

Notice of request for more information

The Environmental Permitting (England & Wales) Regulations 2016

The Director or Company Secretary
Elliott Environmental Drainage Limited
Unit 1
St Michaels Close
Aylesford
Kent
ME20 7BU

Application number: EPR/ZP3623LZ/A001

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 07/10/2024.

Send the information to either the email or postal address below by 13/03/2026. If we do not receive this information by the date specified then we may treat your application as having been withdrawn or it may be refused.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: tommy.wager@environment-agency.gov.uk.

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

Name	Date
Tommy Wager	13/02/2026

Authorised on behalf of the Environment Agency

Notes

These notes do not form part of this notice.

We will recover our costs where we have to send three or more information notices about the same issue. For details of the fixed cost see our [charging guidance](#) or [charging scheme](#). This is the second notice on the issues covered in this notice.

As part of this notice we are requesting information that may lead to extra charges being applied to support this application. This will be determined upon assessment of the Schedule 5 Notice response documents and will be communicated to you as necessary within further correspondence and/or requests for further information/schedule 5 notices.

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.

Fire Prevention Plan

You must consider the 'Fire Prevention Plans: environmental permits' guidance (updated 11/01/2021) [GOV.UK](#), hereafter referred to as the guidance, and come to your own view as to what proposals you consider will meet the objectives to:

- minimise the likelihood of a fire happening;
- aim for a fire to be extinguished within 4 hours; and
- minimise the spread of fire within the site and to neighbouring sites.

You can follow the measures set out in the guidance and if you do so you will meet the objectives of the guidance and we are likely to approve your Fire Prevention Plan (FPP). If you do not include these measures you can propose alternative measures to meet the objectives. We will technically assess your alternative measures and, if we are satisfied that they meet the objectives, we can approve the FPP.

If your proposals do not meet the measures in the guidance, you should explain in detail the alternative measures you intend to take and how those measures can meet the objectives. This applies to each of the information requests in the attached schedule.

Schedule

Section 1 – Application charges

The Environment Agency (Environmental Permitting and Abstraction Licensing) (England) Charging Scheme 2022 provides information on the charges that should be paid when applying for an environmental permit. The environmental Permits: How and when you are charged guidance provides further information regarding how we apply charges. In line with charging scheme we require a response to the following question:

1. Provide additional payment for the biological treatment of waste, the physical-chemical treatment of non-hazardous waste for recovery activity, the activities in building 2 (5.3 phys-chem x2, 5.4 phys chem for disposal and physical treatment waste op for recovery) and the charge to reconsult totalling **£30,577**. The payment must be made within the specified deadline provided by this notice and you will need to provide remittance advice, including the date the payment was made as well as the overall sum provided to allow us to trace the payment. A breakdown of the additional charges has been provided below:
 - 1.16.1.1 – Section 5.3 (a) (i) – hazardous waste installation – biological treatment for disposal (reasonably associated @ 50% discount) – **£8,000**
 - 1.16.1.1 – Section 5.3 (a) (i) – hazardous waste installation – biological treatment for recovery (duplicate activity @ 90% discount) – **£1,600**
 - 1.16.2.1 – Section 5.4 (b)(i) – non-hazardous waste installation – biological Treatment for disposal (reasonably associated @ 50% discount) – **£8,000**
 - 1.16.2.1 – Section 5.4 (b)(i) – non-hazardous waste installation – biological Treatment for recovery (duplicate activity @ 90% discount) – **£1,600**
 - 1.16.14 – Physico-chemical treatment of waste – waste operation physical-chemical treatment of non-hazardous waste for recovery in building 1 (reasonably associated @ 50% discount) – **£3,965**
 - 1.16.1.2 – Section 5.3 (a) (ii) – hazardous waste installation – physical-chemical treatment for recovery in building 2 (duplicate activity @ 90% discount) – **£1,600**
 - 1.16.1.2 – Section 5.3 (a) (ii) – hazardous waste installation – physical-chemical treatment for disposal in building 2 (duplicate activity @ 90% discount) – **£1,600**
 - 1.16.2.1 – Section 5.4 (a)(ii) – non-hazardous waste installation – physical-chemical treatment for disposal in building 2 (duplicate activity @ 90% discount) – **£1,344**
 - 1.16.12 – Physical treatment of waste – waste operation for recovery in building 2 (duplicate activity @ 90% discount) – **£793**
 - 10. (b) under Application charges – additional charge in relation to an application amendment - **£2,075**
 - Total charge = **£30,577**

Reason for Question

On assessment of the schedule 5 notice response (provided 07/11/25) we can see the operator has confirmed that aerobic digestion is undertaken as part of the treatment steps within building 1. Aerobic digestion involves the introduction of micro-organisms which would break down some of the substances and materials via the process of digestion which would represent a clear biological activity that has not been identified or paid for previously. In most cases we would look to exclude activities from a permit application at this stage of determination that were not originally applied for prior to duly making, however in this case we believe this treatment step is intrinsically linked to the overall process and so on this occasion we can proceed with the determination of the biological activity aspects of this application on the basis that the additional charges specified above are paid by the operator and that additional supporting information/revised documents are provided in line with questions we have positioned later in this this notice.

We have also identified the requirement to levy a charge for physical-chemical treatment of non-hazardous waste for recovery activity under 1.16.14 of the charging scheme. The previously charged 1.16.12 physical treatment of waste charge covers the repackaging of non-hazardous waste (for disposal and recovery) carried out in building 3, which must be represented by its own waste operation entry. The new charge raised under 1.16.14 is due to the inclusion of physical-chemical treatment for non-hazardous waste

resulting in recovery carried out in building 1 and 2 (previously charged incorrectly under 1.16.12 during validation), which is a wholly separated waste activity from the repackaging of non-hazardous waste occurring in building 3 which is suitable for the 1.16.12 charge.

