



# Global Warming Assessment

Energy Ventures No1 Ltd

14<sup>th</sup> August 2025

Project No.: SOL\_24\_P076\_PCM

### Document Details

Document Title	Global Warming Assessment
Document Subtitle	Energy Ventures No1 Ltd
Project No.	SOL_24_P076_PCM
Date	14 <sup>th</sup> August 2025
Version	QMS_7.5.38_TEM – Template – Report Long Form – New Style (Perm) v5
Author	Charlie Holmes
Client Name	Energy Ventures No1 Ltd

### Document History

Version	Comments	Date	Author Initials	Reviewer Initials
I1	First Issue to the Environment Agency	14/08/2025	CH	SR

---

Signature Page

14<sup>th</sup> August 2025

# Global Warming Assessment

Energy Ventures No1 Ltd

---



Charlie Holmes  
Environmental Consultant



Sophie Rainey  
Senior Environmental Permitting Manager

*This report has been prepared by Sol Environment with all reasonable skill, care, and diligence, and taking account of the Services and the Terms agreed between Sol Environment Ltd and the Client. This report is confidential to the client, and Sol Environment accepts no responsibility whatsoever to third parties to whom this report, or any part thereof, is made known, unless formally agreed by Sol Environment Ltd beforehand. Any such party relies upon the report at their own risk.*

*Sol Environment disclaims any responsibility to the Client and others in respect of any matters outside the agreed scope of the Services*

---

Registered office: 10 The Lees, Malvern, Worcestershire, WR14 3HT  
Company Registered in England no. 7068933



Sol is ISO 9001:2015 certified by British Assessment Bureau Limited, a UKAS Accredited Certification Body number 8289 for the scope of Environmental Consultancy providing a range of services to companies in the UK and Europe. Certificate number: 259774.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This document has been prepared by Sol Environment Ltd on the behalf of Energy Ventures No1 Ltd (in support of its Environmental Permit Application) for the proposed energy recovery facility at their site in Sherburn in Elmet, Leeds.

The document contains a Global Warming Potential assessment against the potential flue gas emissions abatement technology options for the energy recovery facility.

This report provides a qualitative and quantitative appraisal of the various flue gas and emissions abatement technologies relating to NO<sub>x</sub> abatement, acid gas treatment, dioxin / furan and particulate abatement.

## 2. OPTIONS APPRAISALS

### 2.1 Introduction

A detailed description and BAT justification for the proposed combustion systems and associated balance of plant has been provided within the main Application Support Document.

In summary, the proposed hybrid combustion system incorporates the following pollution abatement technologies:

- NOx abatement using Selective Non-Catalytic Reduction (SNCR) through urea injection;
- Acid gas abatement using sodium bicarbonate injection and filtration;
- Heavy metal, dioxins, furans and VOC abatement provided through the injection of activated carbon; and
- Particulate abatement through the use of bag filtration.

### 2.2 Selection of Treatment Technology

A review of the technology is provided within the Application Support Document.

Moving grate combustion has a number of advantages for waste incineration for a number of factors:

- Capable of dealing with waste streams that are not necessarily homogeneous;
- High temperatures to achieve 850oC for 2 seconds retention time in combustion chamber;
- Allows continuous feed disposal;
- Fully automated and thus ensuring safe operation even at extreme temperatures;
- Inclined moving (riddling) grate configuration increases mechanical turbulence to optimise destruction of wastes;
- An increase of mechanical turbulence to optimise destruction of wastes;
- Thermal oxidation of combustion gases within the secondary combustion chamber; and
- Proven, reliable technology with typically modular design allowing ease of installation and future maintenance.

### 2.3 NOx Abatement Selection

As required by the EA Sector Guidance, the applicant has provided a site-specific appraisal of the selected NOx abatement and control system. NOx reduction can be achieved through one or a combination of the following, each of which has been considered within the assessment:

- Flue Gas Recirculation (FGR);
- Selective Non-Catalytic Reduction (SNCR); and
- Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR)

The process of FGR in this application is not required as NOx limits can be met without it.

FGR is not required in order to achieve the required NOx emissions and avoids potential additional operational expenditure issues associated with the operation of additional fans, flues and corrosion issues associated with the recirculation of untreated flue gases.

On the basis that NOx reduction is required and that primary NOx control measures, for example combustion air controls, fuel mixing, grate cooling etc are applied, this assessment evaluates the key environmental impacts of SNCR and SCR.

Although consideration has been given to the environmental impacts of waste production and raw materials usage, as both options are using the same chemical dosing reagents, the accident risks, noise and odour potential are considered similar and have therefore have not been assessed further.

### *Air Quality Impacts of NOx Emissions*

The NOx removal performance of SNCR and SCR differ and therefore achieve different release concentrations when used in identical combustion systems. Estimated long-term emission concentrations for both SNCR and SCR are provided in Table 2.1 and are based on the EA BAT limit for nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), waste incineration BREF level for nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) and BAT conclusions limit for urea<sup>1</sup>.

