dew point problems.	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 fabric filters for the abatement of particulate matter. Fabric filters provide reliable abatement of particulate matter to below 5 mg/m³ and are BAT for most installations. The Applicant proposes to use multiple compartment filters with burst bag detection to minimise the risk of increased particulate emissions in the event of bag rupture.

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.

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
Selective	NOx emissions	Relies on an	Port injection	All plant

non-catalytic reduction (SNCR)	80 -180 mg/m ³ Lower energy consumption than SCR Lower costs than SCR	optimum temperature around 900 °C, and sufficient retention time for reduction May lead to Ammonia slip	locations	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.

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 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 ammonia.

Emissions of NO_x cannot be screened out as insignificant. Therefore the Applicant has carried out a cost / benefit study of the alternative techniques. The cost per tonne of NO_x abated over the projected life of the plant has been calculated and compared with the environmental impact as shown in the table below.

Parameter	Units	SNCR	SCR	SNCR + FGR
NO _x released after abatement	t p.a.	240	190	240
NO _x abated	t p.a.	620	670	530
Photochemical Ozone Creation Potential (POCP)	t ethylene-eq p.a.	-9,200	-7,200	-9,200
Global Warming Potential	t CO ₂ p.a.	1,400	5,300	1,900
Ammonia used	t.p.a.	4,250	2,000	3,630
Annualised Cost	£ p.a.	£845,000	£3,018,000	£1,004,000
Cost per tonne NO _x abated	£ p.t NO _x .	£1,360	£4,470	£1,890

Based on the figures above the Applicant considers that the additional cost of SCR over SNCR is not justified by the reduction in environmental impact. Thus SCR is not BAT in this case, and SNCR is BAT for the Installation. The Applicant has justified the use of ammonia as the reagent on the basis of a reduced climate change impact, due to lower nitrous oxide formation than urea. We agree with this assessment.

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 quarter.

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	Disperses sources of acid	Requires closer control of waste		All plant with heterogeneous

streams	gases (e.g. PVC) through feed.	management		waste feed
----------------	--------------------------------	------------	--	------------

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 re-cycle</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>Higher solid residue production</p> <p>Reagent consumption controlled only by input rate</p>		All plant

	Lowest visible plume potential			
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	Wide range of uses	MWIs, CWIs

	Temperature of reaction well suited to use with bag filters	volume 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.
- 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.

The Applicant has considered 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. The Applicant has not proposed direct boiler injection. They have stated that this only achieves partial abatement of acid gases and does not eliminate the need for additional flue gas treatment stages. They have acknowledged that using a combination of both boiler sorbent injection and the additional proposed acid gas abatement would provide a higher level of abatement than either system alone; however, the operating and maintenance costs and reagent composition would be higher. For this reason, it is not considered BAT for this Installation.

In this case, the Applicant proposes to use a dry system with lime. Lime is injected into the flue gas stream within the flue gas treatment system located after the boiler. 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

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 <i>de novo</i> 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 control of acid gas emissions also assists in the control of dioxin releases.

In this case the Applicant proposes that the lime and activated carbon dosage system will have separate control systems for the injection into the flue gas stream, but they may be injected via the same injection point. 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.

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 that the lime and activated carbon dosage system will have separate control systems for the injection into the flue gas stream, but they may be injected via the same injection point. We are satisfied their proposals are BAT.

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.

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 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.

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.

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]

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

Emissions to water will consist of uncontaminated surface water runoff from buildings, roadways and external areas of hardstanding. The runoff will be discharged into the site's surface water drainage system, from there it will be discharged via petrol interceptors into attenuation storage prior to discharge to storm sewer.

Process effluent from the Installation will not be discharged to water. Where practicable the effluents will be re-used within the process. In the unlikely event that excess process effluents are generated these will be tankered off site and disposed of at a suitably licensed waste management facility. Foul effluent from domestic facilities will be treated in a wastewater treatment plant on site prior to discharge to foul sewer. Note that discharges of domestic effluent are not controlled by this permit.

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

There will be no discharges to sewer other than those described above.

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

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 proposed techniques for minimising fugitive emissions include:

- Activated carbon and lime will be stored within silos that have local dust filters and also incorporate high level alarms to avoid over filling.
- All chemicals (including fuel oil) and raw materials will be stored within a tank in a dedicated storage area, with secondary containment.

- The site surface water drainage system will be installed with a penstock valve or similar which will prohibit the discharge of contaminated surface water off site in the event of a fire or other emergency.
- The surfaces of the waste reception; handling and storage areas; and tanker offloading areas have been designed and will be constructed as impermeable structures.
- Spill kits will be available on site.
- Waste storage and IBA will be stored in a building which will have sealed drainage. Contaminated runoff from these areas will be collected and re used where possible or if necessary tankered off site.