In addition, after having consulted with internal colleagues we have defined the operations within building 2 to be wholly separated from those carried out in building 1. This decision is based on the following points:

- The storage tanks in the external area represent a break in the process, regardless of whether waste are received directly there.
- Separated air emissions with building 2 and 1 – despite the fact they are potentially abated through the same OCU are produced in separate buildings
- Separated drainage and bunding with building 2 and 1
- The basis that the activities in building 2 represent physical treatment and the activities in Building 1 represent a chemical and biological process.
- This has been weighted by our approach to regulating other such facilities based on the above aspects and in not classifying these as separated processes, would potentially set an unfair precedent.

The above charges and changes to the application will also require us to re-consult both externally and internally and so an additional fee for re-consulting – under 10. (b) of the additional charges rule in the charging scheme – has been levied. Payment of the above charges is necessary for us to progress the application considering the new information regarding the recently disclosed aerobic digestion treatment steps, the reclassified separation of processes between building 1 and 2 and the newly identified additional waste operation.

Section 2 – Best Available Techniques (BAT) and Appropriate Measures

The Best Available Techniques (BAT) Reference Document for Waste Treatment provides standards to which facilities should comply with, and Technical guidance for regulated industry sectors: environmental permitting provides guidance for industry based sectors. In line with these requirements provide responses to the following questions:

- 2. Update and resubmit your BAT assessment document to include an assessment of the aerobic biological treatment activities and reflect any other changes introduced in response to this notice. The revised document must address the following aspects as a minimum:**
 - a. Sections covering BAT 33, BAT 34, BAT 35, BAT 36 and BAT 37 (with reference to windrows, some of the aspects of BAT 36 and 37 may only be relevant to composting, instead focus on waste input, temperature, aeration and abatement of wider building for the vessel or vessels undertaking biological treatment).
 - b. Amend the numbering on page 20 onwards.
 - c. It must be a standalone document that does not reference other documents for further information such as the EMS.
 - d. It must be fully comprehensive in scope ensuring each relevant BAT point (both number and letter, e.g. BAT '14d') has been demonstrated or addressed clearly and in detail.
 - e. Demonstration of how BAT will be met rather than just stating that BAT will be achieved (e.i demonstration through onsite processes, details of policy, abatement techniques etc).
 - f. Where a BAT conclusion has not been fully demonstrated, a clear justification outlining the reason for the deviation must be provided.
 - g. Where you have not meet BAT, provide an alternative approach that would provide an equivalent level of environmental protection with supported evidence.

Reason for Question

On assessment of the schedule 5 notice response (provided 07/11/25) we can see the operator has confirmed that aerobic digestion is undertaken as part of the treatment steps within building 1. An assessment will need to be made against the relevant BAT conclusions for biological treatment (BAT 33 -35) and specifically aerobic treatment (BAT 36 and 37). The assessment should be completed as a standalone document with clear and detailed demonstrations and justifications provided for each point and so the previously communicated aspects included for consideration have been maintained in the above bullet points.

In addition, we have also noted the numbering from page 20 onwards reverts to 2.1.2 rather than continuing from 2.1.7.8.

- 3. Provide a revised process flow diagram (PFD) and revised non-technical summary (NTS) to demonstrate the step-by-step onsite operations ensuring it includes the following aspects:**
 - a. Include the biological treatment activity step in the PFD as it is unclear whether these are carried out in the four sludge tanks or final water tank 1.**
 - b. Include a linked connection between the treatment vessels/plant and the solids bay to link the output to the vessel they are derived from.**
 - c. Include retention times for the final water tanks (1, 2 and 3) and consider renaming the treated water tanks as final water tanks 2 and 3 to be consistent with the naming convention used in the technical drawing.**
 - d. Include a clear step by step process description detailing each stage in the non-technical summary.**
 - e. Ensure that the pre-existing aspects of both the PFD and non-technical summary as communicated in the previous schedule 5 notice are maintained.**

Reason for Question

On assessment of the PFD we can still there still some missing information, such as a clear indication of where the aerobic treatment takes place and the retention times for the final water tanks. We are also missing a linked connection between the solids storage bays in building 1 and the vessels/plant the solids are taken from.

The non-technical summary is still missing a sufficient step by step process description for how the wastes travel through the operations on site before becoming outputs/emissions. The non-technical summary provides an opportunity for the general public to understand what is happening on site in a reduced technical language format and so an explanation demonstrating clear steps of the process should be both included and consistent with other submitted documents.

- 4. Provide a revised site layout plan that includes the connecting pipeline/ducting transferring foul air between building 1 and 2 to maintain negative pressure in both buildings.**
- 5. Provide emission to air points and national grid references for the carbon filter abated vents on the external tanks. Include these emission points on the site layout plan.**
- 6. Provide an emission point and national grid reference for uncontaminated roof and surface water entering the surface water drains (this can be represented as W1 rather than S2 to differentiate the sampling point from the water emission point). Include this emission point on the site layout plan and make sure it is located beyond the interceptor to ensure it can be inspected prior to discharge to ensure it is free from oil and grease.**
- 7. Confirm that no unloading/processing/storage of waste shall be undertaken outside of the three buildings and external tank area. If the yard area is used in any circumstances for unloading, storage or the processing of waste then the surface water for that area will not be considered uncontaminated. If this is the case emission point W1 asked for in the previous question will need to be re-established as S2 (a sampling point for emission to sewer) and be subject to the same or similar sampling and monitoring regime as S1 on the permit.**

Reason for Question

On assessment of revised site layout plan, we can see that it is still missing an emission to sewer for the uncontaminated surface and roof water from non-operational areas of the site. This should be located beyond the interceptor to ensure it can be inspected for oil and grease prior to discharge. If there is any unloading/storage and/or processing of waste in the yard area whether non-hazardous or hazardous then the water discharge for surface water will need to be sampled and monitored in line with process effluent rather than as uncontaminated surface water.

