

Environment Agency permitting decisions

Variation

We have decided to issue the variation for Green Lodge Farm AD Plant operated by Shropshire Bio Gas Limited.

The variation number is EPR/BB3505FL/V002.

We consider in reaching that decision we have taken into account all relevant considerations and legal requirements and that the permit will ensure that the appropriate level of environmental protection is provided.

Purpose of this document

This decision document:

- explains how the application has been determined
- provides a record of the decision-making process
- shows how all relevant factors have been taken into account
- justifies the specific conditions in the permit other than those in our generic permit template.

Unless the decision document specifies otherwise we have accepted the applicant's proposals.

Structure of this document

- Key issues of the determination
- Annex 1 the decision checklist
- Annex 2 the consultation and web publicising responses

Key issues of the determination

1. Assessment of impact on air quality

The Operator's assessment of the impact on air quality is set out in the Application. The assessment comprises the:

- dispersion modelling of emissions to air from the operation of two CHP engines; and
- a study of the impact of emissions on nearby sensitive habitat/conservation sites.

This section of the decision document deals primarily with the dispersion modelling of emissions to air from the stacks and its impact on local air quality and conservation sites. These assessments predict the potential effects on local air quality from the Installation's stack emissions using the ADMS (version 5) dispersion model, which is a commonly used computer model for regulatory dispersion modelling.

Meteorological data for the assessment comprises five years continuous monitoring from Sutton Bonnington Weather Station (2009-2013). The Operator considered this station as the most suitable source of meteorological data due to its proximity to the facility. The impact of the terrain surrounding the site and buildings upon plume dispersion was considered in the dispersion modelling. As well as calculating the peak ground level concentration, the Operator has modelled the concentration of key pollutants at a number of specified locations within the surrounding area.

The pollutants considered in the assessment are those associated with combustion activities, namely nitrogen dioxide, sulphur dioxide, carbon monoxide and total volatile organic compounds (VOCs). We are satisfied that there is no need to consider any other pollutants, as the fuel is biogas derived from source-segregated biodegradable waste.

Impact on human receptors

The Operator's modelling predictions indicate the predicted peak ground level exposure to pollutants in ambient air. We have made our own simple verification of the percentage process contribution/deposition and predicted environmental concentration submitted by the Operator. Our figures may be very slightly different to those shown in the Application. Any such minor discrepancies do not materially impact on our conclusions. The following table shows the maximum modelled concentration of pollutants at the most sensitive human receptor (New Barn Farm).

Pollutant	EQS / EAL	Back-ground	Process Contribution (PC)		Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC)	
	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	% of EAL	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	% of EAL
NO ₂ (annual)	40	19.49	0.88	2.2	20.37	50.93
NO ₂ (1-hour)	200	[1]	10	5	[1]	[1]
SO ₂ (15-min)	266	2.52	31.4	11.8	33.92	12.75
SO ₂ (1-hour)	350	[1]	18.6	5.31	[1]	[1]
SO ₂ (24-hour)	125	[1]	5.5	4.4	[1]	[1]
CO (8-hour)	10,000	[1]	60	0.6	[1]	[1]
VOCs (annual)	5	0.50	0.18	3.6	0.68	13.6

Note [1]: Where the PC is less than 1% of the benchmark for a long term measurement or less than 10% for a short term measurement, the impact is considered to be insignificant. In these cases, examination of the background and PEC is not required.

From the table above, nitrogen dioxide, sulphur dioxide and VOCs cannot be screened out as insignificant, in that process contributions are >1% of the long term EQS/EAL and/or >10% of the short term EQS/EAL. Although the pollutants did not screen out as insignificant, we consider that it is unlikely that emissions will give rise to significant pollution in that the predicted environmental concentration (PEC) is less than 100% (taking expected modelling uncertainties into account) of both the long term and short term EQS/EAL.

We have carefully scrutinised the Operator's proposals to ensure that they are applying the Best Available Techniques (BAT) to prevent and minimise emissions of these substances.

Impact on nature conservation sites

There are no Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Areas (SPA) and Ramsar sites within 10 km of the Installation.

The following Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) are located within 2 km of the Installation:

- Croft Hill SSSI
- Croft and Huncote SSSI

Croft and Huncote SSSI is designated for its geological significance, and so will not be affected by emissions from the Installation.