We have also set a pre-operational conditional (PO11) requiring the Operator to demonstrate that the containment systems for hazardous liquids are designed and constructed in accordance CIRIA 736 or an equivalent standard.

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

The Applicant proposes that planned maintenance of each line will be undertaken in succession, this means one line will be operating so negative pressure within the waste reception will be maintained. Therefore minimising odorous emissions. If both lines are to be shut down, the Applicant has stated they will reduce the amount of waste in the bunker before the shutdown occurs.

The Applicant has also stated that in the unlikely event that both lines are shutdown due to an unplanned event and odour becomes an issue that they will use atomisation or deodorising system on the odour source to control odour and if necessary backload waste from the bunker and transfer it off site. The frequency of odour monitoring will be increased during shutdown. Waste reception doors will be kept closed for the duration of the shutdown.

6.5.5 Noise and vibration

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.

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.

Our assessment shows that there is the potential for an adverse impact at the nearest noise sensitive receptors during night-time weekend periods. We therefore required the Applicant to submit a noise management plan (NMP). The submitted NMP demonstrated that the Operator's noise management techniques are in line with BAT and therefore noise impacts will be minimised and significant noise impacts are unlikely. We have included a pre-operational condition requiring the Operator to submit an updated NMP following the final design of the installation. We have also included an Improvement Condition (IC12) requiring the Operator to carry out an operational noise assessment and an assessment of the effectiveness of control measures listed in the noise management plan, within 12 months of the completion of commissioning.

Based upon the information in the application and noise management plan 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.

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 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 in assessing BAT. A lower limit of 8 mg/m³ for NH₃ has been set. See section 5.4.4 for further information

(ii) National and European ESs

We are satisfied that the Installation will not result in an exceedance of any National or European ES.

(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. 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

Pre-operational condition PO4 will ensure that measures to protect the environment during commissioning are agreed with the Environment Agency.

6.7 Monitoring

6.7.1 Monitoring during normal operations

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 2.3.12 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 IC9 and IC10 and we can require long term monitoring for dioxins and continuous monitoring for mercury if required.

6.8 Reporting

We have specified the reporting requirements in Schedule 4 of the Permit either to meet the reporting requirements set out in the IED, or to ensure data is reported to enable timely review by 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 decision of the Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council to grant planning permission on 24/07/2020.
- The report and decision notice of the local planning authority accompanying the grant of planning permission.

- The response of the Environment Agency to the local planning authority in its role as consultee to the planning process.

From consideration of all the documents above, the Environment Agency considers that no additional or different 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.

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, both on the original application and later, separately, on the draft permit and a draft decision document. 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)

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.

(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 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 Legislative and Regulatory Reform Act 2006

In accordance with section 21 of this Act, when making this decision we have had regard to the need to be transparent, accountable, proportionate and consistent, and the need to target action where it is needed.

In accordance with section 22 of the Act we have had regard to the Regulators' Code; in particular the need to base our decision on environmental risk, and to support the applicant to comply and grow, so that burdens have only been imposed where they are necessary and proportionate.

7.2.4 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.

7.2.5 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.

7.2.6 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 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.

We assessed the Application and concluded that the Installation will not damage the special features of any SSSI. This was recorded on a CROW Appendix 4 form.

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.

7.2.7 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 as to what action we can properly take, consistently with the proper exercise of our functions, to further the general biodiversity objective, which is to further the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and having considered, determined such policies and specific objectives as we consider appropriate for taking action to further the general biodiversity objective, and take such action as we consider appropriate, in the light of those policies and objectives, to further that objective.

Section 40(2A) states that in complying with the duty in section 40(1) and (1A) we must have particular regard to any relevant local nature recovery strategy and species protection strategy or protected sites strategy

We have, also, 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.

7.2.8 Countryside Act 1968

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.

There is no National Park which could be affected by the Installation.

7.2.12 Environment Act 2021

Section 110(10) requires that we must have regard to a protected sites strategy, which Natural England has prepared and published in relation to improving the conservation and management of a protected site, and managing the impact of plans, projects or other activities (wherever undertaken) on the conservation and management of the protected site, where relevant to exercise of our duties under Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, sections 28G to 28I Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 or Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009.

We have had regard to this in our assessments.

7.3 National secondary legislation

7.3.1 Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017

We assessed the Application in accordance with our guidance and concluded that for the purposes of the Habitats Regulations there will be likely significant effects on any European site and undertook an Appropriate Assessment (Habitats Regulations Assessment Stage 2) of those effects.

We consulted Natural England on the appropriate assessment, they did not agree with our conclusion that the operation of the Installation would not have adverse effects on the interest features of European sites. The way we have had regard to Natural England's response is detailed in section 5.4 of this document and a copy of the full Habitats Regulations Assessments can be found on our 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

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.