Short-term emissions performance for both options would be compliant with IED BAT limits for NO<sub>2</sub>. Whilst emissions performance data for N<sub>2</sub>O is provided, N<sub>2</sub>O is not an air quality pollutant but does contribute to global warming which is discussed later in this section.

Given the purpose of this assessment is to provide an assessment of the relative performance of the options, the various options have not been modelled further.

**Table 2.1 - Summary of Air Quality Performance Associated with NOx abatement**

Option	SNCR	SCR
<b>Achievable emissions concentrations (in mg/Nm<sup>3</sup>) long-term(1)</b>		
Nitrogen Dioxide	100	80
Nitrous Oxide	10	0
NH <sub>3</sub>	10	<10

In terms of NO<sub>2</sub> performance SCR can achieve lower emission concentrations in the flue gases than SNCR and consequently lower process contributions and predicted environmental concentrations can be achieved, albeit not substantially lower.

For the proposed development, achieving the new plant BREF Emission Limit Values is achieved with the primary control measures of controlled two stage combustion and use of Selective Non Catalytic Reduction (SNCR) technology with injection of urea into the hot flue gasses.

### *Global Warming Potential*

The energy requirements to operate an SCR system are considerably higher than those for SNCR due to the need to operate the catalyst within a range of 180 – 400°C. By comparison, SNCR does not require any reheating and therefore minimal energy input is only required to operate associated plant.

<sup>1</sup> <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32019D2010&from=EN>

Therefore, the assessment of the Global Warming Potential (GWP) of the two systems considers a combination of the CO<sub>2</sub>e releases (nitrous oxides and carbon dioxide) combined with comparison of the relative energy requirements of the two systems.

### *Raw Materials*

SNCR and SCR systems both require the injection of an urea containing reducing reagent. Despite the overall annual consumption of urea being largely similar, SCR requires a catalyst which periodically needs replacing.

The specific energy consumption and consumables usage of the two options considered is summarised in Table 2.2 below. SCR typically requires more energy to operate than SNCR.

**Table 2.2 - Summary of GWP Performance**

Option	SNCR	SCR
Energy Requirements kWh/T waste treated <sup>2</sup>	45 – 50	65 – 100
Reagent Consumption Kg/T waste treated	1 – 4	1 – 3 (plus catalyst)

### *Waste*

The waste generation of the two competing systems differ. SNCR does not produce any wastes requiring disposal whilst SCR utilises catalysts which in turn require periodic disposal. Spent catalyst typically needs to be replaced approximately every 5 years and is estimated as producing approximately 40 tonnes per annum of waste for disposal.

The spent catalyst is classified as a hazardous waste and will require disposal at a hazardous waste landfill.

### *Summary of Environmental Performance*

A qualitative assessment approach has been used to establish BAT for the proposed NOx abatement system. The comparison of the performance of SNCR and SCR for each of the relevant issues identified in the section above has been provided in Table 2.3 below.

**Table 2.3 - Summary Ranking**

Option	Ranking	
	SNCR	SCR
NOx performance	2	1
Urea Performance	1	1
GWP performance	1	2
Raw Material Consumption: Urea and Catalyst (SCR only)	1	2
Waste	1	2
<b>Environmental Performance Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>

<sup>2</sup> Data sourced from EU Waste Incineration BREF (Tables 4.33 and 4.36 Section 4.5.4.3 and 4.4.5.4 respectively)

From the table above the overall environmental performance of the SNCR option is marginally better than that for SCR.

For the proposed development, achieving the new plant BREF Emission Limit Values is achieved with the primary control measures of controlled combustion and use of Selective Non-Catalytic Reduction (SNCR) technology with injection of urea into the hot flue gasses. No further NOx control is required to be the necessary BREF limits.

All concentrations from the plant will be in line with the BREF emission limits for new plant. It is therefore concluded that SNCR is BAT for the process on the basis that it achieves ELV's well below the IED limits and meets the sector BAT AELs.

## 2.4 Acid Gas Abatement Selection

In a similar manner to NOx abatement, an options appraisal has been provided for the selected acid gas abatement.

The following options have been considered for the proposed EfW:

- Dry system;
- Semi-dry system; and
- Wet scrubber.

Given that the plant has no process emissions to water and seeks to achieve a level of water neutrality close to zero, the inclusion of a wet scrubbing system would introduce a process discharge to water. This option is undesirable and has been discounted from further consideration

For both options, it is assumed that the same primary measures for minimising the formation of acid gases are in place.

The options considered for control of acid gases have been assessed on the basis of the following environmental criteria:

- Air quality impacts;
- Global warming potential (GWP);
- Raw material consumption; and
- Waste generation.