The following non-statutory local sites (local wildlife sites) are located within 2 km of the Installation:

- Croft Quarry Ponds
- River Soar and Mature Willows, Croft Quarry
- Flash Farm, Narborough (River Soar)
- Ashlands Crack Willow
- Croft Quarry Ponds
- Huncote Ridge and Furrow Meadow

Assessment of impact on SSSI

The following table shows the predicted impacts on Croft Hill SSSI from the Installation:

Pollutant	CLe/CLo	PC	PC as % of CLe/CLo	Background	Significance	PEC	PEC as % of CLe/CLo
Nitrogen oxides (as NO₂)	30 µg/m ³	0.03 µg/m ³	0.1%	[1]	Insignificant: PC<1% of CLe	[1]	[1]
Nitrogen oxides (as NO₂)	75 µg/m ³	0.45 µg/m ³	0.6%	[1]	Insignificant: PC<10% of CLe	[1]	[1]
Sulphur Dioxide	20 µg/m ³	0.04 µg/m ³	0.2%	[1]	Insignificant: PC is <1% of CLe	[1]	[1]
Nut-N deposition CLo	8-15 kgN/ha/yr	0.006 kgN/ha/yr	0.08%	[1]	Insignificant: PC<1% of CLo	[1]	[1]
Acid deposition	1.083 keq/ha/yr	0.005 keq/ha/yr	0.46%	[1]	Insignificant: PC<1% of CLo	[1]	[1]
Note 1: Where the PC is less than 1% of the benchmark for a long term measurement or less than 10% for a short term measurement, the impact is considered to be insignificant. In these cases, examination of the predicted environmental concentration (PEC) is not required.							

Nitrogen oxides/sulphur dioxide: Emissions are not likely to damage the interest features of the SSSI as the long term process contributions are less than 1% of the relevant environmental benchmark and the short term process contributions are less than 10% of the short term environmental benchmark.

Nutrient nitrogen deposition: The process contribution is 0.006 kgN/ha/yr at the Croft Hill SSSI which is less than 1% of the critical load and can be regarded as insignificant.

Acid deposition: The SSSI is considered to be sensitive to acidification and a critical load has been set (1.083 keq/ha/yr). The process contribution is 0.005

keq/ha/yr which is less than 1% of the critical load and can be regarded as insignificant.

We therefore conclude there will be no significant impact from the proposed AD facility on interest features of the Croft Hill SSSI.

Assessment of impact on Non-Statutory Sites

The Operator's assessment of non-statutory sites was reviewed by the Environment Agency and we agree with the conclusions, that the proposal will not damage the special features of the non-statutory sites. As there are no specific regulations for the protection of these sites (*beyond our requirements to enhance biodiversity under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 and our wider conservation duties under the Environment Act*), we are required to ensure that the permitting of the Installation will not result in significant pollution.

The Operator has assessed the dispersion of important pollutants against critical level criteria for the protection of vegetation and ecosystems which is summarised in the following table. The values shown represent the worst for any of the receptors for each pollutant.

Pollutant	EQS / EAL ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	PC ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)[1]	PC as % of EQS / EAL
SO ₂	20 (LT)	0.66	3.3
NO _x	30 (LT)	0.66	2.2
	75 (ST)	2.25	3.0

Note 1 – PC is given as the worst case of results for all non-statutory sites

The Operator has assessed the critical loads for nitrogen and acid deposition against critical load criteria for sites as obtained from the UK Air Pollution Information System (APIS) which is summarised in the following table. The values shown represent the worst for any of the receptors for each parameter.

Pollutant	Critical load (most severe criterion used to exemplify receptors)	PC	PC as % of CL
Nitrogen deposition	8 kg N/ha/yr	0.094 kg N/ha/yr	1.18
Acid deposition	1.083 keq/ha/yr	0.084 keq/ha/yr	7.76

In accordance with Environment Agency guidance, we consider that given the size of the process contribution which is a small fraction of the critical level/load, the impact on the sites is not likely to cause significant pollution. As modelling and assessment has demonstrated that the predicted ground level environmental concentrations of pollutants in the area even at a maximum will not compromise any Air Quality Objectives, we are satisfied that the operation of the AD facility will not compromise the integrity of the above sites.