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.

7.5 Other relevant legal requirements

7.5.1 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 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. No discharge from flue gas treatment.
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 3.6.4 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 2.3.12 and 2.3.13.
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. No hazardous waste accepted.
45(2)(b)	The permit shall include the minimum and maximum mass flows	Not applicable. No hazardous waste

IED Article	Requirement	Delivered by
	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.	accepted.
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 and Table S1.2 of Schedule 1 of the Permit.
46(2)	Emission into air shall not exceed the emission limit values set out in part 3 of Annex VI.	Conditions 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 and Tables S3.1, S3.1a.
46(2)	Emission into air shall not exceed the emission limit values set out in parts 4 or determined in accordance with part 4 of Annex VI.	Conditions 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 and Tables S3.1, S3.1a
46(3)	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(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	Conditions 2.3.12 and 2.3.13

IED Article	Requirement	Delivered by
	TOC not to be exceeded during this period.	
47	In the event of breakdown, reduce or close down operations as soon as practicable. Limits on dust (150 mg/m ³), CO and TOC not to be exceeded during this period.	Condition 2.3.9
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 to 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 PO8
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 S3.4
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	Condition 2.3.14

IED Article	Requirement	Delivered by
	liquefied gas or natural gas.	
50(4)(a)	Automatic shut-down to prevent waste feed if at start up until the specified temperature has been reached.	Condition 2.3.9
50(4)(b)	Automatic shut-down to prevent waste feed if the combustion temperature is not maintained.	Condition 2.3.9
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 2.3.9 and 2.3.12 and 2.3.13
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 1.1.4 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).	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
52(1)	Take all necessary precautions concerning delivery and reception of Wastes, to prevent or minimise pollution.	Conditions 2.3.1, 2.3.3, 2.3.4, 2.3.5, 2.3.6, 2.3.7 and 2.3.8. Pre-operational

IED Article	Requirement	Delivered by
		condition PO5.
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.

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 3.6.1 and table S3.4
4	Monitoring emissions to air	Condition 3.6.1 and table S3.1 and S3.1(a)
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

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. Waste types not accepted on site.
23	Management system to prevent or reduce dust emissions from treatment of slags and ashes	Not applicable. No treatment of slags or ashes.
24	Techniques to prevent or reduce diffuse emissions to air from treatment of slags and ashes	Not applicable. No treatment of slags or ashes.
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, 3.2.1, 3.3.1, 3.3.2. 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 and table S3.1

BAT conclusion	Criteria	Delivered by
26	Techniques and BAT AEL for dust emissions from enclosed slags and ashes treatment	Not applicable. No treatment of slags or ashes.
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 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. 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
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 S1.2, 2.3.1, table S1.2, 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 and table S3.1
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

BAT conclusion	Criteria	Delivered by
34	Reduce emissions to water from FGC and/or from treatment or storage of bottom ashes. BAT AELs	Not applicable. No treatment of slags or ashes; or wet scrubbers.
35	Handle and treat bottom ashes separately from FGC residues	Permit condition 2.3.15
36	Techniques for treatment of slags and bottom ashes	Not applicable. No treatment of slags or ashes.
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

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.

Table S1.4 Pre-operational measures	
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>
PO4	<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 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</p>

Table S1.4 Pre-operational measures	
Reference	Pre-operational measures
	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	<p>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.</p> <p>The procedure shall be implemented in accordance with the written approval from the Agency.</p>
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	Prior to the commencement of commissioning, the Operator shall submit a report, and obtain the Environment Agency's written approval to it, on the baseline conditions of soil and groundwater at the installation. The report shall contain the information necessary to determine the state of soil and groundwater contamination so as to make a quantified comparison with the state upon definitive cessation of activities provided for in Article 22(3) of the IED. The report shall contain information, supplementary to that already provided in application Site Condition Report, needed to meet the information requirements of Article 22(2) of the IED.
PO8	<p>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 monitoring stack emissions measuring locations, techniques and standards for periodic monitoring and M20. The report shall include the following:</p> <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
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.
PO10	At least 6 months before the commencement of commissioning the operator shall submit an updated Fire Prevention Plan to the Environment Agency for assessment

Table S1.4 Pre-operational measures	
Reference	Pre-operational measures
	<p>and written approval. The updated plan shall be based on the final design of the installation and be written in accordance with the latest version Environment Agency Fire Prevention Plan guidance. The updated plan shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The location of all quarantine areas; size of the quarantine area; clearance areas around the perimeter (a 6m separation distance, or equivalent alternative measure, must be maintained around the quarantined waste); and infrastructure associated with the quarantine area. • The procedure for removing waste temporarily stored from the quarantine area as soon as practicable in the event of fire. <p>The operator shall implement the proposals in the plan as agreed with the Environment Agency.</p>
PO11	<p>At least 6 months before the commencement of commissioning the operator shall submit an updated Noise Management Plan to the Environment Agency for assessment and written approval. The updated plan shall be based on the final design of the installation and follow the latest version of Environment Agency Noise Management Plan guidance. You shall implement the proposals in the plan as agreed with the Environment Agency.</p>
PO12	<p>At least 6 months before the commencement of commissioning the operator shall submit a report to the Environment Agency for approval demonstrating that the containment systems for hazardous liquids stored on site are designed and are constructed in accordance with CIRIA 736 (Containment Systems for the prevention of pollution) or an equivalent standard.</p>

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.

