

Permitting Decisions - Bespoke Permit

We have decided to grant the permit for Church Stretton Science Park operated by Agilent Technologies LDA UK Limited.

The permit number is EPR/KP3320LH.

The permit was granted on **28/07/2026**.

The application is for an existing organic polymer manufacturing site to operate as a permitted installation under Schedule 1 Part 1 of The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016:

Section 4.1 Part A(1)(a)(viii) – producing organic chemicals such as plastic materials

Section 4.1 Part A(1)(a)(xi) - producing organic chemicals such as surface-active agents

This permit authorises Agilent Technologies LDA UK Limited to manufacture silica and organic polymers for use in laboratory and industrial applications in human clinical and diagnostics, liquid chromatography and solid support synthesis particles at a rate of less than 5 tonnes per year.

On site processes include receipt and storage of raw materials, polymerisation of monomers and surface modification, storage, loading and dispatch of finished products. There is also a research and development laboratory located on site.

The raw materials include organic solvents and monomers. The reactions take place within temperature controlled reaction systems, which are heated via electrical heating systems. Once the reaction is complete, the product is transferred to a vessel whether it is mixed with a solvent, filtered and blended prior to discharge. Products are then transferred to smaller packages as required.

The general heating and other process heating is provided via low temperature hot water system, this is powered using several gas-fired boilers, all less than 1MWth. The site also has an emergency diesel generator (<1MWth) which backs up critical electrical supplies.

The reactors and vessels are connected to a wet scrubber to abate volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions to air. Local exhaust ventilation for the fume cupboards is also present on site.

The process cooling and wash water is discharged to sewer under four trade effluent discharge consents with Severn Trent. The chlorinated and unchlorinated waste

solvent containing water is collected twice a week by a waste contractor and reused as cement kiln fuel.

Solid waste at the site is transferred offsite to a suitable licensed facility for recycling or for use as fuel in an energy from waste plant.

The drum store on site comprises bundled, undercover storage for raw materials and waste. A 10,000 litre underground attenuation tank is located on the surface water drainage system prior to discharge to offsite storm water drains.

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:

- summarises the decision making process in the [decision considerations](#) section to show how the main relevant factors have been taken into account
- highlights [key issues](#) in the determination
- 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.

Key issues of the decision

Air Emissions Risk Assessment (AERA)

Overview

The consultant, on behalf of the applicant, has submitted an air emissions risk assessment for the emissions from their manufacturing activities on site, in line with Environment Agency guidance '*Air emissions risk assessment for your environmental permit*'. The emissions to air from this site are volatile organic compounds (VOCs). The consultant has used monitored data for total volatile organic compounds (TVOCs) and speciated volatile organic compounds to inform the H1 risk assessment methodology. The study compares the emissions of VOCs against their relevant environmental assessment levels (EALs) and concludes the impact on human health receptors. Here, since the substances do not have relevant environmental standards for ecological receptors, the risk assessment is for human health receptors only.

Where the EALs for some of the VOCs are not published, the applicant has used EALs for Benzene or a suitable EAL has been derived using the hazard characterisation method for determining tolerable concentrations in air (TCAs) methodology. The consultant has used the Environment Agency guidance '*Methodology for the scientific derivation of Environmental Assessment Levels (EALs)*' (2025) for deriving the EALs. A review of toxicological data from suitable reference studies has also been presented.

Air emissions risk assessment screening approach

The long-term (LT) and short term (ST) process contributions (PC) are calculated by multiplying the dispersion factor, in micrograms per cubic metre per gram per second, by the release rate, in grams per second.

To screen out a PC from further assessment, the PC must meet both of the following criteria:

- The ST PC is less than 10% of the short term environmental standard
- The LT PC is less than 1% of the long term environmental standard

IF PC do not meet the above criteria, then a second stage of screening is required, in which the predicted environmental concentration (PEC) is calculated as the sum of PC and the background concentration of the relevant substance. The second stage of screening must meet the following criteria:

- The short term PC is less than 20% of the short term environmental standards minus twice the long term background concentration.
- The long term PEC is less than 70% of the long term environmental standards.

If the above criteria is met, then further detailed assessment (dispersion modelling) is not required.

