

Permitting Decisions - Variation

We have decided to grant the variation for Melton Waste Park operated by Transwaste Recycling and Aggregates Limited.

The variation number is EPR/BP3792LD/V010

The permit was issued on 24/09/2026.

This permit variation includes:

- The operation of three small waste incineration plants (SWIPs), designed to produce hot water and heat and regulated under Schedule 13, Waste Incineration: Industrial emissions directive and are included as a Directly Associated Activity (DAA) (AR7).
- The addition of conditions related to being a multi-operator installation. Hot water generated by the SWIP's boilers will be used to maintain the appropriate temperature in the digesters in Melton Anaerobic Digestion Facility, operated by Melton Energy Tech, permit number EPR/ZP3322SC. Due to the technical connection between Transwaste Recycling and Aggregates and Melton Energy Tech, both sites constitute a multi-operator installation.
- The part surrender of land that is now occupied by Melton Anaerobic Digestion Facility and smaller areas to the west and south west of the installation.

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.
- explains why we have also made an Environment Agency initiated variation.

- summarises the engagement carried out because this is a site of high public interest.
- 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

Installation of three SWIPs

The site is proposing to install three 1.1 MWth biomass boilers which are considered SWIPs, each with a 22 metre stack. The SWIPs will be fuelled by a mixture of waste wood (accepted on site under activity AR11) and dry, solid digestate (accepted on site under AR7). Each SWIP is operated using a moving grate system to ensure even fuel flow and combustion. Flue gas abatement consists of a urea-based selective non-catalytic recovery (SNCR) system for oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) and a sodium bicarbonate injection system for sulphur dioxide (SO₂), hydrogen chloride (HCl) and hydrogen fluoride (HF) plus a pre-separator cyclone and fabric filter for particulates. The SWIPs will be fitted with MCERTS compliant continuous emissions monitoring system (CEMS), used to continuously monitor the outgoing gas stream.

The heat generated by the SWIPs will be used in three existing absorption chillers that form part of the air cooling in sheds 4 and 5 which store and process refuse-derived fuel (RDF) and solid recovered fuel (SRF) as part of Activity AR1. Hot water from the SWIPs is provided to the neighbouring Melton Waste Park Anaerobic Digestion Facility, operated by Melton Energy Tech, permit number EPR/ZP3322SC, to help maintain temperature in the digesters as required. It is this technical connection that determines that Melton Waste Park and Melton Waste Park Anaerobic Digestion Facility, is a multi-operator installation.

The application confirmed that the SWIPs are designed to be fully compliant with the requirements of the of the Industrial Emissions Directive.

The digestate accepted on site as part-fuel for the SWIPs will come from the neighbouring Melton Waste Park Anaerobic Digestion Facility. The digestate will have been pressed and dried to reduce water content. Further details on the appropriate storage and treatment of the digestate is included under 'Odour' below.

Digestate is mixed with wood to create the fuel for the SWIPs. The site is not permitted to accept hazardous waste wood. The operator has committed to measures to ensure that hazardous wood is not accidentally incorporated as a

fuel source for the SWIPs. The measures, are set out in the document titled *230215 acceptance and pre-acceptance checks for non-haz wood incinerators V1.0.pdf* and are included as an operating technique in Table S1.2. A pre-operational conditional has been included in the permit in table S1.4 to ensure that the measures which require action prior to the commissioning of the SWIPs are carried out.

Emissions to air

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 (PC) 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 exceedances of the relevant ES are likely. This is done through detailed audit and review of the Applicant's air dispersion modelling taking background concentrations and modelling uncertainties into account. Where an exceedance of an AAD limit value is identified, we may require the applicant to go beyond what would normally be considered BAT for the Installation or we may refuse the application if the applicant is unable to provide suitable proposals. Whether or not exceedances are considered likely, the application is subject to the requirement to operate in accordance with BAT.

This is not the end of the risk assessment, because we also take into account local factors (for example, particularly sensitive receptors nearby such as 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.

Assessment of Impact on Air Quality

The Applicant's assessment of the impact of air quality is set out in Appendix 5 of the Application. The assessment comprises:

- Dispersion modelling of emissions to air from the operation of the incinerators.
- 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 the Decision Considerations section, below.

