

Decision document variation

We have decided to grant the variation for A303 IBA Facility operated by Fortis IBA Limited.

The variation number is EPR/FB3805GN/V006.

The permit was issued on 13/07/2026.

The variation authorises the decommissioning and removal of the existing IBA processing plant and the construction of an upgraded replacement IBA plant, together with the addition of a new Section 5.4 A(1)(b)(iii) waste recovery activity for enhanced IBA processing. The permit boundary is extended eastwards to accommodate a new enhanced IBA recovery facility. The variation also allows an increase in the total annual throughput from 205,000 tonnes to 220,280 tonnes per year and updates the permitted waste types associated with the IBA replant and the enhanced IBA recovery facility.

We consider in reaching that decision we have taken into account all relevant considerations and legal requirements and that the permit will ensure that the appropriate level of environmental protection is provided.

Purpose of this document

This decision document provides a record of the decision-making process. It

- highlights key issues in the determination
- summarises the decision making process in the decision considerations section to show how the main relevant factors have been taken into account
- shows how we have considered the consultation responses

Unless the decision document specifies otherwise, we have accepted the applicant's proposals.

Read the permitting decisions in conjunction with the environmental permit and the variation notice.

Key issues of the decision

Emissions to air – Local Exhaust Ventilation system (Emission points A1 and A2)

Emission points A1 and A2 have been included within the permit to represent releases from the site's Local Exhaust Ventilation (LEV) system, which is used to capture and control particulate emissions from the IBA processing building. The applicant submitted an air quality assessment supported by dispersion modelling, which were reviewed during determination. This review identified that predicted impacts at relevant receptors were predominantly low, with some medium risk classifications; however, the overall risk from emissions was considered to be low. On this basis, the proposal was screened out from requiring further detailed air quality modelling. The inclusion of emission points A1 and A2 within the permit ensures appropriate regulatory control of these releases and we have set an emission limit for dust of 5 mg/Nm³. We consider that emissions to air will not result in significant pollution of the environment or harm to human health.

Decision considerations

Confidential information

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

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

Identifying confidential information

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

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

Consultation

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

The application was publicised on the GOV.UK website.

We consulted the following organisations:

- Local Authority – Test Valley Borough Council
- Local Authority – Hampshire County Council

- UK Health Security Agency (Previously Public Health England) and the relevant Director of Public Health
- Health and safety executive – HSE
- Food Standards Agency

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

The regulated facility

We considered the extent and nature of the facility at the site in accordance with RGN2 'Understanding the meaning of regulated facility', Appendix 2 of RGN2 'Defining the scope of the installation', Appendix 1 of RGN 2 'Interpretation of Schedule 1', guidance on waste recovery plans and permits.

The extent of the facility is defined in the site plan and in the permit. The activities are defined in table S1.1 of the permit.

The site

The operator has provided a plan which we consider to be satisfactory.

The plan shows the location of the part of the installation to which this permit applies on that site.

The plan is included in the permit.

Site condition report

The operator has provided a description of the condition of the site, which we consider is satisfactory. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on site condition reports and baseline reporting under the Industrial Emissions Directive.

Nature conservation, landscape, heritage and protected species and habitat designations

We have checked the location of the application to assess if it is within the screening distances we consider relevant for impacts on nature conservation, landscape, heritage, protected species and habitat designations. The application is within our screening distances for these designations.

We have assessed the application and its potential to affect sites of nature conservation, landscape, heritage, protected species and habitat designations identified in the nature conservation screening report as part of the permitting process.

We consider that the application will not affect any site of nature conservation, landscape and heritage, and/or protected species or habitats identified.

We have not consulted Natural England.

The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance.

Environmental risk

We have reviewed the operator's assessment of the environmental risk from the facility.

The operator's risk assessment is satisfactory.

General operating techniques

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

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

National Air Pollution Control Programme

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

Dust management

We have reviewed the dust and emission management plan in accordance with our guidance on emissions management plans for dust.

We consider that the dust and emission management plan is satisfactory and we approve this plan.

We have approved the dust and emission management plan as we consider it to be appropriate measures based on information available to us at the current time. The applicant should not take our approval of this plan to mean that the measures in the plan are considered to cover every circumstance throughout the life of the permit.

The applicant should keep the plans under constant review and revise them annually or if necessary sooner if there have been complaints arising from

operations on site or if circumstances change. This is in accordance with our guidance 'Control and monitor emissions for your environmental permit.

The plan has been incorporated into the operating techniques table S1.2 of the environmental permit.