2. Impact of odour emissions

The AD facility is adjacent to an intensive pig farm regulated under a separate permit. The surrounding feature of the facility is mainly agricultural land. The nearest residential receptors to the AD facility are Springfield Farm and New Barn Farm, located approximately 450 metres from the site. The direction of the prevailing wind is from the south west to the north east of the site.

The areas on site with the potential to generate odour have been identified in the site's Odour Management Plan (OMP) as the pig slurry reception pit, the waste reception building and digestate separation building.

Odour emissions from the waste reception building will primarily be controlled by pre-service agreements from waste producers, outlining the waste types and condition prior to acceptance at the facility. The Operator reports that wastes are delivered on a planned basis, in pre-arranged booking slots. This enables staff to predict the volumes of wastes that can be managed in one day, thereby ensuring the correct mix of feedstock undergoing anaerobic digestion. Wastes will be stored in the reception building for no more than one week before being processed.

The odour from the existing pig slurry pit will also be controlled by utilising the waste via the digestion process as soon as possible. Pig manure will continue to be produced by the existing pig farm, but will be utilised by the AD plant all year round. Pig slurry will be pumped directly (via an enclosed pipe) from the final reception pit on the pig farm unit to the pig slurry storage tank at the AD facility.

To further reduce odour emissions from site activities, the Operator proposes the following measures:

- Good housekeeping and management of the reception building's high speed doors. The doors are only opened to allow vehicles to enter the reception building once the vehicle is aligned to reverse. This will be achieved via radio communication between the site supervisor and site staff inside the reception building. Once a vehicle has safely entered the reception building, the door will close immediately behind it. All doors will be capable of being managed either manually via push buttons or via remote control by staff within the reception building. The opening of doors to permit vehicles to leave the site will only take place once the vehicle driver has signalled confirmation that he is ready to exit the building and doors will be closed immediately upon exit from the building;
- The biogas produced during anaerobic digestion will be fed directly to the CHP engines for combustion prior to discharge via stacks;
- Solid digestate will be stored in an enclosed building on site; whole digestate will be separated via a screw press and the liquid fraction stored in a sealed digestate storage tank prior to removal from the site; and
- Sniff tests to be undertaken once a week at key points around the site boundary and at the most sensitive receptors

Whilst the current measures are effective in controlling odour emissions from the facility, the Operator commits to install an appropriate odour abatement system in the event:

- there is a change in receptor perception, sensitivity and introduction of new receptors within the vicinity of the facility; and/or
- there is an increase in the duration, persistence, strength and offensiveness of odours generated on site

The Operator's management of odour at the facility relies on the above measures, the direction of the prevailing wind and no odour complaints. The Operator proposes to increase annual throughput of waste to almost two times the existing throughput (50,000 tonnes). We consider that:

- the current odour management measures do not currently meet BAT as specified in the current BAT reference note for Waste Treatment, Section 4.2.2 – which requires a robust containment feature and air extraction to an abatement system;
- there is likelihood of odour complaints with the increase in annual throughput;
- the AD plant is located in close proximity with other odour-producing facilities; and
- the prevailing wind direction is subject to change

We have therefore included a pre-operational measure (POM 1) for future development that requires the Operator to submit a report detailing the full specification of the odour abatement system (including air extraction) proposed for the facility. Following the completion of POM 1, the Operator shall submit a commissioning plan for the installation of the odour abatement plant for approval by the Environment Agency (Improvement Conditions 2a and 2b).

The Operator submitted an odour management plan (OMP) as part of this variation application which we have reviewed. Whilst the amended OMP is an improvement of the existing plan, we consider that it requires revision to include key information. We have included an Improvement Condition (IC1) which requires the Operator to submit a revised OMP in accordance with the Environment Agency's recommendations. Following the installation of the odour abatement system, the Operator shall submit an updated OMP detailing measures taken on site to further reduce odour emissions in accordance with Environment Agency Guidance IPPC S5.06 and H4 – Odour Management (Improvement Condition 2c).

We consider that the conditions in the permit are sufficient to ensure that odour emissions from the facility do not cause annoyance. Process monitoring conditions including weekly sniff tests at the site boundary will also ensure that emissions of odour are not causing annoyance. In the event that odour emissions are causing pollution, the permit conditions require the Operator to comply with the measures specified in the site's operating techniques and odour management plan (following approval).

3. Impact of fugitive emissions to air, land and water

Activities on site will be managed in accordance with the site's management system. This includes regular inspections and maintenance of equipment to ensure they continue to operate at optimum conditions.