The consultant has carried out the above screening steps for the following substances, and their AERA concludes that the emissions screen out as insignificant as the short term PC for all substances are less 10% of the environmental standard and long term PC is less than 1% of the environmental standard. Please see the table below:

Table 1 - Predicted impacts for short term and long term

Substance	ST PC (µg/m ³)	EAL (µg/m ³)	ST PC as % of EAL	LT PC (µg/m ³)	EAL (µg/m ³)	PC as % of EAL
Acetone	2769.00	362,000	0.76%	34.0	18,100	0.2%
Methanol	2340.00	33,300	7.03	23.7	2,660	0.9%
Styrene	17.00	800	2.13%	Not assessed**		
Tetrahydrofuran	936.00	59,900	1.56%	1.9	3,000	0.1%
Toluene	36.00	8,000	0.45%	0.87	260	0.3%
Ethanol*	300.00	576,000	0.052%	2.8	19,200	0.015%
Diethylbenzene*	2.10	190	1.11%	0.03	190	0.016%
Ethylene diamine*	0.062	327	0.019%	0.0011	327	0.00034%
Heptane*	5.90	4,960	0.12%	0.16	4,960	0.0032%
Iso-Amyl Alcohol*	4.70	174	2.70%	0.08	174	0.046%
Vinylbenzene chloride*	2.30	30	7.7%	Not assessed**		
Divinylbenzene*	28.00	3,000	0.93%	Not assessed**		
Dichloromethane	153.70	2100	7.32%	0.410	770	0.0532%
Dimethylacetamide*	1.52	3200	0.0474%	0.00472	3200	0.00015%
Dimethylformamide	281.00	6100	4.60%	1.401	300	0.467%

*These substances do not have published EALs. The EALs for these substances were derived by the consultant. For more information, please see the section on derived EALs.

**The long term impact of these substances were not assessed. The consultant has justified that this is because these materials will be consumed by the process; they will be present in the reactors for a short duration, thus reducing the likelihood of these materials being emitted via stacks. The consultant has provided additional information in relation to these substances. We agree with the consultant's approach.

We have audited the air emissions risk assessment and found that there are emissions of substances which may be toxic to human health, including substances which are carcinogenic, mutagenic and reproductive (CMR) toxicants. However, our audit findings confirm the consultant's conclusion that the impact of these substances will be insignificant on human health receptors. Furthermore, the consultant has assumed worst case maximum emissions for the assessment, however the actual emissions are expected to be less due to the intermittent or short duration of the manufacturing process.

Derivation of EALs

The consultant has referred to the Environment Agency guidance '*Methodology for the scientific derivation of Environmental Assessment Levels (EALs)*' (2025) for deriving the EALs. They have used relevant toxicological data to determine the Point of Departure of the derivation of EALs. The toxicology data has been taken from published toxicology or human health exposure reference sources i.e. the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) REACH Dossier Data. The consultant has not presented the detailed toxicology evidence used to determine the exposure limits. They have justified that such evidence is held within the ECHA/REACH registration system and have provided the links to these REACH dossiers within the AERA.

We have consulted the UK Health and Security Agency (UKHSA) regarding the derived EALs. UKHSA concludes that based on the information provided, the emissions do not indicate an appreciable risk to public health. See further details under the consultation section.

Emissions from boilers and emergency diesel generator

The applicant has stated that there are 9 boilers on site, which are all less than 1MWth rated thermal input. The boilers are used for site heating and some process heating. The main reaction vessels are heated electrically. There is one emergency diesel generator (<1MWth) which will be used to provide back up for critical systems. Furthermore, the generator will not be operated for more than 50 hours per year.

As the boilers and the emergency diesel generator is <1MWth, the applicant has concluded that the Medium Combustion Plant Directive (MCPD) does not apply. Therefore the applicant has not risk assessed the emissions associated with these combustion equipment.

We have reviewed the applicant's justification, and found that the boilers are very small, ranging from 0.012MWth to 0.2909MWth. We believe that the emissions from these boilers will not have a significant impact on human health receptors. We have therefore accepted the applicant's justification. The information on ecological impacts is covered under further section in this document.

Environment Risk Assessment (ERA)

The applicant has provided an ERA using the source, pathway, receptor model and has demonstrated how the risk of pollutants and harm can be mitigated. The applicant has carried out risk assessments for the following:

Quantitative Risk Assessment - Air emissions, Photochemical Ozone Creation Potential, Global Warming Potential.