In addition, the site layout plan does not illustrate the connective pipeline transferring foul air from building 2 into building 1 prior to discharge at emission point A1. You must also identify the emission to air points from the external tanks.

- 8. Provide an explanation of how waste pre-acceptance and acceptance procedures will ensure that only water based liquid wastes (those of an 80% or higher w/w water content) are accepted and treated on site under the physical, physico-chemical and biological treatment processes. You should update the BAT assessment document accordingly.**
- 9. Provide an explanation of what happens to the treated waste liquid that is re-introduced into building 2 for recirculation rather than discharge via S1 from the final water tank 3.**
- 10. Provide confirmation that recirculated water it is not used to knowingly dilute wastes introduced into building 2 via the reception pit or within the CDE hydro tip/G-Max unit itself.**
- 11. Does the site undertake pre-mixing when it comes to compatible wastes (for example the storage of non-hazardous wastes of a similar composition within the same tank), excluding:
 - a. Wastes that would react with one another; and**
 - b. Wastes for recovery with wastes for disposal or a lower form of recovery; and**
 - c. Oils that could negatively effect regeneration or recycling; and**
 - d. Wastes containing POPs being mixed solely to achieve a mixture below the defined low POPs content; and**
 - e. Wastes to deliberately dilute.****

Reason for Question

On assessment of the response to the previous schedule 5 notice (specifically the EWC list) we can see that those wastes included for acceptance include potentially oily wastes. It is our understanding that the site intends to treat waste water that may be contaminated by oils, however liquid waste below the 80% threshold w/w water content may be classified as 'waste with a calorific value' rather than 'water based liquid waste'. Treatment of waste with a calorific value would result in tighter limits being applied to the permit for sampling and monitoring of indirect emissions to water. It is therefore important that the operator demonstrates robust pre-acceptance and acceptance procedures in order to ensure oily wastes below the 80% threshold are prevented from being accepted on site.

It is currently unclear what happens to the recirculated water diverted from final water tank 3 to building 2. We have included these questions due to the requirement to ensure operators are not knowingly diluting wastes to achieve lower detectible limits within wastes that exhibit hazardous substances/characteristics.

We also require clarification regarding pre-mixing of compatible waste versus the exclusions we would place in the permit for the wastes we deem non-compatible, or those mixed to achieve another waste outcome not suitable for mixing (as listed above).

- 12. Update and resubmit your BAT assessment document (page 8 paragraphs 2.1.3.21 and 2.1.3.22) and the appropriate measures documents (page 8 and referenced on page 19) to remove the paragraphs relating to emergency loads.**

Reason for Question

On assessment of the BAT assessment document and the appropriate measures assessment documents received in response to the last schedule 5 notice, we have noted that the section relating to pre-acceptance and acceptance of emergency loads is currently in contradiction of the pre-acceptance and acceptance of waste that every installation has a duty of care to undertake. You have stated that the waste treatment BREF provides the justification for how emergency loads can be allowed to bypass the pre acceptance and acceptance precedures, however on examination the waste treatment BREF it clearly states in section 2.3.2.3 waste acceptance under 'Acceptance principles' (i) that 'Other than in an emergency, the operator only receives onto the site prebooked wastes..',. our interpretation is that pre-acceptance may be bypassed in this scenario, but nowhere does it state this is the case for acceptance precedures. In addition, in section 2.3.2.3 'waste acceptance' under section 'reception' (xxi) states that "Bulk loads (liquid or solid) can only be offloaded once they have been fully verified as compliant. Interim storage of incompliant bulk load is not done except in an emergency situation." Our interpretation of this is that emergency loads can be accepted and stored in buffer tanks where those loads are incompliant, to test the waste is incompliant the site would need to have capacity for interim storage at the front end of an operation which this site does not currently have as part of its infrastructure. In addition, the configuration of the treatment processes would not be suitable for the acceptance of emergency loads, we note that the oil separation within the DAF plant, occurs after the chemical neutralisation and flocculation stages. It would be reasonable to conclude that on acceptance of emergency loads containing a high percentage of oils that the potential acids and flocculants introduced during these earlier steps would render those oils less recoverable and so this would indicate the site is unsuitable for the recovery of any emergency loads containing particularly oily waste.

to ensure incompliant loads are not introduced into the treatment process where the treatment is not verified as being suitable to effectively treat the substances within those wastes. We believe the current configuration of the site is not suitable for the acceptance of emergency loads given the absence of a buffer tank to allow acceptance checks in an emergency and the unlikeliness that the site will be able to reasonably treat waste with a high oil content based on the configuration of the treatment steps.