Table S1.3 Improvement programme requirements		
Reference	Requirement	Date
IC1	The Operator shall submit a written report to the Environment Agency for approval 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 for approval to carry out tests to determine the size distribution of the particulate matter in the exhaust gas emissions to air from emission point A1 an A2, 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 for approval 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 PO6.	Validation tests completed before the end of commissioning
	The operator shall submit a written report to the Environment Agency for approval on the validation of residence time, oxygen and temperature whilst operating under normal load, minimum turn down and overload conditions. The report shall identify the process controls used to ensure residence time and temperature requirements are complied with during operation of the incineration plant	Report submitted within 2 months of the completion of commissioning.
IC5	The Operator shall submit a written report to the Environment Agency for approval describing the performance and optimisation of:	Within 4 months of the

Table S1.3 Improvement programme requirements		
Reference	Requirement	Date
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The lime 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 (NO_x). The report shall include an initial assessment of the level of NO_x, N₂O and NH₃ emissions that can be achieved under optimum operating conditions. 	completion of commissioning.
IC6	<p>The Operator shall carry out an assessment of the impact of emissions to air of all the following component metals subject to emission limit values:</p> <p>Cu, As & Cr(VI)</p> <p>A report on the assessment shall be submitted to the Environment Agency for approval.</p> <p>Emissions monitoring data obtained during the first year of operation shall be used to compare the actual emissions with those assumed in the impact assessment submitted with the Application. An assessment shall be made of the impact of each metal against the relevant ES. In the event that the assessment shows that an environmental standard can be exceeded, the report shall include proposals for further investigative work.</p>	15 months from the completion of commissioning
IC7	The Operator shall submit a written summary report to the Environment Agency for approval 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>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>
IC8	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	Within 6 months of completion of commissioning.
IC9	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 for approval 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

Table S1.3 Improvement programme requirements		
Reference	Requirement	Date
IC10	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 for approval 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
IC11	<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.</p> <p>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.
IC12	<p>The Operator shall submit a written proposal to the Environment Agency for approval to carry out a review of the noise impact of the installation at the most sensitive receptors once the facility is fully operational in its first year of operation.</p> <p>The proposal shall include as a minimum a review of the appropriate measurements to verify any modelling work to establish whether any noise emissions are likely to give rise to nuisance or complaints and an action plan to be developed and agreed if significant adverse impacts are identified.</p>	Within 6 months of completion of commissioning or as agreed in writing with the Environment Agency.
	The Operator shall submit a written report to the Environment Agency for approval on the findings of the review of noise impacts, including an action plan to address any significant adverse impacts where they are identified.	Report to be submitted to the Environment Agency within 12 months of completion of commissioning.

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 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 02/09/2024 to 14/10/2024 and in the Teesside Gazette on 02/09/2024. The Application was made available to view on line on Citizen Space and the .gov.uk. website.

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

- Health and Safety Executive
- UK Health Security Agency
- Food Standards Agency
- Director of Public Health Redcar and Cleveland Council
- Planning Department Redcar and Cleveland Council
- Environmental Protection Department Redcar and Cleveland Council
- Cleveland Fire and Rescue Service

1) Consultation Responses from Statutory and Non-Statutory Bodies

Response Received from UK Health Security Agency	
Brief summary of issues raised:	Summary of action taken / how this has been covered
The UKHSAs risk assessment is that modern well run and regulated municipal waste incinerators are not a significant risk to public health.	No action required.
The Environment Agency should reduce public exposure to non-threshold pollutants (such as particulate matter and nitrogen dioxide) below air quality standard.	We are satisfied that there will not a significant impact on human health or the environment. See section 5.3 for our assessment of emissions to air.
The Environment Agency should also satisfy itself that a suitable procedure is in place for reporting complaints to the Operator.	We are satisfied that suitable procedure will be in place for reporting complaints. The Operator is required by condition 1.1 in the permit to have an Environmental Management System in place that will have procedures for reporting complaints.

Response Received from Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council Planning Dept	
Brief summary of issues raised:	Summary of action taken / how this has been covered
No issues raised.	No action required.