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 Leconfield Airfield between 2018 and 2022, approximately 17km north of the site. 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 46(2) and Annex VI of the Industrial Emissions Directive (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 (Cd), thallium (Tl), mercury (Hg), antimony (Sb), arsenic (As), lead (Pb), chromium (Cr), cobalt (Co), copper (Cu), manganese (Mn), nickel (Ni) and vanadium (v))
 - 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.
- Third, the model also considered emissions of pollutants not covered by Annex VI of IED, specifically, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs).

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. Background data from a variety of sources has been used, including Defra background maps and monitoring networks, and automatic and non-automatic monitoring from East Riding of Yorkshire Council.

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.

Due to the commissioning of the neighbouring anaerobic digestion activity (Melton Anaerobic Digestion Facility, operated by Melton Energy Tech, permit number EPR/ZP3322SC) and the associations between the two sites (a multi operator installation), the audit also took into account the modelling for both permits.

The conclusions from the operator's air dispersion modelling for the SWIPs alone are as follows:

- The maximum PCs for annual and short term NO₂, annual PM_{2.5}, annual SO₂, annual VOCs, annual and short term Cd and Tl, annual Hg, As, Cr^(VI), Co, short term Cu, Pb, annual Mn, annual and short term Ni and PAH's

could not be screened out as not significant at Step 1 of the screening process.

- All substances could be screened out at Step 2 of the screening process, when comparing with background data as not significant apart from short term Cd and Tl, As, Cr^(VI), short term Cu and PAH's.
- The background data used for modelling the above substances were taken from Scunthorpe Low Santon, approximately 14km south west of Melton Waste Park. Scunthorpe Low Santon monitoring station is 100 m north east from an asphalt processing plant and 400m north east from the nearby Scunthorpe steel works. Therefore, Scunthorpe Low Santon is considered to be heavily impacted by emissions from industry and not representative of background concentrations at Melton Waste Park. When comparing with mapped modelled background data on the UK-air.defra.gov.uk website as more representative of the Melton Waste Park area, short term Cd and Tl and PAH's were screened out.
- For Group 3 metals that remained as not significant As, Cr^(VI), and short term Cu, the operator followed Environment Agency guidance to compare with data from operational incinerators to assess the likely contributions of individual metal species to the total and calculated as a percentage contribution to the BAT-AEL specified for Group 3 metals in the IED. From this assessment, As and short-term Cu screen out and can be considered not significant.
- For Cr^(VI), analysis of the gridded points across the modelled 4km x 4km grid, shows only 3 points that would record a PC of Cr^(VI) of more than 1% of the EAL. All three points are within the site boundary and therefore none are located at sensitive receptors and therefore screened out as not significant.

Our review of the Applicant's assessment leads us to agree with the Applicant's conclusions for human health. We have also audited the air quality and human health impact assessment and similarly agree that the conclusions drawn in the reports were acceptable and that process contributions are either insignificant or predicted environmental concentrations (PECs) are not predicted to exceed environmental standards (ES) for human health. Ecological impacts are considered in the 'Decision Considerations' section below.

A Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) is not required for this application due to the small scale of the SWIP, being below the Schedule 1 regulatory threshold for incinerators. This is based on the SWIP burning less than 3 tonnes of waste per hour.

Odour

The operator submitted an updated odour management plan (OMP) in response to a Schedule 5 Request for Further Information to update the site OMP to include digestate storage, dated 14/10/2025. Due to on-going discussions with

the area enforcement team, the OMP has been fully updated for the whole site. However, the parts of the OMP that are reviewed for this variation are for the storage and handling of the digestate only.

The operator will receive digestate from the neighbouring anaerobic digestion (Melton Waste Park Anaerobic Digestion Facility), into Shed 4. The digestate will be transferred from the dedicated area on the Melton Waste Park Anaerobic Digestion Facility site using enclosed or covered skips. The digestate has a dedicated bay in Shed 4. It will be requested and received on a 'as required' basis. Storage times will be no longer than 48 hours in normal conditions and minimised as much as possible to avoid re-wetting of material. The digestate will be transferred to the screener, also located in Shed 4, to screen out any remaining contaminants such as plastic and grit. The screened digestate is then mixed with wood waste in Shed 4 before being transferred via shovel loader to the fuel storage area, located just outside the doors to Shed 4. The fuel storage containers are enclosed metal units and covered.