- 13. Explain why the HDPE storage solution you have proposed is suitable for the storage of lime or propose an alternative storage solution.**
- 14. Explain why the HDPE storage solution you have proposed is suitable for the storage of Calcium Hydroxide (slaked lime/hydrated lime slurry) and Diesel or propose an alternative storage solution.**

Reason for Question

Under BREF guidance BAT conclusion 11 the annual consumption of raw materials should be monitored. On assessment of your schedule 5 response, you have identified high density polyethylene as the preferred storage methodology for every raw material apart from activated carbon (which is stored in steel containers). HDPE is suitable for most of the raw materials you have listed however we have concerns that lime specifically is unsuitable for storage in HDPE on account of its propensity to cause stress cracks in the material if it comes into contact with moisture and long term/bulk storage of calcium hydroxide and diesel is not suitable as they can be abrasive and permeate the HDPE over time.

- 15. Update and resubmit the appropriate measures assessment document to also cover Biological waste treatment: appropriate measures for permitted facilities. Ensure that it addresses the following aspects as a minimum:**
 - a. It should be a standalone document that does not reference other documents for further information such as the EMS.**
 - b. It addresses each relevant section and point demonstrating clearly that the activities onsite reflect the proscribed measures detailed in the guidance.**
 - c. Where alternative measures are proposed, evidence-based justification that those alternative measures provide an equivalent level of environmental protection to those proscribed in the guidance should be provided.**

- d. It should address each section separately and with sufficient level of detail, without referring to another section of the document.
- e. Correct inconsistencies and grammatical errors.

16. Provide details of the biological treatment process including the following aspects:

- a. Number of tanks undertaking biological activity/treatment, including the sizes and retention times.
- b. What key process parameters are maintained to ensure effective aerobic treatment and digestion of the wastes held within those tanks.
- c. How the above process parameters are maintained and to what level.

Reason for Question

On assessment of the response to the previous schedule 5 we can see that you have submitted an appropriate measures assessment document that covers the chemical waste and non-hazardous/inert appropriate measures guidance, however on information received we have established a biological treatment activity and so the appropriate measures guidance for biological treatment should be included with the scope of that assessment.

In addition, we also require more information relating to how the aerobic digestion activity is managed in terms of key processes and their parameters as well as clear identification of which assets are used in the aerobic treatment. Currently the PFD and site plan do not clearly outline the assets and the non-technical summary is not detailed enough to provide a step by step breakdown of the process. On the information we have, the PFD would allude to the final water storage tank (final water tank 1 in the drawing) being the tank where this could occur however the naming convention of the four sludge tanks would make sense, given they are able to introduce wastes of a differing type (non-haz and haz).

We have also noted that you have deferred some sections to previous parts of the document, an example of this is section 3.1 to 3.3 on page 19 where you have deferred to the section 3 of the non-haz appropriate measures. By doing so you have indicated that each point has not been considered, sections 3.1-3.3 of the chemical waste measures present a different set of measures to that of the non-haz and inert appropriate measures. You should address each point raised in the guidance and provide justification for any points that the operator is unable to meet.

The level of detail provided in the appropriate measures assessment documents is not at a level considered appropriate for an installations site. There are 41 separate points within section 3.2 acceptance for chemical waste and only 11 points for the section 3.2 in the non-hazardous and inert appropriate measures document, We cannot see that you have provided information that shows each of the 41 and 11 points have been taken into consideration and/or had justification provided for when these have not been met. There are numerous grammatical errors and inconsistencies with the document, for example section 4.3 of the chem waste appropriate measures breakdown on page 21 states no aerosol storage but then goes on to state aerosols will be stored undercover, in a well-ventilated container within a cage. Section 4.5 on the same page repeats the wording 'sorting', which looks likely that it should state the word 'bulking' instead.

Section 3 – Waste Codes

Waste classification should be undertaken in accordance with Technical Guidance WM3. In line with the above guidance, BAT, appropriate measures for chemicals, biological waste and non-haz/inert waste, we require responses to the following questions:

17. Update and resubmit the EWC list with the new alternative six digit waste codes (not previously applied for) in accordance with WM3 guidance for the waste streams you expect to accept instead of the 99 codes.
18. For each of the newly added waste codes explain how you will be able to effectively treat those wastes.

19. Confirm the waste streams you would expect the new codes to come from (i.e. emergency spills, jetting wastes from specific industry, etc)

Reason for Question

We have reviewed the schedule 5 notice response to question 23 and cross-referenced this with the updated EWC waste list submitted as a supporting document. Unfortunately, the documents appear to contradict one another and so we consider this question unanswered. We note in the response document for questions 23 and 24 that you appear to agree that there are sufficient waste codes that exist that could be used in lieu of the 99 codes, however the EWC table breakdown provided as a supporting document does not reflect the new codes and still lists the 99 codes.

In the response document you have listed the following waste codes that could be used, but of which some have not been updated in the EWC table, I have listed all the codes below to highlight those still missing, you should ensure they have sufficient descriptions to reflect the waste you intend to accept them under.

19 05 99 – (should be withdrawn)

- 19 05 01 - (inc, in 5.4 phy chem for disposal)
- 19 08 05 - (not applied for)
- 19 12 12 - (not applied for)
- 20 03 03 - (not applied for)
- 19 08 02 - (not applied for)
- 15 01 05 - (not applied for)

19 08 99 – (should be withdrawn)

- 19 08 14 - (inc, in 5.4 phy chem for disposal)
- 19 08 05 - (not applied for)
- 19 08 02 - (not applied for)
- 19 12 12 - (not applied for)
- 19 09 02 - (not applied for)
- 19 09 03 - (inc, in 5.4 phy chem for disposal)
- 19 09 04 - (inc, in 5.4 phy chem for disposal)
- 19 09 05 - (not applied for)
- 19 13 04 - (inc, in 5.4 phy chem for disposal)
- 19 08 11* - (inc, in 5.3 phy chem for disposal)
- 19 08 01 - (not applied for)

19 09 99 – (should be withdrawn).