Response Received from Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council Environmental Protection.	
Brief summary of issues raised:	Summary of action taken / how this has been covered
No issues raised.	No action required.

Response Received from Hartlepool Borough Council	
Brief summary of issues raised:	Summary of action taken / how this has been covered
No issues raised.	No action required.

2) **Consultation Responses from Members of the Public and Community Organisations**

a) Representations from Community and Other Organisations

Representations were received from Climate Action Newcastle and Stop Incineration North East.

Brief summary of issues raised:	Environment Agency comment
Concern over the emissions of carbon dioxide and the impact on global warming.	Our assessment of global warming is covered in sections 6.3 and 6.6 of this decision document.
Concern that the application should be treated as high public interest.	We have treated the application as high public interest and consulted in accordance with our procedures for such applications. See section 2.2 for details of the consultation.
Concern over how modelling (air dispersion & Noise modelling) modelling was carried out.	We audited the Applicant's air quality dispersion and noise modelling. As part of the audit, we checked that the modelling parameters, weather data and background levels used by the Applicant were appropriate and we are satisfied that there were. Based on the Applicant's modelling we are satisfied that there will not be a significant impact in air quality or noise impacts.

	See section 5.2 and 6.5.5 of this decision document for further details.
--	--

b) Representations from Individual Members of the Public

A total of 23 of responses were received from individual members of the public. Many of the issues raised were the same as those considered above. Only those issues additional to those already considered are listed below:

Brief summary of issues raised:	Environment Agency comment
Concern over health impacts including impact from PCB and accumulation in the food chain.	Section 5.3 provides details of how we have assessed impact on human health including from PCBs and dioxin-like PCBs including accumulation in the food chain. We are satisfied that impacts will not be significant.
Concern waste reduction is not being considered.	This is primarily outside the scope of this determination. Waste reduction initiatives are a matter for local and national government policy.
Concern over health impacts including cancer.	We are satisfied that there will not be a significant impact on human health due to the Installation. Section 5.3 of this decision document has further details. The standards that we have used to assess against are set to protect all members of the public.
Concern about the amount of waste incinerators in Teesside.	Our assessment included consideration of background pollutions levels and cumulative impacts from other nearby combustion activities.

B) Advertising and Consultation on the Draft Decision

This section reports on the outcome of the public consultation on our draft decision carried out between 06/05/2025 and 03/06/2025.

In some cases the issues raised in the consultation were the same as those raised previously and already reported in section A of this Annex and so have not been repeated in this section.

Also, some of the consultation responses received were on matters which are outside the scope of the Environment Agency's powers under the Environmental Permitting Regulations. Our position on these matters is as described previously.

a) Consultation Responses from Statutory and Non-Statutory Bodies

Response Received from UK Health Security Agency	
Brief summary of issues raised:	Summary of action taken / how this has been covered
The additional information supplied does not change the content of UKHSA's response above. So, on this occasion, we have no additional comments to provide.	No action required.

d) Representations from individual members of the public; local councillors; community and other organisations.

A total of 63 responses were received from individual members of the public, community and other organisations including UKWIN, Stop Incineration North East, Gainsborough Eco group and local councillors. Many of the issues raised were the same as those considered above. Only those issues additional to those already considered are listed below:

Brief summary of issues raised:	Environment Agency comment
Comments about air emissions, air risk assessment and health impacts	
Concern that the air quality modelling was not good enough.	Environment Agency technical specialists have audited and assessed the Applicant's pollution modelling assessments and we are satisfied that the modelling assessment is appropriate. See section 5.2 for further details.
Concern was expressed that there will be an impact on health due to the Installation including: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• those with existing health conditions• young people	We are satisfied that there will not be a significant impact on health due to the Installation. Section 5.3 of this decision document has further details.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • elderly 	The standards that we have used to assess against are set to protect all members of the public.
Concern about cumulative emissions from nearby incinerators (e.g. Redcar Energy Centre).	The air quality impact assessment has considered the existing background air quality and has also considered potential impacts from nearby plans and projects including Redcar Energy Centre. We are satisfied that the cumulative impacts have been considered in the assessment and we are satisfied that there will be no significant cumulative impact.
Concern about the adequacy of local air quality monitoring.	We audited the Applicant's dispersion modelling and as part of the audit we checked the background pollution levels. We are satisfied that background monitoring data used in the Applicant's air quality assessment is appropriate.
Concern about emissions of particulate matter.	The impact from particulate emissions was shown to be insignificant. Section 5.2 of this decision document has more details on particulate impacts.
Concern about pollution of soil and contamination of food grown in the local area.	The Applicant carried out a human health impact assessment (HHRA) on dioxin emissions from the Installation which includes impact on the food chain via deposition to soil. We audited the HHRA and we have concluded that dioxin emissions will not have a significant impact on human health. See section 5.3 for further details.
Concern about air inversion affects resulting in poor air quality.	Weather data used in modelling already takes temperature inversions this into account. The use of models such as Calpuff, that can model inversions in valleys, is not required for this application.
Concern about POPs accumulating in areas surrounding the incinerator.	We are satisfied that the Permit ensures that the formation and releases of POPs and dioxins and furans will be prevented or minimised. See section 6.4 of this decision document has more details.
Concern that the stack is not high enough.	We are satisfied that the stack height has been calculated in

