

**From:** [Werelich, Alek](#)  
**To:** [Werelich, Alek](#)  
**Subject:** Not duly made letter. Thornfield001 -EPR/VP3506PE  
**Date:** 10 July 2023 13:52:11  
**Attachments:** [image007.aif](#)  
[image008.aif](#)  
[image009.aif](#)  
[image010.aif](#)  
[image011.aif](#)  
[image012.png](#)  
[image013.jpg](#)  
[image014.png](#)  
[image015.png](#)  
[image016.png](#)  
[image017.png](#)  
[image018.png](#)

---

**From:** Werelich, Alek  
**Sent:** 07 July 2023 15:15  
**To:** Heath, Katie <[kheath@wardell-armstrong.com](mailto:kheath@wardell-armstrong.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Not duly made letter. Thornfield001 -EPR/VP3506PE

Hi Katie,

Yes, this is everything that was required at this stage.  
As soon as the full payment is booked on our system, I can duly make this application.  
I have sent an email to chase why the payment is still not showing and hopefully it will be there on Monday.

Kind Regards,

**Aleksander Werelich**

Permitting Officer

**Environment Agency** | Aqua House, 20 Lionel Street, Birmingham, B3 1AQ

[aleksander.werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:aleksander.werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk)

Mobile: 07391392964

Pronouns: he/him ([Why is this here?](#))



**Please help reduce our email traffic and environmental impact. "Thank you" emails are not necessary and I would like to thank you in advance of any future support and assistance you provide.**

---

**From:** Heath, Katie <[kheath@wardell-armstrong.com](mailto:kheath@wardell-armstrong.com)>  
**Sent:** 04 July 2023 15:17  
**To:** Werelich, Alek <[Aleksander.Werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:Aleksander.Werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** RE: Not duly made letter. Thornfield001 -EPR/VP3506PE

Hi Alek,

Please see attached the updated Form F1 for Thornfield001 - EPR/VP3506PE.

Payment was made today using reference PSCAPPTHORN047.

Is that everything you need from me?

Kind regards,

Katie

**Katie Heath** | Senior Waste and Resources Consultant  
Wardell Armstrong LLP  
Sir Henry Doulton House, Forge Lane, Etruria, Stoke on Trent, ST1 5BD  
07341 564348 01782 276700



---

**From:** Werelich, Alek <[Aleksander.Werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:Aleksander.Werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk)>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 3, 2023 12:05 PM  
**To:** Heath, Katie <[kheath@wardell-armstrong.com](mailto:kheath@wardell-armstrong.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Not duly made letter. Thornfield001 -EPR/VP3506PE

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Katie,

This section only applies to situation when an application is for more than one activity. There is only one (physical treatment of waste by a centrifuge oil separator) being added as part of this application, therefore this rule does not apply.

“8.(3) Where more than one application activity is the subject of an application for a permit.”

If there were multiple activities being added as part of this permit, it could be subjected to such rebate given it met all the other criteria listed in that section.

Hope this helps

Kind Regards,  
**Aleksander Werelich**  
Permitting Officer  
**Environment Agency** | Aqua House, 20 Lionel Street, Birmingham, B3 1AQ  
[aleksander.werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:aleksander.werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk)  
Mobile: 07391392964  
Pronouns: he/him ([Why is this here?](#))



**Please help reduce our email traffic and environmental impact. “Thank you” emails are not necessary and I would like to thank you in advance of any future support and assistance you provide.**

---

**From:** Heath, Katie <[kheath@wardell-armstrong.com](mailto:kheath@wardell-armstrong.com)>

**Sent:** 03 July 2023 09:20

**To:** Werelich, Alek <[Aleksander.Werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:Aleksander.Werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** RE: Not duly made letter. Thornfield001 -EPR/VP3506PE

Hi Alek,

Just a final thought - should the fee for variation of the AD plant (£6,992) be reduced by 50% as per Section 8.(3)(b)(i) of the charging scheme, as the activities are reasonably associated with each other?

