Notice of request for more information

The Environmental Permitting (England & Wales) Regulations 2016.

Company Director

Gent Fairhead & Co Limited
Court Of Noke
Pembridge
Leominster
Herefordshire
HR6 9HW

Application number: EPR/FP3335YU/V002

The Environment Agency, in exercise of its powers under paragraph 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 5 of the above Regulations, requires you to provide the information detailed in the attached schedule. The information is required in order to determine your application for a permit duly made on 26/10/2018.

Send the information to either the email or postal address below by 26/04/2019. If we do not receive this information by the date specified then we may treat your application as having been withdrawn or it may be refused. If this happens you may lose your application fee.

Email address: psc@environment-agency.gov.uk.

Postal address:
Permitting and Support Centre
Quadrant 2
99 Parkway Avenue
Parkway Business Park
Sheffield
S9 4WF

Name	Date
[redacted]	29/03/2019

Authorised on behalf of the Environment Agency

Notes

These notes do not form part of this notice.

Please note that we charge £1,200 where we have to send a third or subsequent information notice in relation to the same issue. We consider this to be the first notice on the issues covered in this notice.

The notes in italics that appear after information requests in the attached schedule do not form part of the notice. The notes are intended to assist you in providing a full response.

Schedule

1) Advanced SNCR

Section 2.2 of your Environmental Permit Variation Supporting Information document (reference S1552-0740-0001SMO) states that reduced emission limits for nitrogen oxides would be achieved using an advanced version of the currently permitted SNCR system.

Provide further quantifiable evidence and representative operational data from an equivalent representative plant or plants to demonstrate why your proposal can be considered to represent Best Available Techniques (BAT).

This must include but not necessarily be limited to the following:

- **Evidence and data to demonstrate that the stated reduction in long term (daily) NOx emissions from 150 mg/m^3 to 100 mg/m^3 and short term (half hourly) emissions from 400 mg/m^3 to 200 mg/m^3 will be achievable in practice on a consistent basis.**
- **Evidence and data to demonstrate that the stated increase in tonnes of NOx emissions abated by the advanced SNCR system from 500 to 650 tonnes per year will be achievable in practice on a consistent basis**
- **Evidence and data to support ammonia slip reduction taking into account that you are proposing a reduction in the daily NOx emission limit from 150 mg/m^3 to 100 mg/m^3.**
- **A justification of why the plant or plants from which the operational data has been obtained can be considered to be representative of the proposed plant at Rivenhall including consideration of furnace design, waste type, feedstock, throughput, advanced SNCR design and any other relevant factors.**

2) Equivalent Emissions

In section 4.2 of the application supporting information document (reference S1552-0740-0001SMO) you have justified Best Available Techniques (BAT) on the basis that impacts have not changed significantly from those previously accepted as BAT.

Our web guidance in line with the requirements of the Industrial Emissions Directive (IED) states:

"If your alternative technique will provide a level of environmental protection ***that's equivalent to the BAT,*** *you need to explain how it will do so in the operating techniques section of the application form.* ***If your technique won't provide equivalent environmental protection****, but you want to make a case that it's justified on cost benefit grounds, you'll need to provide a justification in the operating techniques section of the form and through your risk assessment and cost benefit analysis.*

https://www.gov.uk/guidance/best-available-techniques-environmental-permits#how-to-propose-an-alternative-technique.

As you are proposing alternative techniques to those considered BAT, you are required to demonstrate that the alternative stack height and abatement proposals provide an **equivalent or a higher level of environmental protection** to those already determined to be BAT.

At present your application suggests there would be an increase in process contributions (as shown below), but does not demonstrate why this increase is equivalent or better than the existing proposal.

- Table 3.2 predicts an increase in NOx annual process contribution from 2.19% to 3.27% of the Environmental Standard (ES).
- Table 3.3 predicts an increase in NOx annual process contribution at one receptor (All Shots Farm) from 0.60% to 1.40% of the ES so that it cannot be screened out as insignificant
- Table 3.2 VOCs process contribution (as benzene) increases from 2.97% to 6.56% of the ES
- Table 3.2 VOCs process contribution (as 1, 3-butadiene) increases from 6.60% to 15.57% of the ES

In line with the requirements for demonstrating alternative BAT techniques, provide further information to demonstrate why your proposals for a 35 m metre stack with advanced SNCR abatement will provide a level of environmental protection that's better than or equivalent to the 58 m stack and SNCR design which has previously been determined as BAT.

This must include a justification for the differences (as shown above) in the following emissions:

a) Oxides of Nitrogen

b) Volatile Organic Compounds

c) Heavy metals

3) Change in Sulphur dioxide limits

Section 2.3 of the application states that "*The Applicant is confident that the control system will be able to control peak concentrations of sulphur dioxide to ensure that the half-hourly concentration remains below 90 mg/Nm^3*".

Demonstrate and provide evidence to support why the Applicant is confident this emission limit is now achievable and explain why emissions are now proposed to be lower than in the previous application.

4) Cadmium and thallium limits

The application proposes to reduce the cadmium and thallium emission limits for A1 and A2 from 0.05 mg/Nm^3 to 0.02 mg/Nm^3. The Applicant has committed to achieve this BAT-AEL from the commencement of operations and prior to implementation of the requirements of the BREF.

Demonstrate and provide evidence to support why the Applicant is confident this emission limit is now achievable and explain why emissions are now proposed to be lower than in the previous application.

5) Advanced SNCR increase in use of ammonia and impact on the environment.

The proposed use of advanced SNCR is projected to result in additional ammonia utilisation. How this effects emissions from the facility and impacts on sensitive receptors has not been accounted for in the emissions assessment in this application.

a) Will the stated additional ammonia utilisation increase ammonia air emissions?

b) If there is no increase in ammonia emissions, provide justification and evidence to demonstrate why.

c) If ammonia emissions will increase, provide updated modelling results to show the impact at all ecological sites within the relevant screening distance.