	accordance with IED article 46(1). Having assessed the Application as a whole we are satisfied that the measures proposed, of which stack height is one aspect, are BAT.
Several reports by ToxicoWatch and Zero waste Europe were cited along with concern that the reports showed elevated levels of persistent organic pollutants in the environment around incineration plants in Europe	We are not aware of any similar reports for UK energy from waste plants, nor can we comment on the validity of the cited reports (which do not appear to have been peer reviewed or published in any scientific journals). The Applicant carried out a human health impact assessment (HHRA) on dioxin emissions from the Installation which includes impact on the food chain via deposition to soil. We audited the HHRA and we have concluded that dioxin emissions will not have a significant impact on human health
Several reports, papers and articles were cited claiming that the incinerator would cause health impacts due to air emissions.	We considered the reports, papers and articles that were cited. Our view is that the Installation will not have a significant impact on health. This view is supported by the UKHSA. Further details are in section 5.3 of this decision document.
Concern expressed over the Parsons et al study on dioxins in breast milk.	We contacted the UKHSA who confirmed the following: 'The UK was part of the Imperial College London and UKHSA "Chemical and Radiation Threats and Hazards" Health Protection Research Unit (HPRU) work plan. This study showed that emissions from incinerators may make a small contribution to the body burden of dioxins, furans and PCBs, but further work would be needed to show a causal link. While the study shows a small increase in the compounds in human milk, this cannot be translated into any increased health risk. The concentrations identified in the study are similar to those in other recent human biomonitoring studies in Europe. The findings of the breast milk study are consistent with the UKHSA position that

	<p>modern, well run and regulated municipal waste incinerators are not a significant risk to public health, as they indicate a small increase in the amount of dioxins and furans in the milk, and any potential health impact of a small increase is likely to be very small. Therefore, UKHSA does not consider there is a need to change its position statement on the basis of this study’.</p> <p>Having considered the study and the UKHSA advice we remain satisfied there will be no significant impact on human health.</p>
Comments on impacts on habitat and conservation sites	
Concern over the impact at habitat sites and other ecological sites.	Our assessment at ecological sites is described in section 5.4 of this decision document. We are satisfied that there will not be a significant impact on nearby habitat and ecological sites.
Concern about impacts on Nutrient Neutrality at nearby protected sites.	Impacts from emissions resulting in Nutrient deposition has been considered in the Habitats Risk Assessment completed as part of the determination. We are satisfied that the nutrient deposition will not be significant at nearby protected habitat sites. See section 5.4 for further details. Note that there will be no point source emissions of process effluent to surface water only uncontaminated surface water is permitted to be discharged.
Concern that Natural England do not agree with the conclusion of the HRA.	See section 5.4 for details of our consultation with Natural England and how we have considered their comments. We have a duty to consult NE when completing a Stage 2 Habitat Risk Assessment, which we have done; and we have taken account of their comments in the completion of the assessment.
Concern that the draft decision document misrepresented NE's position following consultation on the HRA.	We acknowledge that section 7.3.1 of the draft decision document did state that NE did agree with the conclusion of the HRA when this was not the case. This was a

	<p>drafting error and it was not our intention to misrepresent NE's position. We are satisfied that section 5.4 of the draft decision document and the completed HRAs (which are available on public register) provided details of the key issues of the assessment and NE's comments. However, we have updated section 5.4 and 7.3.1 of this document to provide further clarification.</p>
<p>Concern that the Environment Agency did not provide evidence of pH and Phosphorus limitation in relation to the HRA.</p>	<p>The HRA completed for this Application (which is available on public register) contains a detailed account of our assessment including how we have considered pH and Phosphorous limitation in relation to sensitivity of the coastal dune habitat to nitrogen deposition. Further information above that already provided by the Applicant was not deemed necessary to complete our assessment.</p>
Comments about Operator competence	
<p>Concern that Viridor has a poor record as an Operator.</p>	<p>We are satisfied that the Applicant will be a competent operator because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An EMS certified to ISO 14001 will be in place • A suitably qualified facility manager will be appointed who will have responsibility of Permit compliance • An environmental policy will require that the Installation operates in full compliance with legislative requirements
Comments about traffic impacts	
<p>Concern about road congestion caused by the incinerator and resulting pollution.</p>	<p>These are relevant considerations for the grant of planning permission, but do not form part of the Environmental Permit decision making process except where there are established high background concentrations contributing to poor air quality and the increased level of traffic might be significant in these limited circumstances. That is not the case here.</p>