Regards,

Katie

**Katie Heath** | Senior Waste and Resources Consultant  
Wardell Armstrong LLP  
Sir Henry Doulton House, Forge Lane, Etruria, Stoke on Trent, ST1 5BD  
07341 564348 01782 276700



---

**From:** Werelich, Alek <[Aleksander.Werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:Aleksander.Werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk)>

**Sent:** Friday, June 30, 2023 3:41 PM

**To:** Heath, Katie <[kheath@wardell-armstrong.com](mailto:kheath@wardell-armstrong.com)>

**Subject:** RE: Not duly made letter. Thornfield001 -EPR/VP3506PE

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Katie,

Regarding your previous email.

Assessment of the OMP is necessary because you are adding a new activity with a new process that presents an odour risk, as well as a new odour abatement system and a new emission point, this will have to be reviewed to determine whether the process will be well managed and operated to ensure it is and remains effective.

I can see that there were only minor changes to the OMP, but in the determination stage the OMP will need to be assessed and checked if it satisfies all required criteria such as that the abatement, monitoring, and maintenance. From the initial assessment during the duly making stage, it is clear that the OMP will almost certainly require further changes.

Regarding your latest email:

We accept this as a confirmation of zero baseline emissions for the extension of the site boundary suggested in EA/EPR/VP3506PE/V003.

Given we have been in discussion about the fees I think it is appropriate that you can have extra time. Please make sure to send over the remaining documents and the charges by the end of this working week 7th July.

As stated previously the correct baseline application charge is £16,168. I can confirm we received the initial payment of £6,992.00 this leaves a balance of £9,176.00 to pay.

Changes that you are proposing to make require three charges for:

- normal variation, this includes replacement of two biogas CHP engines with one natural gas CHP engine; addition of new waste codes; amendment to the permit boundary - £6,992
- new waste activity – physical treatment of waste by a centrifuge oil separator - £7,930

- odour management plan - £1,246
- Total = £16,168

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind Regards,

**Aleksander Werelich**

Permitting Officer

**Environment Agency** | Aqua House, 20 Lionel Street, Birmingham, B3 1AQ

[aleksander.werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:aleksander.werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk)

Mobile: 07391392964

Pronouns: he/him ([Why is this here?](#))



**Please help reduce our email traffic and environmental impact. “Thank you” emails are not necessary and I would like to thank you in advance of any future support and assistance you provide.**

---

**From:** Heath, Katie <[kheath@wardell-armstrong.com](mailto:kheath@wardell-armstrong.com)>

**Sent:** 29 June 2023 11:28

**To:** Werelich, Alek <[Aleksander.Werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:Aleksander.Werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** RE: Not duly made letter. Thornfield001 -EPR/VP3506PE

Hi Alek,

I can confirm the operator is happy to confirm acceptance of a zero contamination baseline for the additional land at Thornfield001AD Facility.

I will send the updated F1 when I've had confirmation of the fees based on my last comment. I understand the official deadline is tomorrow, but please could you allow the operator some extra time to arrange any additional payment if we get your response in the next couple of days?

Regards,

Katie

**Katie Heath** | Senior Waste and Resources Consultant

Wardell Armstrong LLP

Sir Henry Doulton House, Forge Lane, Etruria, Stoke on Trent, ST1 5BD

07341 564348 01782 276700



---

**From:** Heath, Katie

**Sent:** Monday, June 26, 2023 10:53 AM

**To:** 'Werelich, Alek' <[Aleksander.Werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:Aleksander.Werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** RE: Not duly made letter. Thornfield001 -EPR/VP3506PE

Hi Alek,

Sorry please disregard my point about DAAs in last e-mail. I spoke to my manager and she agreed

with you that it's not a DAA because it doesn't directly serve the AD process.

However, I think the reason for my mix-up is that I did not reference a DAA in my original query. AR3 of the permit, which allows for the physical treatment of waste, is not listed as a DAA, so it wouldn't be inconsistent with the permit for it to be included under this activity. A3 allows for treatment followed by despatch for anaerobic digestion or despatch off site for recovery. Therefore, I still believe that separation of oil by centrifuge would be an expansion of the "Limits of specified activity and waste types" already allowed under A3 and not a new activity.