Good housekeeping practices will be applied, such as regular inspection and cleaning/sweeping of all paved areas on site; sheeting of lorries or use of sealed containers for transportation of feedstock/waste to the site and/or export of solid digestate from the site.

The waste treatment processes will benefit from a number of process control features and prevent the development of abnormal operating conditions. Operations will be controlled and monitored using the Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system which creates documentation that can be accessed in remote locations. The system will provide a range of control and monitoring functions that automate and monitor actions throughout the plant. These procedures are designed to ensure the integrity of the plant throughout the life of the facility.

Secondary containment will be provided for all tanks containing liquids whose spillage could be harmful to the environment. The proposed site secondary containment is designed to hold a minimum of 110% of the capacity of the largest tank or 25% of total tank volume, whichever is the greater. The digestate storage tank was formerly used as a covered slurry permastore which was constructed in accordance with the SSAFO Regulations, but not provided with secondary containment. The Operator reports that the earth bund surrounding the AD facility provides a raised area at the back of the digestate storage tank. In the event of a catastrophic tank failure, digestate will be sufficiently contained with the added benefit of flowing into the bunded area surrounding the digesters.

The Environment Agency considers that the Operator has proposed appropriate measures to minimise any impact of fugitive emissions on nearby sensitive receptors. The proposed procedures satisfy the requirements of the Environment Agency's Technical Guidance IPPC S5.06 - *Guidance for the Recovery and Disposal of Hazardous and Non-hazardous Waste* and are considered BAT for this Installation. The permit conditions (3.2.1 to 3.2.3) are sufficient to ensure that emissions of substances not controlled by emission limits do not cause pollution. The Operator is required to implement mitigation measures in line with their management system in the event activities on site are causing pollution.

Based upon the information provided, we are satisfied that appropriate measures are in place to prevent fugitive emissions to air, land and water.

4. Waste acceptance – glycerol

The Operator proposes to accept glycerol under the following EWC code:

- 07 01 08* – glycerol waste from biodiesel manufacture from non-waste vegetable oils only

We have included a pre-operational measure (POM 2) that specifies that waste acceptance procedures for glycerol must be agreed with the Environment Agency before it can be accepted at the facility. This includes the method to ensure that glycerol is free of substances such as sodium hydroxide and methanol. This is because glycerol has the potential to be contaminated by non-biodegradable and hazardous substances which may impede the digestion process, hence the need for a robust waste acceptance criteria for this waste type.

5. Monitoring and compliance

We have specified that monitoring should be carried out for the parameters listed in Schedule 3 table S3.1, S3.2 and S3.3 in the permit, using the methods and to the frequencies in those tables. These monitoring requirements have been imposed in order to demonstrate compliance with emission limit values.

Air

Annual monitoring of emissions (Table S3.1 in the permit) from the CHP engines and flare will be undertaken by MCERTS accredited personnel using MCERTS approved methods. The Environment Agency has specified that monitoring of the CHP engines should be carried out in accordance with emission standards in LFTGN 08 - *Guidance for monitoring landfill gas engine emissions* (see Table below) and the monitoring requirements of M2 - *Technical Guidance Note, Monitoring of stack emissions to air*.

Parameter	Emission standard (mg/m ³)
Nitrogen oxides	500
Carbon monoxide	1400
Total volatile organic compounds	1000
Sulphur dioxide	350

We have also specified in the permit that emissions testing on the emergency flare should be undertaken 12 months following commissioning and then in the event the flare has been operational for over 10% of the year (876 hours). Guidance for monitoring enclosed landfill gas flares (LFTGN 05) sets out the emission standards for enclosed gas flares (see Table below).

Parameter	Emission standard (mg/m ³)
Oxides of nitrogen as NO ₂	150
Carbon monoxide	50
Total volatile organic compounds	10

Water

Weekly visual monitoring has been specified in the permit to ensure early detection of contaminated water entering the unnamed tributary to the River Soar (see Table S3.2 in the permit).

Process monitoring

We have specified monitoring of the AD process as a whole (see Table S3.3 in the permit). This includes monitoring of key digestion parameters, daily olfactory checks and structural integrity checks of the digesters and storage tanks. These monitoring checks are included to ensure that any malfunction of plant/equipment on site are detected early to reduce serious pollution.