The two options considered have similar odour, noise, accident hazard and visible plume potential. No releases to water are generated from the dry and semi dry abatement options and therefore consideration of these environmental effects has therefore been excluded from this assessment.

### *Air Quality Impacts*

The achievable long term emission concentrations for each of these technology options are similar and can be demonstrated to meet the required BAT EALs. On this basis, the emissions performance of each option is considered to be similar and will achieve the same process contribution irrespective of technology used.

*Table 2.4 - Summary of Air Quality performance Associated with Releases of Acid Gas Emissions*

Option	Dry	Semi-dry
<b>Achievable emissions concentrations (in mg/Nm<sup>3</sup>)</b>		
SO <sub>2</sub>	30	30
HCl	6	6
HF	1	1

Given the emissions performance is the same for both options the process contributions for both options will be similar. The air quality modelling screens out the emissions impacts of HF, SO<sub>2</sub> and HCl and it therefore can be concluded that the air quality effects from either option would be considered acceptable.

#### *Global Warming Potential*

The Waste Incineration BREF does not provide comparative figures for the GWP performance of dry and semi-dry gas abatement systems. Therefore, on this basis a similar energy demand is assumed for both systems.

#### *Raw Materials*

Both dry and semi-dry gas abatement systems require the injection of reagent (typically lime or sodium bicarbonate), whilst a semi-dry system also utilises water.

Table 2.5 below summarises the raw material consumption for each of the options.

*Table 2.5 - Summary of Raw Material Consumption<sup>3</sup>*

Option	Dry	Semi-dry
Lime	10 – 20 kg/t	7 – 10 kg/t
Sodium Bicarbonate	6 – 12 kg/t	Not provided in BREF
Waste	7 – 25 kg/t	25 – 50 kg/t
Water	-	<300

The BREF only details lime as an option for semi-dry systems, however as you will see from the figures provided for dry systems, compared to lime less sodium bicarbonate is required due to its high efficiency. Dry gas scrubbing also tends to consume more reagent than Semi-Dry systems, whilst Semi-Dry systems has an additional water demand and higher levels of waste.

#### *Waste*

Both options generate waste streams for disposal as a result of excess reagent and reaction products. Residues from both options are considered to be hazardous and therefore subject to the same disposal routes. Given the higher levels of waste associated with semi-dry abatement systems, a dry abatement technology is considered to be BAT for this process.

<sup>3</sup>Figures taken from WI BREF Table 4.23 and 4.28. Please note, Table 4.23 for semi-dry only uses quicklime as an reagent option.

### *Summary of Environmental Performance*

A qualitative assessment approach has been used to establish BAT for the proposed acid gas abatement system. The comparison of the performance of dry gas and semi-dry gas abatement for each of the relevant issues identified in the section above has been provided in Table 2.6 below.

**Table 2.6 - Summary of Environmental Performance**

Options	Ranking	
	Dry Gas Treatment	Semi-dry Gas Treatment
Emissions to air	1	1
GWP performance	1	1
Raw material usage	1	2
Waste hazard	1	2
<b>Environmental Performance Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>

It can be seen from the above assessment that dry gas abatement performs largely similar in terms of performance but consumes less waste and raw materials than the alternatives. Whilst dry gas scrubbing performs better than semi-dry gas treatment, the differences in environmental performance are considered marginal.

### *Summary of Acid Gas Appraisal*

The assessment of acid gas abatement has considered the environmental performance of the options.

The plant operators have selected a dry abatement system as their preferred acid gas abatement system and consider this to be BAT for the process. Please refer to the application support document for more information on the selection of sodium bicarbonate for use within the system.

## 2.5 Dioxin and Furan Abatement Selection

Activated carbon has been selected for control of dioxins and furans and is widely accepted as being the preferred abatement technique for this sector. It is recognised that dioxins and furans can also be controlled by the use of catalytic abatement systems and have the advantage of destroying the dioxins and furans rather than removal and transfer into the APC residues. Activated carbon however has the added benefit of controlling mercury emissions, which is a key consideration for the sector.

Given that activated carbon is effective for the removal of all three pollutants, this is considered to represent BAT and has been selected for the proposed facility.

## 2.6 Control of Particulates

There are a range of options available for particulate control including:

- Fabric Filters;
- Ceramic Filters;
- Electro-static Precipitators (ESPs); and
- Wet Scrubbers.

Wet scrubbers and ESPs cannot meet the emission level performance of other techniques therefore do not represent BAT for this sector and are not considered further. Ceramic filters can achieve high removal efficiencies of particulates but are not applicable in this application due to the relative low temperature of the flue gases. Ceramic filters / candles are also more susceptible to mechanical failures and blinding than fabric filters so are not considered BAT.

Fabric filters provide reliable abatement of particulates and are generally accepted as BAT for particulate control.