

MEMO			
TO:	Board of Directors	FROM:	Dr. Brian Donlon
CC:		DATE:	16/09/03
SUBJECT : Greenhills Compost Ltd. (Reg. No. 117-1) Technical Committee Report			

Application details

Application Details	
Applicant:	Greenhills Compost Ltd.
Location of Activity:	Carnagh Upper, Kilcogy, Co. Cavan
Reg. No.:	117-1
Licensed Activities under Waste Management Act 1996:	Fourth Schedule: Class 2
Proposed Decision issued on:	14/05/03
Objections received:	3
Submissions on objections received:	3
Inspector that drafted PD:	Kealan Reynolds

Objections received

Objection by Applicant	1
Objection by third party/parties	2

1. Raymond McKenna Greenhills Compost Ltd., Kilcogy, Co. Cavan
2. Patrick and Maureen Harten, Kilcogy, Co. Cavan
3. John Beglan, Erne Valley Concerned Residents (EVRC), Kilcogy, Co. Cavan

Submissions on Objections received

Submissions on Objections	3
---------------------------	---

A Technical Committee was established to consider the objections and submissions on objections.

The Technical Committee included;

Dr Brian Donlon, Chairperson, Mr Caoimhin Nolan, Inspector, Ms Maeve McHugh, Inspector
This is the Technical Committee's report on the objection.

A Technical Committee was established to consider the objections and submissions on objections. The submissions on the Greenhills Compost Ltd. objection received from EVRC and Mr and Mrs Harten are similar and I have combined them under the respective grounds on which they were based.

Objection 1 from Raymond McKenna, Greenhills Compost Ltd., Kilcogy, Co. Cavan

Ground 1.1: Condition 1.5 and Schedule A

Condition 1.5 and Schedule A of the licence limits the production process to the composting of "chicken litter" only, to a maximum quantity of 6000 tonnes per annum.

Chicken litter is predominantly used in the production process. However, turkey litter is also sometimes used, so the general term “poultry litter” is preferable to “chicken litter”. In addition, in the event of an outbreak of disease on poultry farms, the company will need to use alternative organic litter sources. The company has in place an emergency plan for compost production, in the event of a total ban on the movement of poultry manure, which as happened in Holland in the recent past. Therefore restricting the company to the use of “chicken litter” is not practical and they wish to have this amended. The company has expanded since applying for a waste licence in September 1999 and they are now processing up to 10,000 tonnes of poultry manure per annum.

Submission on Objection

They strongly oppose use of pig slurry – No Odour emission rates supplied. Inclusion of other new materials is beyond the parameters of this licence application. They request that all raw materials be dried (not in liquid form) so as to minimise danger of spillage & leakage. Company should not be allowed to increase tonnage from 6,000 to 10,000 as this is a major alteration. New values for odour emissions would have to be submitted. Cavan Co. Co as planning authority have turned a blind eye to operations at the facility. The increase in tonnage is unauthorised and any plans to build a new facility should be subject to rigorous planning and EPA approval.

Technical Committees Evaluation:

The technical committee notes the applicants comments in relation to the waste type (i.e. chicken litter) specified in Schedule A. Having regard to the similar nature and composition of chicken litter and turkey litter, the technical committee considers that the term ‘poultry litter’ would be more appropriate. This would allow the applicant to accept chicken litter and/or turkey litter subject to the agreement of the Agency (see Note 1 to Schedule A). The acceptance of alternative waste sources should be allowed in the event of disease on poultry farms subject to the agreement of the Agency,

It is not recommended that the total tonnage of 10,000 tonnes per annum be allowed as this was not applied for in the application and the odour modelling was performed on the lower figure of 6,000 tpa.

Recommendation:

Amend Schedule A by replacing ‘Chicken Litter’ with ‘Poultry Litter’ and replace ‘Chicken Litter’ with ‘Poultry Litter’ throughout waste licence.

Insert **Note 2 to Schedule A** : Such other alternatives as agreed by the Agency in the event of an outbreak of disease on poultry farms..