- 19 09 02 - (not applied for)
- 19 09 03 - (inc, in 5.4 phy chem for disposal)
- 19 08 01 - (not applied for)
- 19 09 01 - (not applied for)
- 17 05 06 - (not applied for)
- 19 12 12 - (not applied for)
- 19 12 09 - (not applied for)
- 19 09 05 - (not applied for)
- 19 08 05 - (not applied for)
- 16 10 01* - (inc, in 5.3 phy chem for recovery)
- 16 10 03* - (inc, in 5.3 phy chem for recovery)
- 19 09 04 - (inc, in 5.4 phy chem for disposal)
- 19 13 08 - (not applied for)
- 19 08 08* - (not applied for)
- 19 02 06 - (not applied for)

We also note two entries against the table provided in response to question 23 that indicates the 99 codes may still be required for the following types of waste:

- 19 05 99 - Oversize or non-compostable fractions contaminated with residual organics
- 19 08 99 - Off-spec sludges not covered by 19 08 05 (sludges from treatment of urban wastewater) or 19 08 12 (sludges from industrial effluent treatment).

We fundamentally disagree with the proposed case that 99 codes would still be required under these scenarios. You have stated "Oversize or non-compostable fractions contaminated with residual organics' if it does not fall under 19 12 12 (applicable if it is a result of mechanical treatment) and 19 05 01 (applicable if non-composted fraction of municipal and similar waste) then it would need to be a 19 05 99 code", however you have not provided any evidenced examples of known waste streams the operator intends to accept waste from that would not fall under municipal or mechanical waste, or that could not be reasonably coded under an alternative. Similar to the above you have stated "Off-spec sludges not covered by 19 08 05 (sludges from treatment of urban wastewater) or 19 08 12 (sludges from industrial effluent treatment)' if it does not fall under 19 08 14 (applicable if it is a sludge other treatment of industrial water) and 19 12 12 (applicable if sludge is from mechanical treatment) then it would need to be a 19 08 99 code". Again, we cannot accept this proposal based on the fact the operator has not provided any evidence of specific waste streams they intend to accept this waste from that could not be categorized either as sludge from mechanical treatment, urban waste water or industrial effluent treatment.

99 codes should only be requested in the event that existing codes under WM3 are not suitable for the specific and individual waste streams expected to be accepted at the site. 99 codes should not be used to future proof a sites potential acceptance of hypothetical waste streams that have not yet been identified as likely to be accepted (i.e. based on a specific industry/source). When applying specific waste codes under WM3 you should be able to define the codes according to the waste stream under those subsections without defaulting to broader descriptions that are vague and/or non-descript.

20. Update and resubmit the EWC lists, separated according to the individual activities, ensuring full descriptions representing the waste streams expected to be accepted on site are provided with the following specific amendments:

- a. The repackaging operation split by non-hazardous vs hazardous (rather than disposal vs recovery).**
- b. The addition of the biological activities and physical activities added to each physico-chemical counterpart (5.3 hazardous disposal, 5.3 hazardous recovery, 5.4 non-hazardous disposal and waste operation physico-chemical treatment for recovery paired with the 5.4 non-hazardous biological treatment for recovery and the waste operation physical treatment for recovery).**

21. Provide the annual throughput associated with each activity and associated waste table.

Reason for Question

On assessment of the revised EWC list submitted in response to the schedule 5 notice, we have noted there are still waste codes that feature broad descriptions such as wastes containing dangerous substances, which require a narrower description to explain if the waste will be suitable for the treatment processes identified.

This document should be updated to address the addition of the biological and physical activities (sharing tables with the physico-chemical treatment activities) and the repackaging list which needs to be split by hazardous vs non-hazardous EWC codes rather than disposal vs recovery, this is due to repackaging's classification as a activity were treatment is limited in its scope to change the nature or composition of the waste, which allows us to list the recovery and disposal activities together on the permit for repackaging.

We require a breakdown of the annual throughput for each activity. We shall use these individual throughput values when we draft the separate EWC tables into the permit and so they should be an accurate representation of what you expect to treat/store each year under the individual activities.

- 22. Confirm the specific organic toxins and pathogens you expect to receive and provide detailed explanation of how the on site processes treat those specific substances with evidence of how those hazardous properties are removed. If you are unable to provide sufficient evidence you may need to consider removing EWCs (19 08 10, 19 08 11, 19 08 13.)**

Reason for Question

On assessment of the EWCs provided and having looked at the table included in the schedule 5 response document for question 27, we can see that you have specified organic toxins and pathogens, but have not broken these down fully. When cross referenced with table 2.1 of the BAT assessment document we can see the microbiological containments that specify E. coli, Enterococci and Salmonella, however in neither document have you provided evidence for how dewatering and stabilisation will effectively remove those hazardous properties. We require a clear explanation of how the treatment methodologies on site remove pathogens and organics toxins prior to the discharge to sewer.

- 23. Correct the error in the EWC table where you have specified 19 03 07 in the second set of EWCs.**

Reason for Question

On assessment of the EWCs table you have specified 19 03 07, however this may be a mistake as code 19 13 07 would follow on logically from that point rather than 19 03 07.

- 24. Confirm whether any of the wastes accepted into the water based liquid waste treatment process are accepted as process aids only (i.e. introduced in lieu of raw materials to aid treatment).**

Reason for Question

On assessment of the EWCs table and other supporting documents we cannot see where you have specified that any of the wastes are bought in as process aid. It may be that the operator only uses raw materials as process aids, however you should disclose an waste types included in the waste tables that are imported to the site for the purpose of aiding treatment.