Qualitative Risk Assessment – Surface Water, Accidents, Odour, Noise & Vibration, Fugitive emissions.

We have reviewed the applicant's ERA and our findings in relation to the qualitative risk assessment is presented below:

Surface water – The applicant has stated that there are no direct discharges to surface water. The primary process effluent includes chlorinated and unchlorinated waste solvent from process vessels, which is collected by waste contractor and reused as cement kiln fuel. The boilers do not generate boiler blowdown water.

The wastewater generated at the site comprises of process cooling and equipment wash water, which is discharged via Severn Trent Treatment to tributary of Quinny Brook. Based on the manufacturing process, we are satisfied that this effluent will not contain inorganic nitrogen, phosphorous, organically bound halogens or metals as these are not added to the process. The proposed monitoring of total organic carbon (TOC), chemical oxygen demand (COD), total suspended solids (TSS) as a weekly composite with monthly spot sampling for the presence of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) is considered appropriate for the expected low level of potential contamination from polymerisation vessel washes.

Flooding – The applicant has identified that their site falls within Flood Zone 3 and has a high probability for flooding from rivers. The applicant has identified that the site is at 'medium risk' of flooding from surface water from *The Long Term Flood Risk Assessment (gov.uk source)*. The applicant flood risk assessment concludes that the offsite surface water flooding along Essex road has previously impacted the site. During such an event, the site access road floods and waste is collected in the 10,000L attenuation tank, and later pumped to discharge point S1 for release. Further the applicant has confirmed that flooding only occurs along the access road and car parking area, which is away from the raw material, waste and chemical storage. The applicant has had discussions with the 'Drainage and Flood Risk Manager' at Shropshire County Council as well as Severn Trent, and it is Agilent's understanding that Severn Trent intends to undertake remedial works to manage offsite surface water flooding issue. Agilent therefore operates the site under an Emergency Flood Plan procedure (dt. 18 September 2022). We consider the steps taken by the applicant as most appropriate measures. We have also looked at the site plan and we are satisfied that the storage of raw materials and waste solvents are away from the area of flooding, with proper containment, thus reducing the potential for pollution during a flooding event.

Noise - The applicant submitted a noise impact assessment (NIA) dated 21st August 2025, and a noise management plan (NMP) dated 13th February 2026. We have audited the NIA and although we found higher noise impacts overall than the consultant, we agree with their conclusion of adverse impacts.

However during the course of determination, one of the two main sources of noise – Unit 3 Impingement Scrubber has been removed and replaced with a temporary scrubber, while a new abatement system is being designed. The applicant has stated that as their NIA was based on a single set of site noise source monitoring data, and included some conservative assumptions, they believe that there has been an overestimation of offsite noise impacts. Therefore, they have proposed a noise monitoring programme within their NMP; the findings of this offsite noise monitoring would be used to assess actual noise impacts, and to identify additional noise abatement measures as required. The applicant has included some potential targeted mitigation measures in the NMP. We are satisfied with the applicant's noise management plan and have included an improvement condition in the permit for the noise monitoring programme.

Odour – The applicant has stated that majority of their raw materials are odourless. The potentially odourless chemicals are stored in sealed containers, handled in low volumes indoor, and used within high integrity closed systems. Further, the applicant's management plan includes daily checks for odour and measures to manage the risks if odour issue is identified. The applicant has also assessed fugitive emissions of VOCs and the measures to reduce their emissions include transfer of such volatile chemicals via minimal sealed indoor pipework into a closed process.

Accidents – The applicant has considered risk of accidents from several hazards, including but not limited to, spillages, fire and explosion. The measures include switching off the pump connecting to Severn Trent sewer and containing fire water to be tankered off site, containment measures which meet CIRIA 736 standards, ATEX rated storage compounds for flammable solvents and appropriate segregation and storage of raw materials and waste solvents. Flooding is covered as a separate point above.

We are satisfied with the applicant's risk assessment and risk management measures.

Best Available Techniques (BAT)

The applicant has provided detailed BAT assessment for the following:

- Organic Speciality Chemicals Technical Guidance Note
- Production of Polymers BREF
- Common Waste Water and Waste Gas Treatment/Management Systems in the Chemical Sector BAT Conclusions (CWW BATC)
- Common Waste Gas Management and Treatment Systems in the Chemical Sector BREF (WGC BREF) - Although the WGC UK BAT Conclusions have not been published, the applicant has referred to the EU version in order to apply the most appropriate operating techniques and to operate as closely as possible to UK WGC BATC when it will be published.