Raw materials

We have specified limits and controls on the use of raw materials and fuels.

Waste types

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

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

- they are suitable for the proposed activities
- the proposed infrastructure is appropriate; and
- the environmental risk assessment is acceptable.

Pre-operational conditions

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

We have included a pre-operational condition requiring the operator to submit a commissioning plan/report for approval before commencing operations of the new enhanced IBA treatment activity under AR2. The enhanced treatment facility has not yet been constructed, and therefore sufficient evidence was not available at the time of permit determination to demonstrate that the final design, construction specifications, containment infrastructure, drainage systems and pollution control measures will operate as proposed. The pre-operational condition will ensure that the completed facility, associated engineering controls and monitoring arrangements are independently verified and approved by the Environment Agency prior to operation, providing confidence that the activity can be carried out without causing pollution of the environment.

Improvement programme

Based on the information on the application, we consider that we need to include an improvement programme.

We have included an improvement programme in Table S1.3.

Emission limits

Emission Limit Values (ELVs) and equivalent parameters or technical measures based on Best Available Techniques (BAT) have been added for emissions to air for the following substances:

Dust: 2-5mg/Nm³

Emission limit values are derived from Waste Treatment BREF for BAT associated emission limits.

Monitoring

We have decided that monitoring should be carried out for the parameters listed in the permit, using the methods detailed and to the frequencies specified.

We made these decisions in accordance with waste treatment best available techniques BAT conclusions.

Based on the information in the application we are satisfied that the operator's techniques, personnel and equipment have either MCERTS certification or MCERTS accreditation as appropriate.

Reporting

We have added reporting in the permit for the following parameters:

Dust: 5mg/Nm³

We made these decisions in accordance with waste treatment best available techniques BAT conclusions.

Management system

We are not aware of any reason to consider that the operator will not have the management system to enable it to comply with the permit conditions.

The decision was taken in accordance with the guidance on operator competence and how to develop a management system for environmental permits.

A full review of the management system is undertaken during compliance checks.

Growth duty

We have considered our duty to have regard to the desirability of promoting economic growth set out in section 108(1) of the Deregulation Act 2015 and the guidance issued under section 110 of that Act in deciding whether to grant this permit variation.

Paragraph 1.3 of the guidance says:

“The primary role of regulators, in delivering regulation, is to achieve the regulatory outcomes for which they are responsible. For a number of regulators, these regulatory outcomes include an explicit reference to development or growth. The growth duty establishes economic growth as a factor that all specified regulators should have regard to, alongside the delivery of the protections set out in the relevant legislation.”

We have addressed the legislative requirements and environmental standards to be set for this operation in the body of the decision document above. The guidance is clear at paragraph 1.5 that the growth duty does not legitimise non-compliance and its purpose is not to achieve or pursue economic growth at the expense of necessary protections.

We consider the requirements and standards we have set in this permit are reasonable and necessary to avoid a risk of an unacceptable level of pollution. This also promotes growth amongst legitimate operators because the standards applied to the operator are consistent across businesses in this sector and have been set to achieve the required legislative standards.

Consultation Responses

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

Response received from UK Health Security Agency – UKHSA (Previously Public Health England) and the relevant Director of Public Health

Brief summary of issues raised:

The UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) was consulted on the application and reviewed the applicant's air quality assessment, including dispersion modelling of particulate emissions (PM10 and PM2.5) from the Local Exhaust Ventilation (LEV) systems. UKHSA noted that the assessment was undertaken using conservative assumptions and concluded that no exceedances of relevant air

quality objectives are predicted at residential receptors, with impacts considered not significant. UKHSA recommended that the Environment Agency is satisfied with the modelling approach, including the representativeness of meteorological data, and emphasised the importance of appropriate management controls, particularly for fugitive emissions. On the basis that the installation is operated in accordance with relevant guidance and Best Available Techniques (BAT), UKHSA confirmed that it has no grounds for objection on public health grounds.

Summary of actions taken:

None.

Representations from individual members of the public

Brief summary of issues raised:

Concerns were raised about what controls are in place to determine the PFAS content of wastes received for processing and their fate during processing and within the products leaving the facility.

Summary of actions taken:

Incoming ash must be tested and confirmed to be non-hazardous before it can be processed. The permit requires the operator to use appropriate measures to minimise the risk of pollution from substances contained within the ash, such as controlling dust emissions. Use of the incinerator bottom ash aggregate (IBAA) produced by the plant will then be controlled under a variety of regulatory instruments to minimise the risk of pollution. IBAA can only be used if it is non-hazardous.