Section 4 – Storage and treatment

In line with BAT and appropriate measures for chemicals, biological waste and non-haz/inert waste, we require responses to the following questions:

- 25. Provide details of the specific techniques within the treatment methodology to treat/remove heavy metals from the waste and provide evidence for how these techniques are effective.**

Reason for Question

On assessment of the updated assessment documents and the PFD, we can see that you have specified chemical neutralisation as the methodology to remove or treat heavy metals, however you have not expanded fully on this, provided details of the steps that make up the chemical neutralisation (such as the what chemicals are added, additional techniques and the optimal compositional outcome) or provided evidence of how the chemical neutralisation stage is effective.

26. Provide details of the specific techniques that make up the other treatment methodologies onsite to treat/remove hazardous substance and demonstrate how they (in turn) prevent the potential dilution of wastes prior to discharge to sewer.
27. Confirm how the conditions of each treatment step are maintained at optimal levels.
28. Confirm details of any specific chemicals/raw materials that are introduced at specific points in the treatment process.
29. Confirm details of the process ranges such as the pH balancing range in the neutralisation tanks and the temperature range in the aeration tanks or tank.

Reason for Question

As with the previous question we seek to understand more details regarding the individual techniques that make up the treatment methodologies, for example what chemicals/raw materials are added and at which stage of each technique, how are micro-organisms dosed into the aeration tank(s) and how do you maintain optimal conditions for them to break down the hydrocarbons effectively? We require evidence to demonstrate that the treatment techniques proposed will adequately treat the hazardous properties of the wastes, prior to discharge.

30. Explain why the oil separation process in the DAF tank is suitable for the recovery of oils as opposed to just disposal. You should consider the previous steps, the addition of flocculants, acids and other chemicals during those steps and how they can negatively impact the recoverability of oils. You may want to consider removing EWCs that could be coded as predominantly oily wastes, revising the PFD, NTS and any other document to reflect the oil separated as being for disposal only.
31. Explain the techniques utilised by the DAF plant that enable the separation of the oil from water based liquid waste.
32. Confirm the storage arrangements for the separated oil and grease including size, type of containers, location of storage and retention time prior to removal from site.
33. Confirm you will not undertake the treatment of oils to produce an output oil which can be used as a fuel (PFO/RFO) as this would be a refining activity 5.3 A(1) a (x)
34. Confirm you will not mix waste oils where this could negatively affect their regeneration or recycling.

Reason for Question

On assessment of the supporting documents, we cannot find any reasonable explanation for why the oil separation stage is positioned after other treatment steps. Sites wishing to separate oils from water based liquid wastes would normally position this step to occur before processes such as chemical neutralisation, this is because if acids are added to aid the balancing of pH prior to oil separation, then a knock on effect would be that the oil is possibly contaminated by acids potentially hampering the recoverability of the oil, which contravenes the aims of ensuring recoverable materials are recycled at the highest rate of recoverability. We also do not have enough information regarding the individual processes or techniques for separating the oils in the DAF plant in addition to the dissolved air flotation (for example plate separators, phase separation, surface skimming, emulsion breaking, etc.). You have also only referred to oil and grease storage as two 1m³ containers and have not provided other details such as type of container (material used, sealed, etc), location it is stored in and maximum storage time before removal from site.

- 35. Provide the daily rate capacity for both the repackaging activity and the amalgamated water based liquid waste treatment processes (physical, physico-chemical and biological treatment) and provide the calculation using the principles set out in RGN 2 guidance appendices 1 and 2 (page 2) – Note that paragraph A2.6 gives instruction on calculating batch processes. The resultant figures should reflect the daily treatment maximums, based on plant, vessel and storage capacity and retention times at each stage based on the potential operations at full capacity as opposed to projected.**

Reason for Question

On assessment of the supporting documents, we cannot find a breakdown of the daily treatment capacity for the two separate end to end processes on site. This should be calculated in accordance with RGN 2 (appendices 1 and 2). We will need to review the way this has been calculated to ensure it takes accurate stock of the storage and plant capacities taking into consideration retention times and the batch calculation methodology outlined in RGN 2 appendices 1 and 2 to derive the daily limits. We shall be including those limits within the drafted permit to ensure the operator does not accept more waste than can be moved through the process based on maximum capacities calculations.

- 36. Provide the maximum storage volumes for hazardous waste, non-hazardous waste for liquid wastes introduced into physical-chem/biological treatment route and solid/liquid wastes for repackaging.**

Reason for Question

Very similar to the previous question we require a breakdown of the storage capacities for inclusion in the limits of activities table in the permit. These should be provided for non-hazardous liquid waste, hazardous liquid waste, non-hazardous solid waste and hazardous solid waste, based on the available storage maximum capacities. Vessels that can store both hazardous and non-hazardous (pending cleanout to prevent cross contamination) should be used in the calculation for both. Essentially, we are looking to understand the max storage on site at any one time for each individual category as mentioned above.

- 37. Confirm the thresholds/checks that are used to determine whether waste is re-introduced into the circular treatment process from the drum screen back into the clarification settlement tank.**

Reason for Question

On assessment of the supporting documents we can see that the operation incorporates a circular treatment process that loops back around from the drum screen to the clarification settlement tanks. We would like to understand the checks and thresholds that determine whether waste are re-introduced through the process for further treatment.