Annex 1: decision checklist

This document should be read in conjunction with the Duly Making checklist, the application and supporting information and permit/notice.

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met
		Yes
Consultation		
Scope of consultation	The consultation requirements were identified and implemented. The decision was taken in accordance with RGN 6 High Profile Sites, our Public Participation Statement and our Working Together Agreements.	✓
Responses to consultation and web publicising	The web publicising and consultation responses (Annex 2) were taken into account in the decision. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance.	✓
Operator		
Control of the facility	We are satisfied that the applicant (now the operator) is the person who will have control over the operation of the facility after the grant of the permit. The decision was taken in accordance with EPR RGN 1 Understanding the meaning of operator.	✓
European Directives		
Applicable directives	All applicable European directives have been considered in the determination of the application.	✓
The site		
Extent of the site of the facility	The operator has provided a plan which we consider is satisfactory, showing the extent of the site of the facility. A plan is included in the permit and the operator is required to carry on the permitted activities within the site boundary.	✓
Site condition report	The operator has provided a description of the condition of the site. We consider this description is satisfactory. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on site condition reports and baseline reporting under IED – guidance and templates (H5).	✓
Biodiversity, Heritage, Landscape and Nature	The application is within the relevant distance criteria of a site of heritage, landscape or nature conservation, and/or protected species or habitat. A full assessment of the application and its potential to affect the sites has been	✓

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met
		Yes
Conservation	carried out as part of the permitting process. We consider that the application will not affect the features of the sites. We have not formally consulted on the application. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance (<i>Appendix 4-11 consultation procedures – Crib sheet September 2010</i>)	
Environmental Risk Assessment and operating techniques		
EIA	In determining the application we have considered the Environmental Statement. We have also considered the planning permission and the committee report approving it.	✓
Environmental risk	We have reviewed the operator's assessment of the environmental risk from the facility. The operator's risk assessment is satisfactory. The assessment shows that, applying the conservative criteria in our guidance on Environmental Risk Assessment, all emissions may be categorised as environmentally insignificant.	✓
Operating techniques	<p>We have reviewed the techniques used by the operator and compared these with the relevant guidance notes –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Sector Guidance Note IPPC S5.06 – Guidance for the Recovery and Disposal of Hazardous and Non-Hazardous Waste; and</i> • <i>How to Comply with Your Environmental Permit</i> <p>The proposed techniques/emission levels for priorities for control are in line with the benchmark levels contained in the above technical guidance notes and we consider them to represent appropriate techniques for the facility. The BAT assessment provided by the operator adequately addresses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pre-acceptance of waste • acceptance of waste • storage and handling of waste • process (treatment) description • fugitive emissions to air • fugitive emissions to surface and groundwater (secondary containment, site drainage plan) • odour management • point source emissions to air, water or land 	✓

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met
		Yes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • monitoring • accidents 	
The permit conditions		
Updating permit conditions during consolidation.	We have updated previous permit conditions to those in the new generic permit template as part of permit consolidation. The new conditions have the same meaning as those in the previous permit(s).	✓
Waste types	<p>We have specified the permitted waste types, descriptions and quantities, which can be accepted at the regulated facility. We are satisfied that the operator can accept these wastes because they have the necessary infrastructure, operating systems and technical capability to manage these wastes in an appropriate manner.</p> <p>The wastes types can be treated via anaerobic digestion as they are included in the revised Anaerobic Digestate Quality Protocol (ADQP). We made these decisions with respect to waste types in accordance with our Technical Guidance Note – <i>Framework for assessing suitability of wastes going to anaerobic digestion, composting and biological treatment.</i></p>	✓
Pre-operational conditions	Based on the information in the application, we consider that we need to impose pre-operational conditions – see Key Issues.	✓
Improvement conditions	Based on the information on the application, we consider that we need to impose improvement conditions. We have imposed improvement conditions to ensure that the appropriate measures are in place to prevent pollution from odour – see Key Issues.	✓
Incorporating the application	We have specified that the applicant must operate the permit in accordance with descriptions in the application, including all additional information received as part of the determination process. These descriptions are specified in the Operating Techniques table in the permit.	✓
Emission limits	We have decided that emission limits should be set for the parameters listed in the permit (<i>See section on Monitoring and Compliance in Key Issues</i>). Nitrogen oxides, Sulphur dioxide, Carbon monoxide, Total	✓