Regards,

Katie

**Katie Heath** | Senior Waste and Resources Consultant  
Wardell Armstrong LLP  
Sir Henry Doulton House, Forge Lane, Etruria, Stoke on Trent, ST1 5BD  
07341 564348 01782 276700



---

**From:** Heath, Katie  
**Sent:** Monday, June 26, 2023 8:49 AM  
**To:** Werelich, Alek <[Aleksander.Werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:Aleksander.Werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk)>  
**Cc:** Cook, Alison <[acook@wardell-armstrong.com](mailto:acook@wardell-armstrong.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Not duly made letter. Thornfield001 -EPR/VP3506PE

Hi Alek,

I don't quite understand your comment that the oil separator "does not solely benefit AD processes and cannot be a DAA". My understanding of the definition of a DAA comes from Schedule 1, Part 1 of [EPR 2016](#), which defines it as:

*"... an operation which—*

*(a) has a technical connection with the activity,*

*(b) is carried on on the same site as the activity, and*

*(c) could have an effect on pollution."*

The oil separator most certainly meets all three of these requirements. It is technically connected as the oils will be extracted from wastes fed from the heat exchanger feed line prior to the pasteurisation process, it is carried out on the same site and it could have an effect on pollution, which is why we have included the risk assessment. Please could you help me understand how this doesn't fit the definition of a DAA under the legislation/ EA guidance?

I've also attached a compare version of the OMP vs the current EA approved OMP. The bulk of the changes are 3 sentences (4.4 – 4.6) to refer to the carbon filters on the oil separation plant (besides minor format changes and a updates reflect the most recent permitted activities). As stated in the operating techniques "these filters have been successfully used elsewhere on site and by other companies within the BioteCH4 group for several years, proving effective at controlling odour." Does the OMP really require £1,246 for assessment of such a minor update in keeping with existing abatement methods operated on the site?

Kind Regards,

Katie

**Katie Heath** | Senior Waste and Resources Consultant  
Wardell Armstrong LLP  
Sir Henry Doulton House, Forge Lane, Etruria, Stoke on Trent, ST1 5BD  
07341 564348 01782 276700



---

**From:** Werelich, Alek <[Aleksander.Werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:Aleksander.Werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk)>  
**Sent:** Friday, June 23, 2023 4:51 PM  
**To:** Heath, Katie <[kheath@wardell-armstrong.com](mailto:kheath@wardell-armstrong.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Not duly made letter. Thornfield001 -EPR/VP3506PE

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Katie,

Thank you for your quick response.

Regarding the new activity charge, your current permit is for a 1.16.2.1 - Section 5.4 (a)(i) and (b)(I) - non -hazardous waste installation – biological treatment, which includes a number of directly associated activities (DAAs) one of which is physical treatment of waste as part of pre-treatment to the AD activity.

A review of the submitted documentation and forms reveals that physical treatment of waste by a centrifuge oil separator is a standalone waste operation activity which has a separate process, aiming to extract oil for recycling into biofuels. This does not solely benefit AD processes and cannot be a DAA.

According to section 3.8 of our [charging guidance](#) if you want to add an activity to your permit, you must pay the charge for a new permit application for that type of activity. This means your proposed addition of the bio-oil separation activity is a new application fee. As the activity meets the description ref 1.16.12 - Physical treatment of non-hazardous waste in our charging scheme, the additional charge you are required to pay for this activity is £7,930.00. (Please refer to table references 1.16.12 of our [charging scheme](#).)

In addition, as stated in your operating techniques and odour management plan, additional/revised odour abatement techniques are proposed to accommodate potential odours from the new oil separation process. Therefore, an assessment of your odour management plan is required and consequently an associated assessment fee is necessary. This is fee is £1,246

As stated previously the correct baseline application charge is £16,168. I can confirm we received the initial payment of £6,992.00 this leaves a balance of £9,176.00 to pay.

Changes that you are proposing to make require three charges for:

- normal variation, this includes replacement of two biogas CHP engines with one natural gas CHP engine; addition of new waste codes; amendment to the permit boundary - £6,992
- new waste activity – physical treatment of waste by a centrifuge oil separator - £7,930
- odour management plan - £1,246

Total = £16,168

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind Regards,

**Aleksander Werelich**

Permitting Officer

**Environment Agency** | Aqua House, 20 Lionel Street, Birmingham, B3 1AQ  
[aleksander.werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:aleksander.werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk)

Mobile: 07391392964

Pronouns: he/him ([Why is this here?](#))



**Please help reduce our email traffic and environmental impact. “Thank you” emails are not necessary and I would like to thank you in advance of any future support and assistance you provide.**



---

**From:** Heath, Katie <[kheath@wardell-armstrong.com](mailto:kheath@wardell-armstrong.com)>

**Sent:** 19 June 2023 10:20

**To:** Werelich, Alek <[Aleksander.Werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:Aleksander.Werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** RE: Not duly made letter.

