

## **Environment Agency permitting decisions**

### **Bespoke permit**

We have decided to grant the permit for Estate Road 2 Fish Processing Site operated by Icelandic Group UK Limited.

The permit number is EPR/JP3830WG

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
- Annex 1 the decision checklist
- Annex 2 the consultation and web publicising responses

## **Key issues of the decision**

### **Odour**

As there are residential receptors within 400m of the installation an Odour Management Plan (OMP) has been submitted. The nearest sensitive receptor is 150m to the South East of the installation. The main source of odour from the site is from the emission points associated with the frying lines. There is also the risk of odour in the event of an incident from the ammonia used for refrigeration purposes.

This installation has been previously regulated under the Environmental Permitting regime for similar activities. During this time no odour complaints were received.

Therefore, taking into account the history and context of the site it is considered that a low risk odour management plan is appropriate. The OMP was reviewed as part of the application process for this permit. The plan considers the sources of odour, sensitive receptors, control measures, release patterns, exposure and impact and contingency measures. The contents and level of detail is considered suitable for the level of risk. The operator is required to periodically review the OMP to ensure its continued suitability for this installation.

The OMP has been incorporated into the operating techniques for the installation. Therefore, the site must be in compliance with the requirements of this document.

### **Noise**

As there are residential receptors within 400m of the installation a Noise Management Plan has been submitted. The nearest sensitive receptor is 150m to the South East of the installation.

This installation has been previously regulated under the Environmental Permitting regime for similar activities. During this time no noise complaints were received.

Therefore, taking into account the history and context of the site it is considered that a low risk noise management plan is appropriate. Noise was reviewed as part of the application process for this permit.

### **Emissions to Air**

The point source emissions to air from the facility consist of those from the frying lines and boilers used for heating the frying oil and meeting the steam requirements of the installation. The main emissions from the frying lines are Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs), these compounds have the potential to

generate odour pollution. The emissions from the frying lines are discussed in the odour section above.

There are seven boilers on the installation, which are all fired using natural gas. Four of these are Wanson boilers which are used to heat the oil for frying lines 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 by indirect heating. The thermal inputs of these boilers are 0.547MW, 0.821MW, 0.821MW and 1.368MW. There are three steam boilers. The thermal inputs are 1.053MW, 0.222MW and 0.222MW. The total thermal input of the seven boilers is 5.054MW. Although, the boilers are routinely maintained routine emissions monitoring is not carried out. The Environment Agency's H1 Annex F – Air Emissions guidance advises that gas boilers with an aggregated thermal input of less than 20MW are not considered to be major sources of pollution.

Using the DEFRA background maps the background level of NO<sub>2</sub> is 21.9µg/m<sup>3</sup>. Background levels are within the Air Quality Standards for NO<sub>2</sub> which is 200µg/m<sup>3</sup> for short term emissions and 40 µg/m<sup>3</sup> long term emissions. Considering the size of the boilers, their contribution is expected to be small and would not result in a breach of the AQS either alone or when compared to background levels.

### **Emissions to Sewer**

The sewers serving the installation are combined sewers. Process effluent, foul water and surface water are all collected and discharged to the foul sewer. The operator has a discharge consent in place with the sewage undertaker. The discharge consent only permits the discharge of trade effluent. After discussing this further with Anglian Water, as the site is served by a combined sewer, surface water can also be discharged as long as it is uncontaminated (Anglian Water 23/07/15).

## 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
<b>Yes</b>		
<b>Consultation</b>		
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 consultation and web publicising responses (Annex 2) were taken into account in the decision.  The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance.	✓
<b>Operator</b>		
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.	✓
<b>European Directives</b>		
Applicable directives	All applicable European directives have been considered in the determination of the application.  The permit implements the requirements of the Industrial Emissions Directive.	✓
<b>The site</b>		
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	✓

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met
		Yes
	<p>was taken in accordance with our guidance on site condition reports and baseline reporting under IED–guidance and templates (H5).</p>	
<p>Biodiversity, Heritage, Landscape and Nature Conservation</p>	<p>The application is within the relevant distance criteria of a site of heritage, landscape or nature conservation, and/or protected species or habitat .</p> <p>A full assessment of the application and its potential to affect the sites has been carried out as part of the permitting process. We consider that the application will not affect the features of the sites.</p> <p>The Humber Estuary SAC, SPA, RAMSAR, SSSI is within the screening distance of this installation. There are also a number of Local Wildlife Sites within the screen distance. The combined capacity of the boilers on the site is small. The emissions from these boilers are not considered to be major sources of pollution and do not require any further assessment. All process and surface waters from the site will be discharge to sewer and will be subject to treatment before discharging to surface waters. The emissions to sewer have been assessed using the H1 screening tool. All emissions screen out as insignificant.</p> <p>Therefore, it can be concluded that there will be no adverse effects on any of these sites due to the emissions from this installation.</p> <p>We have not formally consulted on the application. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance.</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p><b>Environmental Risk Assessment and operating techniques</b></p>		
<p>Environmental risk</p>	<p>We have reviewed the operator's assessment of the environmental risk from the facility.</p> <p>The operator's risk assessment is satisfactory.</p> <p>See key issues section for how emissions to air and emissions to sewer have been assessed. An environmental risk assessment has been produced to</p>	<p>✓</p>