We have reviewed the applicant's BAT assessment and are satisfied that the applicant's proposed operating techniques are BAT.

Decision considerations

Confidential information

A claim for commercial or industrial confidentiality has been made.

We have accepted the claim for confidentiality.

We have excluded the following information:

- The detailed list of chemicals stored in the chemicals stores and cold stores.
- Raw material inventory
- Details of the specific polymerisation reactions

We consider that the inclusion of the relevant information on the public register would prejudice the applicant's interests to an unreasonable degree.

While confidentiality request includes information on waste streams and emissions from the production process, this information is included within other documents which are available on the public register.

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.

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 – Environmental Protection Department, Shropshire Unitary Authority
- Director of Public Health – Shropshire County Council
- UK Health and Security Agency

- Health and Safety Executive
- Sewerage Authorities, Severn Trent Water

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

Operator

We are satisfied that the applicant (now the operator) is the person who will have control over the operation of the facility after the grant of the permit. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on legal operator for environmental permits.

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'.

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

The site

The operator has provided plans which we consider to be satisfactory.

These show the extent of the site of the facility.

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.

We agree with the consultant's recommendation in the site condition report (SCR) that the operator should undertake soil and groundwater monitoring. The current data set is insufficient to quantify the current state of soil and groundwater pollution by relevant hazardous substances. The consultant has also suggested a soil and groundwater analytical profile and the installation of gas and groundwater monitoring well and collection of samples.

We have audited the SCR and found that the pollution of land and water is unlikely due to the combination of existing containment and environmental procedures that are in place. The site also has an impermeable concrete surface and a sealed drainage system which is subject to routine inspection.

We are satisfied with the applicant's site condition report, however we have included an improvement condition (IC2) to ensure the applicant carries out an intrusive data collection investigation on site, accompanied by a factual report of the findings.

The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on site condition reports.

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. This is mainly due to the nature of emissions being mainly volatile organic compounds. These substances do not have any environmental standards for ecological receptors and as such, we are unable to do an assessment to determine possible impacts. The assessments have been focused solely on human health impacts (explained under key issues for determination), the impacts on human health were found to be not significant against the relevant criteria. This should serve to be protective of any ecological receptors.

There are boilers and an emergency diesel generator on site. The applicant has justified that as each boiler has a rated thermal input of below 1MWth and as such, the Medium Combustion Plant Directive requirements does not apply. Therefore, a risk assessment for emissions from the boilers and emergency diesel generator has not been provided. In addition to this, the reaction vessels are heated via electrical heating systems, therefore the boilers are not directly related to the manufacturing process itself, and they are used for general heating and other processes only.

We have carried out our own checks and found that the combined net thermal input of the boilers is 1.12MWth. We have found that the nearest statutory habitat site i.e. Sites of Special Scientific Interest - Long Mynd (SSSI) is at a distance of 769m (100m buffer distance) and the Special Areas of Conservation – The Stiperstones & The Hollies (SAC) is at 9.6km from the site. The LWS & Ancient Woodland sites are at a distance >100m. As these ecological receptors fall outside the screening distance¹ we agree

¹ AQTAG014 – Environment Agency internal guidance on identifying 'relevance' for assessment under the Habitats Regulations for installations with combustion processes.

that no assessment is required on these ecological receptors for emissions from boilers.

The emergency diesel generator is below the threshold of a medium combustion plant (1MWth). Both the boilers and the generator are not considered 'relevant' for assessment under the Agency's procedures which cover the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (Habitats Regulations) and/or the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (CROW) 2000). This was determined by referring to the Agency's guidance 'AQTAG014: Guidance on identifying 'relevance' for assessment under the Habitats Regulations for installations with combustion processes.' Thus, no detailed assessment of the effect of releases from the installation's combustion processes on SACs, SPAs and Ramsar sites is required.

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 operator has provided information to support compliance with the BAT Reference document. We have assessed the information provided and we are satisfied that the operator has demonstrated compliance with the following:

- Common waste water and water gas treatment/management systems in the chemical sector BAT Conclusions
- Best available techniques for the Production of Polymers BREF
- How to comply with your environmental permit – Additional guidance for Speciality Organic Chemicals Sector (EPR 4.02) indicative BAT.