- 38. Provide a detailed written description of the repackaging process ensuring you address the following points:**
- a. Confirmation you are intending to store and repackage aerosol containers,**
 - b. Confirmation that storage of aerosol containers will be in a ventilated containers or cages, storage maximum volumes and for no longer than 3 months to prevent gas build up and missing.**

- c. Provide details of a local exhaust ventilation system including the grid reference and emission point used within the open sided building 3 to abate volatile wastes capable of producing VOCs.
- d. Confirmation that repackaging will only occur within the curtilage of Building 3 and not in the yard area.
- e. Confirmation that the site does not undertake repackaging container wash out or crushing/shredding activities.

Reason for Question

On assessment of the supporting documents, we cannot find any further details regarding how aerosols containers are handled and stored, given the request for EWC code 15 01 11 'Metallic packaging containing a hazardous solid porous matrix (for example asbestos), including empty pressure containers', we require more information regarding these types of waste. In addition, several of the EWCs being sought for the repackaging process represents potentially volatile waste that can produce VOCs. An LEV should be incorporated in the open sided building to ensure VOCs are captured and released via a channelled emission to air with abatement. Note an emission point for this will be included in the permit with monitoring requirements but without BAT ELVs due to repackaging not being classified as treatment capable of changing the composition of the waste.*

On assessment of the OMP, section 2.5 delivery of wastes to repackaging area indicates, that repackaging waste may arrive in either sealed drums, intermediate Bulk containers (IBCs) or skips. Given the size of building 3 we have concerns that wastes arriving in skips may indicate that repackaging may be undertaken in the yard for significant loads, if you are intending to process large amounts of waste for repackaging, you may want to ensure the footprint of building 3 is capable of housing that activity, or provide assurances that all waste accepted for repackaging will be processed with building 3 with a view to not accepting loads that would exceed the processing and storage available space in the building.

39. Confirm whether any associated tanker washout activities occur on site.

Reason for Question

On assessment of the supporting documents, we cannot see any clearly defined statements to indicate tanker washout occurs off site or within the boundary. You should be aware this would potentially constitute a DAA and would require sufficient infrastructure relating to the management of hazardous wash waters and drainage.

Section 5 – H1 assessment (indirect emissions to water)

Wastewater emission assessments should be undertaken in accordance with the guidance: Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit. In line with the above guidance as well as BAT (namely BAT conclusions 3, 6, 7 and 20) and appropriate measures (chemicals, biological and non-hazardous/inert), we require responses to the following questions:

- 40. Provide a revised assessment of your emissions to sewer in line with our guidance Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit. This should as a minimum include a H1 risk assessment and if required modelling, a supporting document addressing the following aspects, and raw data for the modelling input:**
 - a. It is our understanding that you are proposing to use 'estimated data' for your assessment of the emissions to sewer. In your written report you must provide a clear

evidence-based assessment of why you have included the parameters identified. This should include sample results from on-site tests or a proxy site (a similar sized site and manufacturing process which is likely to have a similar discharge) to justify the parameters included, ensuring the assessment results are presented as amalgamated data to reflect the overall sum of the impact in lieu of estimated data.

- b. Update your written report to provide an evidence based justification for the exclusion of parameters paying particular attention to:
 - Xylene
 - Manganese
 - PFOA
 - PFOS
 - Ethylbenzene
- c. Explain how your process will effectively remove Bromite or provide confirmation that you will be removing EWC 16 01 10* – ‘aqueous liquid wastes containing dangerous substances i.e. Heavy metals, brominated flame retardants’ – from the permit application.
- d. An explanation why the assessment you have undertaken represents a worse case scenario and is based on the waste accepted and onsite treatment rather than the trade effluent consent.

Reason for Question

Your process is not novel or unique and as such we would expect the use of ‘estimated data’ in line with our guidance Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit. The current data provided is not supported by an evidence-based rationale, and we note that you have clear EWC codes where relevant parameters have not been addressed (such as Bromite). Regarding estimated data, the surface water guidance clearly states:

“You need to use estimated data for the screening tests if you do not have any discharge monitoring data, for example for new discharges that you are not yet discharging. For AA (annual average) EQS you need average discharge concentrations, with a minimum of 12 individual sample results from on-site tests or a proxy site (a similar sized site and manufacturing process which is likely to have a similar discharge). You will need to average your results – if you have a less than figure you must round it up to the nearest whole number (for example less than 10 is assumed to be 10).”

41. Provide a written statement confirming those undertaking sampling and analysis of emissions to water will be accredited to MCERTs or provide evidence of equivalent standards.
42. That sampling and analysis will be undertaken in accordance with the guidance for Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit and Monitoring discharges to water: guidance on selecting a monitoring approach.

Reason for Question

Under BREF, BAT conclusion 3 requires emissions to water to be characterised as part of an inventory of waste water. Sampling and analysis must be carried out in accordance with Surface water pollution risk assessment for your environmental permit and Monitoring discharges to water: CEN and ISO monitoring methods to assess the levels of pollutants within those emissions and to ensure onsite treatment activities sufficiently keep pollutants/determinands below the relevant environmental quality standards (EQS). We require confirmation that the operator will carry out sampling and analysis in accordance with the relevant .gov guidance and to MCERTs standards to ensure the accuracy of the data collected during monitoring in line with the permit conditions.