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met
		Yes
	consider the fugitive emissions from the installation. This has been reviewed as part of the determination.	
Operating techniques	<p>We have reviewed the techniques used by the operator and compared these with the relevant guidance notes.</p> <p>The proposed techniques/ emission levels for priorities for control are in line with the benchmark levels contained in the TGN and we consider them to represent appropriate techniques for the facility. The permit conditions ensure compliance with relevant BREFs and BAT Conclusions.</p> <p>The operator has discussed how the site is in accordance with BAT standards in their application. The assessment identifies the appropriate measures that have been put in place on the site. This assessment has been reviewed and is in line with the relevant indicative BAT measures set out in the Food and Drink Sector guidance (EPR 6.10). Improvement Conditions have been included where appropriate measures are not in place or are unclear. Some of the measures in place include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of high and low level alarms on the vegetable oil storage tanks to prevent overfilling.</li> <li>• An automated leak detection system is fitted to the ammonia storage tanks and emergency procedures are in place.</li> <li>• Use of catch pots to prevent fats, oil and grease blocking the drains.</li> <li>• Process effluent and surface water is to be discharged to the foul sewer for treatment by the sewerage undertaker.</li> <li>• The following parameters are monitored in the emission to sewer. Flow, pH, COD and temperature.</li> </ul> <p>The proposed techniques/ emission levels for priorities for control are in line with the benchmark levels contained in the TGN and we consider them to represent appropriate techniques for the facility. The permit conditions ensure compliance with relevant BREFs and BAT Conclusions.</p>	✓
<b>The permit conditions</b>		
Improvement conditions	Based on the information on the application, we consider that we need to impose improvement conditions (IC).	✓

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met
		Yes
	<p>Seven improvement conditions have been included in the permit. They are required to ensure that the operator has the relevant management systems in place and that the infrastructure on site is in accordance with Best Available Techniques.</p> <p>They require that the operator: submits an Environment Management System, reviews the drainage system, reviews secondary containment measures, reviews measures for mitigating potential spillages, reviews opportunities for heat recovery, undertakes a water efficiency audit and explores opportunities to reduce the amount of surface water that is discharged to sewer.</p>	
Incorporating the application	<p>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.</p> <p>These descriptions are specified in the Operating Techniques table in the permit.</p>	✓
<b>Operator Competence</b>		
Environment management system	<p>There is no known reason to consider that the operator will not have the management systems to enable it to comply with the permit conditions.</p> <p>An Environment Management System was not submitted with the application. One has been requested through Improvement Condition 1.</p>	✓
Relevant convictions	<p>The National Enforcement Database has been checked to ensure that all relevant convictions have been declared.</p> <p>No relevant convictions were found.</p>	✓

## Annex 2: Consultation and web publicising

Summary of responses to consultation and web publication and the way in which we have taken these into account in the determination process. (Newspaper advertising is only carried out for certain application types, in line with our guidance.)

Response received from
Health and Safety Executive (01/07/15)
Brief summary of issues raised
None raised
Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered
None required

Response received from
Sewerage Undertaker – Anglian Water (20/07/15 and 23/07/15)
Brief summary of issues raised
20/07/15 The installation is currently consented to discharge trade effluent to the public foul sewer. The consent only includes used water from the processing and preparation of food products (ref. ADZ 287 01/07/15). The application states that both trade effluent and surface water run-off discharge to the main sewer. The consent is only for trade effluent derived from the processing of food products.  Based on samples taken in the last year the site has been mostly compliant with the conditions of the trade effluent consent.
Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered
23/07/15 The nature of the consent was discussed with Anglian Water, who discussed the matter further with the operator. Based upon these discussions Anglian Water provided further comments confirming that the site is served by a combined sewer. Therefore, it is acceptable to discharge surface water run-off to the sewer as long as it is uncontaminated.

Environment Health were also consulted and no response was received.

The application was advertised on our website from 26/06/15 to 27/07/15. No comments were received.