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

Operating techniques for emissions that screen out as insignificant

Emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) have been screened out as insignificant, and so we agree that the applicant's proposed techniques are Best Available Techniques (BAT) for the installation.

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

National Air Pollution Control Programme

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

Noise and vibration management

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

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

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

The applicant should keep the plans under constant review and revise them annually or if necessary sooner if there have been complaints arising from operations on site or if circumstances change. This is in accordance with our guidance 'Control and monitor emissions for your environmental permit'.

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

Raw materials

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

Emergency diesel generator

Fuel: Gas oil or any other fuel as agreed in writing with the Environment Agency – Less than 0.1% sulphur content.

Improvement programme

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

We have included an improvement programme to ensure that the site is operated to best available techniques and any impact on the environment is minimised or prevented where possible.

IC1 – Noise monitoring programme has been included in order to validate the assumptions and conclusions in the noise impact assessment (NIA) submitted within the application. This requires the operator to submit a report for assessment and written approval by the Environment Agency.

IC2 – This requires the operator to submit a written report on the conditions of soil and groundwater at the installation, for confirmation by the Environment Agency.

IC3 – This requires the operator to submit a written report on the effluent monitoring provisions, monitoring standards and MCERTS compliance, for assessment and written approval by the Environment Agency.

Emission Limits

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

- VOC total Class A
- VOC total Class B

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.

These monitoring requirements have been included in order to ensure environmental protection.

We made these decisions in accordance with How to comply with your environmental permit – Additional guidance for Speciality Organic Chemicals Sector (EPR 4.02) indicative BAT.

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 specified reporting in the permit.

We made these decisions in accordance with our internal guidance.

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.

Previous performance

We have assessed operator competence. There is no known reason to consider the applicant will not comply with the permit conditions.

Financial competence

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

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.

Paragraph 1.3 of the guidance says:

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

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

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

are consistent across businesses in this sector and have been set to achieve the required legislative standards.

Consultation Responses

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

Responses from organisations listed in the consultation section

Response received from UKHSA.

Brief summary of issues raised: The consultee has responded specifically regarding the derived environmental assessment levels (EALs) for substances without published EALs. They would ideally expect a summary of available toxicological data, reason for the choice of a Point of Departure (POD), reason for the selection of uncertainty factors applied and the overall operator derived EAL. The consultee has referred the Environment Agency guidance published in 2025 – Methodology for the scientific derivation of environmental assessment levels and stated that there is need to consider and refer to available authoritative reviews or organisations for each emitted chemical rather than referring to EU/REACH toxicological dossiers. The consultee further states that the EU/REACH dossiers tend to be produced by industry and provide industry derived health based values; and where the EAL has been obtained from EH40/2005 workplace exposure limit, the consultee no longer have access to the basis or derivation of these health-based values, therefore their validity cannot be evaluated, and the values could be potentially out of date.

However, they have considered the toxicity information referred to by the consultant in the air emissions risk assessment, the uncertainty factors applied to the POD and the large margins of exposure between the operator derived EALs and the estimated short term and long term process contributions and conclude that the information provided does not indicate an appreciable risk to public health.

The consultee has also advised that as there is an EU REACH restriction on N,N-dimethylacetamide and 1-ethylpyrrolidin-2-one, there may be a need to consider whether UK REACH intend any similar approach and whether there are any potential implications for the use of this chemical. Similarly, the consultee has also advised to consider the EALs for toluene and tetrahydrofuran when these are published, as the revised EALs may alter the conclusions of the risk assessment.

Summary of actions taken: We have carried out our own audit of the applicant's air emissions risk assessment and we agree that the impact of these emissions are insignificant, as covered in key issues section above. Further, the emission limit values in the permit will be reviewed after the Common Waste Gas Management and Treatment Systems in the Chemical Sector UK BAT Conclusions is published and the

applicable BAT-AELs will be included in the permit. We have checked and found that there are no UK REACH restrictions on the chemical N,N-dimethylacetamide.

Response received from Local Authority – Environmental Protection Department, Shropshire Unitary Authority

Brief summary of issues raised: The consultee has informed that as there hasn't been a history of noise or odour complaints, they do not intend to comment on the application.

Summary of actions taken: No further actions required.