Comments about the Environment Agency consultation	
Concern that the public consultation was not carried out correctly.	We are satisfied that we took appropriate steps to inform people about the Application and our draft decision and how they could comment on it. How we did this is described in section 2 of this decision document.
Concern that not all relevant documents were available for the consultation, including air quality modelling files; full Habitats Risk Assessment (HRA) and Response letter from NE.	We are satisfied all relevant documents were available to the public or other interested parties at both the initial consultation and draft decision consultation stage. This was either via the citizen space portal or via our public register on request. See Section 2 of this document for further details. With specific reference to the dispersion model input files these require specialist software to access so are available on request. Also, section 5.4 of the draft decision document stated that the full HRA and NE response is available on the public register.
Comments on BAT	
Concern that the incineration technology is out of date, and air pollution abatement technology and monitoring systems proposed are not BAT.	Our view is that the furnace type and abatement systems and monitoring proposed by the Applicant are BAT. This is explained in detail in section 6 of this decision document.
Comments on noise, odour and pests.	
Concern about odour emissions from the proposal.	As discussed in section 6.5.4 of this document we are satisfied fugitive emissions of odour will not have a significant adverse impact on human health or the environment.
Concern about noise emissions from the incinerator.	We audited the Applicant's noise assessment. Based on the Applicant's modelling, and our review of it, we are satisfied that there will not be a significant impact from noise. See section 6.5.5 for further details.
Concern about Pests.	Pests are not usually an issue at incineration plants because the waste is only stored for a short period of time. The waste reception and storage area, and all incoming waste handling activities will be

	undertaken within a fully enclosed building. Permit conditions 3.7.1 and 3.7.2 will provide controls.
Comments on the planning process	
Concern that the Planning Department did not notify residents about the incinerator.	Publicity of the planning application is a matter for the planning authority.
Concern about how the planning decision was made; and that it is outdated.	This is a matter for the planning authority.
Comments on the impact on climate change	
Concern that the plant will not have carbon capture and CO ₂ releases from burning plastics will be detrimental to the environment.	<p>There is currently no legal requirement for incineration plants to have carbon capture or be carbon capture ready. This is likely to change, in the near future, following a government consultation on decarbonisation readiness legislation for combustion plants (including energy from waste plants). The Applicant has stated that the facility will be designed to be carbon capture ready.</p> <p>CO₂ emissions and global warming potential are discussed in section 6.3 of the decision document.</p>
Concern that the proposed carbon capture will not work.	The Applicant has stated that the facility will be designed to be carbon capture ready. We do not have details of what carbon capture technology may be used in the future and therefore we are unable to comment on whether it would work. The inclusion of carbon capture would require a new Environmental Permit application or variation to this permit. We would assess the proposals against the relevant legislation and guidance at this point.
Comments on accidents and fires	
Concern about waste fires on site.	The Applicant has submitted a Fire Prevention Plan as part of the Application. We have assessed this plan against our own Fire Prevention Plan guidance. See section 4.3.4 for details of our assessment. Permit conditions requiring the operator to operate in accordance with an EMS

	and FPP that minimises risks of pollution are included in the permit.
Concern that there is no warning system for local residents in the event of a pollution incident on site.	Permit conditions requiring the operator to operate in accordance with an EMS and FPP that minimises risks of pollution are included in the permit. The Applicant will have procedures within these documents on how they will communicate with nearby residents in the event of a pollution incident on site.
Comments about where the incinerator is located.	
Concern that most incinerators are located in low-income communities.	Decisions over land use are matters for the planning system. The location of the installation is a relevant consideration for Environmental Permitting, but only in so far as its potential to have an adverse environmental impact on communities or sensitive environmental receptors. The environmental impact is assessed as part of the determination process and has been reported upon in the main body of this document.
Other comments	
Concern that incineration goes against government guidelines issued 30 th December 2024.	The Government's announcement of 30th December 2024 (which can be found here <u>Government to crack down on waste incinerators with stricter standards for new builds - GOV.UK</u>) on the new requirements which energy from waste (EfW) plants will need to meet to get planning permission. This is only for the planning process and does not affect our determination of Environmental Permits.
Concern that the local area has too many incinerators and has sufficient incineration capacity already and there won't be enough waste for the incinerator.	Need and waste management strategy are matters for the relevant local authority. Our role is to determine whether the facility can be operated without giving rise to significant pollution of the environment or harm to human health.
Concern about the Operator carrying out their own monitoring. There should be independent monitoring.	The Operator's monitoring will have either MCERTS certification or MCERTS accreditation as