Shed 4 is an enclosed building with fast-acting roller shutter doors and there is an existing odour control system which is reported to work well. Processing activities will be planned and managed to minimise the potential for mixing of waste types within Shed 4 and the screener itself, which is also used for screening other waste types. Cleaning of plant, machinery and operational areas is undertaken daily. Cleaning between waste loads will also be undertaken using mechanical and manual methods to minimise the potential for mixing of waste types and to maintain the quality requirements of the resulting fuel material. The site has procedures for operating in abnormal conditions, which include extreme meteorological events, equipment breakdown and receipt of unusually odorous waste. The site undertakes regular odour monitoring.

We are satisfied that the operators proposals mean that digestate is covered or contained in an enclosed space whenever reasonably practicable. The digestate received from MET AD plant will also have been dried, thereby reducing odour potential.

Due to the on-going compliance work with area teams, only the parts of the OMP relevant to this variation application have been included in Table S1.2.

Decision considerations

Confidential information

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

Identifying confidential information

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

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

Consultation

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

The application was publicised on the GOV.UK website.

We consulted the following organisations:

- The UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA)
- Director of Public Health, East Riding of Yorkshire Council
- Environmental control, East Riding of Yorkshire Council
- Fire and Rescue Service

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

The regulated facility

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

The 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.

This permit applies to only one part of the installation, which is everything apart from the anaerobic digestion plant, operated by Melton Energy Tech under permit number EPR/ZP3322SC.

The site

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

These show the extent of the site of the facility.

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.

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.

The following designations were within the appropriate screening distance:

Humber Estuary SAC (UK0030170)

River Derwent SAC (UK0030253)

Humber Estuary SPA (UK9006111)

Humber Estuary Ramsar (UK11031)

Humber Estuary - 2000480 SSSI

Melton Bottom Chalk Pit SSSI

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.

The operator conducted modelling for acid deposition, nitrogen deposition, NH₃, SO₂ and NO_x impacts. PCs from the SWIPs and Melton Anaerobic Digestion Facility on their own and cumulatively together with other sources are either insignificant or PECs are not likely to exceed critical levels. Acid deposition PCs from the SWIPs and Melton Anaerobic Digestion Facility on their own and cumulatively with other sources are insignificant. Nutrient nitrogen PCs from the SWIPs alone are insignificant, however as the nutrient nitrogen PCs from Melton Anaerobic Digestion Facility are greater than 1%, the cumulative impact from the whole multi-operator installation is therefore not insignificant and is likely to exceed the critical load. However, the background level of nutrient nitrogen already exceeds a critical load of 10 kg N/ha/yr. We consider any additional nitrogen deposition from Transwaste operations to be small and unlikely to affect the integrity of these ecological sites.

All storage of potentially polluting materials associated with the SWIP such as bottom ash, diesel associated with the auxiliary burners and urea used in the NO_x abatement process will be suitably stored and if appropriate, banded in line with best available techniques for the industry. As the permit will also prohibit significant releases of these substances we conclude there will be no effect at all.

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 guidance document - The Incineration of Waste (EPR 5.01) - 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.

We consider that the emission limits and operating techniques as set out in IED chapter IV 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.

Odour management

We have reviewed the odour management plan in accordance with our guidance on odour management.

We consider that the parts of the odour management plan that apply to this variation are satisfactory and we approve this plan.

We have approved the parts of the odour management plan that apply to this variation 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 the relevant parts 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 parts of the odour management plan that apply to this variation have been incorporated into the operating techniques table S1.2 of the environmental permit.

Refer to the Key Issues section for further details.

Fire prevention plan

We have assessed the fire prevention plan and are satisfied that it meets the measures and objectives set out in the Fire Prevention Plan guidance.

Raw materials

We have specified limits and controls in table S2.1 on the use of diesel fuel for use in the auxiliary burner, specifying that it must not exceed 0.1% w/w sulphur content.

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 five pre-operational conditions relating to the commissioning of the SWIPs and one to ensure that the measures set out in document titled document titled *230215 acceptance and pre-acceptance checks for non-haz wood incinerators V1.0.pdf* which require action prior to the commissioning of the SWIPs, are carried out.