Section 6 – H1 assessment (emissions to air)

Wastewater emission assessments should be undertaken in accordance with the guidance: [Air emissions risk assessment for your environmental permit](#). In line with the above guidance as well as BAT (namely BAT conclusions 3, 8, 34 and 53) and appropriate measures (chemicals, biological and non-hazardous/inert), we require responses to the following questions:

- 43. In line with our guidance [Air emissions risk assessment for your environmental permit](#) provide a H1 assessment for air emissions from emission points identified as A1. with a supporting assessment that includes the details of the data used (estimated or proxy) to inform the assessment, an explanation of the air abatement for buildings 1 and 2 (emission point A1) treating the channelled emissions to air, and confirm that they will meet the relevant BAT limits identified in BAT 8, BAT 34 and BAT 53 (for treatment of water based liquid waste and biological treatment of waste).**

Reason for Question

We require the screening (H1 assessment) of channelled emissions to air from the emission point A1, so we can verify the results and concentrations provided and assess whether the conclusions can be accepted.

If you have used proxy or estimated data, then you will need to still provide the raw data used to inform the H1 and provide contextual information regarding the source of the data and why this was chosen.

Section 7 – Odour management plan (OMP)

Odour Management plans should be completed in line with guidance [Odour management: comply with your environmental permit](#) and [Best Available Techniques \(BAT\) Reference Document for Waste Treatment](#). Revise the OMP addressing the questions below:

- 44. Update and resubmit your OMP to include the relevant details of other guidance documents that would inform the contents of the OMP.**

Reason for Question

On assessment of section 1.2 'Relevant Guidance', you have now provided the relevant guidance, as the operator has now confirmed a biological waste treatment activity as part of the process, the operator will need to amend this section to reflect the biological treatment appropriate measure guidance that should now be considered.

- 45. For your choice of odour control unit (OCU) confirm how you will control the humidity/moisture of the foul air before it is introduced into the carbon filter.**
- 46. Provide an evidenced based explanation for how the negative pressure, air flow and air changes per hour, will be fully maintained across both building 1 and 2 considering the intention to connect the two buildings via ducting.**
- 47. Provide an evidenced based explanation for how the OCU at emission point A1 in building 1 will be effective at treating the foul air from building 2.**

Reason for Question

On assessment of the OMP we can now see that you have assessed your odorous substances emissions or have demonstrated you have procedures in place to manage control measures ensuring they are effective. However, you have not provided the methodology of how moisture content/humidity of foul air is controlled prior to hitting the filter. It is important that we understand how humidity is controlled as moisture can cause a carbon filter to lose efficiency leading to a less-than-optimal OCU abatement.

We have concerns that the OCU in building 1 may not be able to effectively treat the foul air from building 2 given the proposals for ducting to be provided connecting the two buildings. You will need to demonstrate through evidence-based justification of how the designs will allow for the negative pressure to be maintained across both buildings and how air changes per hour and air flow are maintained consistently across both buildings.

Section 8 – Fire prevention plan (FPP)

Fire Prevention Plans should be completed in line with guidance Fire prevention plans: environmental permits and Best Available Techniques (BAT) Reference Document for Waste Treatment. Revise the FPP addressing the questions below:

- 48. Update and resubmit your FPP to include an explanation of security measures on site, including CCTV (locations and directional view), a secure boundary and out of hours security monitoring. You can send a separate plan to us with this information on that shall remain off the public register.**

Reason for Question

Whilst you have supplied information indicating the above aspects may be in place, you have not provided details that would explain what CCTV coverage the site benefits from. The locations and directional view of the CCTV should be provided ideally as a visual plan to see which areas of the site they cover.

On assessment of the FPP section 2,.7 and the response to question 61, you have stated that the site layout plan has been updated to include the directional and locations of the CCTV. We cannot see that this has been include when assessing the site plan.

- 49. Provide a full and detailed breakdown of the alternative measures for managing detection within building 3 in lieu of an automated detection system, the summary of measures should establish an equivalent level of early fire protection to that of an automated detection system and should be proportionate to the nature and scale of waste management activities you carry out and the associated risks.**

OR

Provide details of the detection system on site. The detection system should be proportionate to the nature and scale of waste management activities you carry out and the associated risks. For all automated systems the design, installation and maintenance should be covered by an appropriate UKAS-accredited third party certification scheme. If the system is not accredited, provide details as to why not and outline how the system will work on site.

Reason for Question

On assessment of the FPP we note that you have still not proposed an automated detection system. You have provided justification outlining low waste volumes, the types of wastes accepted and that it does not

prove a high enough risk and you have taken steps to reduce the waste you intend to store in building 3 by 80%, however section 8.1 still lacks sufficient details of these alternative standards. You should consider procedural practises (for example ensuring wastes are fully contained in sealed containers at the end of each day, inspections to check wastes that could cause combustion in combination are not stored in the same containers, specific clearly defined max storage times, etc) as well as in place practical detection measures such as the existing CCTV arrangements. You should make a reasonable case for the alternative standards in section 8.1 and clearly label it as such.

- 50. Provide a full and detailed breakdown of the alternative measures for managing suppression within building 3 in lieu of an automated suppression system, the summary of measures should establish an equivalent level of fire suppression to that of an automated detection system and should be proportionate to the nature and scale of waste management activities you carry out and the associated risks.**

OR

Provide details of the suppression system on site, ensuring the design, installation and maintenance of all automated suppression equipment is covered by an appropriate UKAS-accredited third party certification scheme. If the system is not accredited, provide details as to why not and outline how the system will work on site.

Reason for Question

On assessment of section 10.4 we have noted that you have provided an alternative measure which outline several measures taken in combination to attempt to justify the lack of automated suppression. Whilst the majority of measures listed could be considered relevant to the case you are making, it still lacks alternative specific suppression methods, such as the provision of firefighting equipment to aid the smothering of a fire. We note that fire extinguishers have been confirmed as being on site and so more detail of the specific location in relation to building 3 would be useful here.