	<p>appropriate. This still applies when carried out by external third party assessors. MCERTS is the Environment Agency's Monitoring Certification Scheme. If monitoring complies with MCERTS we can have confidence in the monitoring of emissions. In addition we will carry out audits of the Operator's monitoring. If we find a problem we will take action to put this right. The Environment Agency may carry out its own monitoring as part of its regulation of the site if required.</p>
Concern that the incinerator will adversely affect local recycling rates.	<p>This is primarily outside the scope of this determination. Recycling initiatives are a matter for the local authority. The Permit through conditions 2.3.5 and 2.3.6 restrict wastes that have been separately collected for recycling from being accepted.</p>
Concern that incineration is not the best method for dealing with waste and other technologies such as anaerobic digestion and modern materials recycling facilities should be utilised.	<p>It is argued that Incineration is not an environmentally sustainable technology and therefore almost by definition cannot be considered to be the Best Available Technique (BAT). Mass burn incineration at this scale is considered BAT provided it meets the requirements (as set out in the BREF and BAT conclusions). See section 6 of this document for more details of the BAT appraisal.</p> <p>Anaerobic digestion is most suitable for high moisture content biodegradable wastes such as food and agricultural wastes, and can be applied where there is separate collection of these waste streams. Anaerobic digestion is not however appropriate for mixed municipal waste.</p>
Concern that the amount of energy recovered by the process is inadequate.	<p>We are satisfied that as much energy as practicable will be recovered from the waste. Further details are in section 4.3.7 of this decision document.</p>
Concern about the cost of penalty	<p>This is a matter for the relevant local</p>

charges for the local authority.	authority and is outside the scope of this determination which is to assess the impact of emissions from the proposed activity.
View that the Application should be refused for the same reason as the Graythorp EfW application.	The Graythorp EfW was refused due to potentially significant impacts on a nearby conservation site. We are satisfied that the impacts from this facility will not be significant at nearby habitat and conservation sites. See section 5.4 of this document for further details of our assessment.
Concern that several EU member states adopt low ELVs and superior abatement	We have applied the emission limits set in the IED and we are satisfied that the proposals are BAT and therefore in line with relevant BAT conclusions which apply across the EU. Some permits may include lower emission limits however these are likely to have been set for site specific reasons.
Concern no pre-treatment or sorting of waste proposed.	<p>The obligation is on waste producers to apply the waste hierarchy and for local authorities to have their own waste strategy dealing, segregating and recycling kerbside collections. Our role in this determination is to assess whether any residual waste that may be sent for incineration can be dealt with in an environmentally acceptable manner.</p> <p>In addition to this we have set permit conditions 2.3.5 and 2.3.6 that do not allow separately collected fractions to be incinerated unless they are unsuitable for recycling.</p>
Concern that the local council will incur significant cost from 2018 due to financial liabilities as a result of the UK Emissions Trading Scheme.	This is a matter for the relevant local authority and is outside the scope of this determination which is to assess the impact of emissions from the proposed activity.
View that waste should be landfilled and not incinerated.	This is a matter for the relevant local authority and is outside the scope of this determination which is to assess the impact of emissions from the proposed activity.
Concern that increased recycling will adversely affect the CV of waste and	We have assessed the application that has been made to us and that

reduce electricity generation meaning that co-fuels and recyclables will need to be burned.	the plant will be able to incinerate the waste types specified in the Permit. If the Applicant wanted to change waste types in the future then they would have to apply to vary the Permit. If the waste feed were to change significantly and the waste calorific value of the waste fell then it is possible that more support fuel would be required but Permit conditions will still have to be met. We can only determine the Application on the information we have but if things should change and they were no longer in the BAT range for energy efficiency then we would have to consider whether to vary the permit or revoke it if required.
Concern that incineration goes against government Net Zero policies.	We are responsible only for the determination of the Environmental Permit. The Government's current waste strategy does not exclude waste incineration with energy recovery as an acceptable waste management option for unavoidable, unrecyclable waste.
Concern about how the EA will regulate the site.	<p>The Environment Agency will regulate the site carrying out a continual assessment of the plant's operations and its environmental performance. This will be achieved in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Operator must monitor emissions and report the results to us; • We will regularly inspect the installations, review monitoring techniques and assess monitoring results to measure the performance of the plant; • We will carry out on-site audits of operator monitoring; • The operator must inform us within 24 hours of any breach of the emission limits, followed by a fuller report of the size of the release. Its

	<p>impact and how they propose to avoid this happening in the future;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The operators monitoring results are placed on the public register; • Depending on the seriousness of any breach , we will take appropriate enforcement action and/or prosecute <p>Copies of inspections reports and monitoring results are available to view by the public.</p>
--	---