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met
		Yes
	<p>volatile organic compounds have been identified as being emitted in significant quantities and ELVs. Emission limits based on BAT have been set for these substances with respect to air emissions.</p> <p>It is considered that the ELVs described above will ensure that significant pollution of the environment is prevented and a high level of protection for the environment secured.</p> <p>The substances above have been set at the benchmark levels quoted in <i>LFTGN 08: Guidance for monitoring landfill gas engine emissions</i> and <i>Guidance for monitoring enclosed landfill gas flares</i> (LFTGN 05).</p>	
Monitoring	<p>We have decided that monitoring should be carried out for the parameters listed in the permit, using the methods detailed and to the frequencies specified.</p> <p>These monitoring requirements have been imposed in order to demonstrate compliance with the conditions of the permit for operations requiring the management of air emissions. We made these decisions in accordance with <i>LFTGN 08: Guidance for monitoring landfill gas engine emissions</i> and <i>Guidance for monitoring enclosed landfill gas flares</i> (LFTGN 05) which are considered the most appropriate TGN for this activity.</p> <p>Based on the information in the application, we are satisfied that the operator's techniques, personnel and equipment have either MCERTS certification or MCERTS accreditation as appropriate.</p>	✓
Reporting	<p>We have specified reporting in the permit. As the monitoring of point source emissions to air is only required annually, reporting is also required annually. Reporting forms have been prepared to facilitate reporting of data in a consistent format. These reporting requirements are deemed sufficient and proportional for the Installation. We made these decisions in accordance with our guidance <i>How to Comply with your Environmental Permit</i>.</p>	✓
Operator Competence		
Environment	There is no known reason to consider that the operator	✓

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met
		Yes
management system	will not have the management systems to enable it to comply with the permit conditions. The decision was taken in accordance with RGN 5 on Operator Competence.	
Technical competence	Technical competency is required for activities permitted. The operator is a member of an agreed scheme.	✓
Relevant convictions	The National Enforcement Database has been checked to ensure that all relevant convictions have been declared. No relevant convictions were found. The operator satisfies the criteria in RGN 5 on Operator Competence.	✓
Financial provision	There is no known reason to consider that the operator will not be financially able to comply with the permit conditions. The decision was taken in accordance with RGN 5 on Operator Competence.	✓

Annex 2: Consultation and web publicising responses

Summary of responses to consultation and web publication and the way in which we have taken these into account in the determination process. The Application was advertised on the Environment Agency website from 3 November 2014 to 1 December 2014. Copies of the Application were placed on the Environment Agency Public Register at Trentside Office, Scarrington Road, West Bridgford, Nottingham, NG2 5BR.

Response Received from National Grid dated 12/11/14	
Brief summary of issues raised:	Summary of action taken / how this has been covered
National Grid made a comment about the location of their asset (overhead line) close to the facility.	Siting of assets owned by organisations is not a material consideration in determining permit applications under the Environmental Permitting Regulations. No further action taken.

Response Received from Blaby District Council (Planning) dated 12/11/14	
Brief summary of issues raised:	Summary of action taken / how this has been covered
No concerns raised. The District Council recommended that the Environment Agency consult Leicestershire County Council (Planning Department) who determined the Planning Application for this facility.	We consulted Leicestershire County Council (Planning Department) as part of this determination. No further action taken.

Response Received from Blaby District Council (Environmental Health) dated 25/11/14	
Brief summary of issues raised:	Summary of action taken / how this has been covered
No concerns raised	No further action taken

Response Received from Public Health England dated 28/11/14	
Brief summary of issues raised:	Summary of action taken / how this has been covered
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Environment Agency should ensure that an Accident Management Plan is in operation on site and that this has been revised to accommodate the increased throughput. PHE conclude that they have no significant concerns regarding risk to health of the local population from the installation, provided that the permit holder takes all appropriate measures to prevent and control pollution, in accordance with the relevant sector 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Operator submitted an Accident Management Plan in response to a Request for Information Notice dated 25/11/14. We have assessed the operator's submission and are satisfied that appropriate measures are in place to deal with accidents at the facility. No further action.

guidance and industry best practice.	
--------------------------------------	--

No responses received from	Leicestershire County Council (Planning Department) Director of Public Health (Leicestershire County Council) Animal Health Health & Safety Executive Leicestershire Fire & Rescue Service Members of the Public
----------------------------	---