Hi Alek,

I will provide the missing information you've requested, however I believe the £16,168 you've calculated is quite disproportionate to the relatively low-risk variation being applied for, considering there is already physical treatment occurring on the site and the remaining changes result in no change to or a reduction in environmental risk.

Under the charging scheme, 1.16.12 is for the “Physical treatment of non - hazardous waste”, however physical treatment is already a permitted activity under Table S1.1 AR3 of the permit. Therefore, the variation would be an expansion of the “Limits of specified activity and waste types” already allowed on site, which I believe is appropriately covered by a normal variation as per 1.16.2.1. of the charging scheme.

As stated in the cover letter, the Odour Management Plan has already been assessed in a previous variation. The latest version has been provided as courtesy to demonstrate it has been updated to reference the new plant, however changes are very limited and represent no changes existing odour control measures and principles, therefore it would be inappropriate to pay the fees for technical assessment.

Therefore £6,992.00 would remain the correct fee. Please can you reconsider the calculation based on these justifications and get back to me?

Regards,

Katie

**Katie Heath** | Senior Waste and Resources Consultant  
Wardell Armstrong LLP  
Sir Henry Doulton House, Forge Lane, Etruria, Stoke on Trent, ST1 5BD  
07341 564348 01782 276700



---

**From:** Werelich, Alek <[Aleksander.Werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:Aleksander.Werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk)>

**Sent:** Friday, June 16, 2023 3:46 PM  
**To:** Heath, Katie <[kheath@wardell-armstrong.com](mailto:kheath@wardell-armstrong.com)>  
**Subject:** Not duly made letter.

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Katie

Please see the not dully made letter attached.  
Do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Kind Regards,  
**Aleksander Werelich**  
Permitting Officer  
**Environment Agency** | Aqua House, 20 Lionel Street, Birmingham, B3 1AQ  
[aleksander.werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:aleksander.werelich@environment-agency.gov.uk)  
Mobile: 07391392964  
Pronouns: he/him ([Why is this here?](#))



**Please help reduce our email traffic and environmental impact. “Thank you” emails are not necessary and I would like to thank you in advance of any future support and assistance you provide.**



Information in this message may be confidential and may be legally privileged. If you have received this message by mistake, please notify the sender immediately, delete it and do not copy it to anyone else. We have checked this email and its attachments for viruses. But you should still check any attachment before opening it. We may have to make this message and any reply to it public if asked to under the Freedom of Information Act, Data Protection Act or for litigation. Email messages and attachments sent to or from any Environment Agency address may also be accessed by someone other than the sender or recipient, for business purposes.

Information in this message may be confidential and may be legally privileged. If you have received this message by mistake, please notify the sender immediately, delete it and do not copy it to anyone else. We have checked this email and its attachments for viruses. But you should still check any attachment before opening it. We may have to make this message and any reply to it public if asked to under the Freedom of Information Act, Data Protection Act or for litigation. Email messages and attachments sent to or from any Environment Agency address may also be accessed by someone other than the sender or recipient, for business purposes.

Information in this message may be confidential and may be legally privileged. If you have received this message by mistake, please notify the sender immediately, delete it and do not copy it to anyone else. We have checked this email and its attachments for viruses. But you should still check any attachment before opening it. We may have to make this message and any reply to it public if asked to under the Freedom of Information Act, Data Protection Act or for litigation. Email messages and attachments sent to or from any Environment Agency address may also be accessed by someone other than the sender or recipient, for business purposes.

Information in this message may be confidential and may be legally privileged. If you have received this message by mistake, please notify the sender immediately, delete it and do not copy it to anyone else. We have checked this email and its attachments for viruses. But you should still check any attachment before opening it. We may have to make this message and any reply to it public if asked to under the Freedom of Information Act, Data Protection Act or for



litigation. Email messages and attachments sent to or from any Environment Agency address may also be accessed by someone other than the sender or recipient, for business purposes.