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 the operator submits reports to the Environment Agency covering the following aspects:

- testing to determine the size distribution for particulate matter.
- the environmental performance of the SWIPs against the design parameters set out in the application and against the permit conditions. They will also need to demonstrate that their EMS has been updated.
- validation testing during commissioning of the SWIPs.
- description of the performance of the emission abatement technology.
- performance of the continuous emissions monitors (CEMs).
- whether the air monitoring locations meet the requirements of BS EN 15259.

Emission limits

Emission Limit Values (ELVs) and/or equivalent parameters or technical measures have been added for the following substances:

- Particulate matter
- Total Organic Carbon (TOC)
- Hydrogen chloride
- Hydrogen fluoride
- Carbon monoxide
- Sulphur dioxide
- Oxides of nitrogen (NO and NO₂ expressed as NO₂)
- Cadmium & thallium and their compounds (total)
- Mercury and its compounds
- Sb, As, Pb, Cr, Co, Cu, Mn, Ni and V and their compounds (total)
- Dioxins / furans (I-TEQ)

Monitoring

We have decided that monitoring should be added for the following parameters, using the methods detailed and to the frequencies specified:

- Particulate matter
- Total Organic Carbon (TOC)
- Hydrogen chloride
- Hydrogen fluoride
- Carbon monoxide
- Sulphur dioxide
- Oxides of nitrogen (NO and NO₂ expressed as NO₂)
- Cadmium & thallium and their compounds (total)
- Mercury and its compounds
- Sb, As, Pb, Cr, Co, Cu, Mn, Ni and V and their compounds (total)
- Exhaust gas temperature
- Exhaust gas pressure
- Exhaust gas flow
- Exhaust gas oxygen content
- Exhaust gas water vapour content
- Carbon dioxide
- Dioxins / furans (I-TEQ)
- Dioxins / furans (WHO-TEQ Humans / Mammals, Fish, Birds)
- Dioxin like PCBs (WHO-TEQ Humans / Mammals, Fish, Birds)
- Specific individual poly-cyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), as specified in Schedule 6.

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 emission limit values and to enable correction of measured concentration of substances to the appropriate reference conditions; 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 IED for monitoring of residues and temperature in the combustion chamber.

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:

- Emissions to air

- TOC in bottom ash
- Metals (Antimony, Cadmium, Thallium, Mercury, Lead, Chromium, Copper, Manganese, Nickel, Arsenic, Cobalt, Vanadium, Zinc) and their compounds, dioxins/furans and dioxin-like PCBs in bottom ash and APC residues.
- Total soluble fraction and metals (Antimony, Cadmium, Thallium, Mercury, Lead, Chromium, Copper, Manganese, Nickel, Arsenic, Cobalt, Vanadium, Zinc) soluble fractions in bottom ash and APC residues.

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 the Environment Agency to ensure compliance with permit conditions and to monitor the efficiency of material use and energy recovery at the installation.

Management system

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

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

Technical competence

Technical competence is required for activities permitted.

The operator is a member of the CIWM/WAMITAB scheme

We are satisfied that the operator is technically competent.

Previous performance

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

Growth duty

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

Paragraph 1.3 of the guidance says:

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

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

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

Consultation Responses

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

Responses from organisations listed in the consultation section

Response received from UK Health Security Agency

Brief summary of issues raised:

The main emissions of potential concern are fugitive emissions of dust and point source emissions of products of combustion. However, noting the outcomes of the appropriate air quality modelling that show a low impact on the health of local human receptors, the UKHSA have no significant concerns regarding the risk to the health of the local population from the installation.

Summary of actions taken:

The Environment Agency’s Air Quality Modelling and Assessment Unit (AQMAU) undertook an audit of the Air Quality Modelling provided with the application. This audit was undertaken in combination with emissions from the neighbouring anaerobic digestion facility, for which an environmental permit was in determination at the time. AQMAU agreed with the applicants conclusions that Process Contributions (PCs) from Melton Waste Park are insignificant.

The site has an existing Dust and Emissions Management Plan (DEMP) which covers fugitive emissions from the activities at the site. With appropriate containment for the digestate received as fuel for the SWIP's, there is little increased risk of fugitive emissions as a result of this permit variation. Therefore an updated DEMP was not reviewed as part of this variation.

Response received from Environmental Control, East Riding of Yorkshire Council

Brief summary of issues raised:

No objection to the variation.

Summary of actions taken:

None required.