Ground 1.2: Condition 2.1.1

Composting is a continuous process, 24 hours per day, hence “at all times” should be changed to “during office hours”.

Submission on Objection

Danger of pollution is on a 24-hour basis. They support the PD which requires some staff to be present at all times. The maintenance of a telephone line to report incidents is required.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The composting process is one which takes place on a continuous basis 24 hours per day. The technical committee acknowledges that it may not be possible for the facility manager or a suitable qualified and experienced deputy to be present at the facility late at night/early morning. Having regard to this, the technical committee recommends that the manager/deputy should be present as a minimum during the hours of operation specified in Condition 1.3.

Recommendation

Amend Condition 2.1.1 as follows:

The licensee shall employ a suitably qualified and experienced facility manager who shall be designated as the person in charge. The facility manager or a nominated, suitably qualified and experienced, deputy shall be present on the facility shall be present on the facility **at all times during the hours specified in Condition 1.3, unless otherwise agreed with the Agency**

Ground 1.3 Condition 3.5.2

Because yard areas cover a large area, this work will have to be done on a phased basis, so nine months to complete this is impractical. The company requested that the timeframe be changed to 18 months, to allow this work to be undertaken correctly.

Submission on Objection

This is a condition that any decent firm operating in a sensitive environment would have already carried out. All targets to the PD and timeframes should be complied with.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The survey required by Condition 3.5.1 will highlight which surfaces need to be upgraded/replaced at the facility. Taking into account the size of the yard areas and the works involved, the technical committee recommends that the timeframe for completion of the work required under Condition 3.5.2 be extended to 18 months from the date of grant of the licence.

Recommendation:

**Amend Condition 3.5.2 as follows:
Within eighteen months of the date of grant of this licence.....**

Ground 1.4: Condition 3.7.1

Chicken litter and gypsum storage areas be fully enclosed within nine months of granting the licence. The company suggest that this storage area will be enclosed under the same roof as the bale blending line, which would be more practical for production purposes. Because this will require a large capital expenditure, the company requests that this timeframe be increased to 18 months. The company also requests that the breathable membranes to be used as side sheeting on these building on health and safety grounds. These membranes are widely used in Holland and Belgium.

Submission on Objection by EVRC

Request that timeframes be brought forward not extended.

Technical Committees Evaluation:

Condition 3.7.1 requires the chicken litter (amended to poultry litter under Ground 1 above) and gypsum storage areas to be fully enclosed within 9 months of the date of grant of the licence. The TC considers that it is not necessary for the gypsum storage areas to be enclosed. However, having regard to the potential for odours to arise from the litter storage areas, it is considered that they should be enclosed. The TC consider that the use of silos for the storage of poultry litter would be appropriate to ensure that odour emissions are controlled and that access to this material by vermin is properly controlled. The design of the storage structure should be agreed with the Agency as a Specified Engineering Works (Schedule B) and the applicant should have regard to HSA Regulations when designing this. The timeframe for carrying out such works should be extended to 18 months to allow for the purchase and installation of these structure(s).

Recommendation:

Amend Condition 3.7 as follows:

*Storage Areas for Poultry Litter
Within **eighteen** months of the date of grant of this licence, the licensee **shall provide silos (or equivalent fully enclosed structures to be agreed with the Agency)** which shall be constructed and maintained in a manner suitable, and be of size appropriate, for the storage of Poultry Litter.*

Amend Schedule B to include:
nclosure of poultry litter storage areas and various elements of process

Ground 1.5: Condition 3.11.1

Condition 3.11.1(i) requires the bale breaking line and the blending line to be enclosed within 12 months. The company requests this timeframe be extended to 18 months as per "Objection 1.4" above.

Submission on Objection by EVRC

Request that timeframe for enclosure of bale breaking/ blending line be brought forward and that the use of silos for gypsum and chicken litter storage is mandatory.

Technical Committees Evaluation:

The TC notes the significant potential for dust, aerosol and odour emissions and in order to minimise the risk of potential disease transfer off-site and considers that the bale breaking, blending and poultry litter shredding should be carried out within an enclosed building at the timeframes specified in the PD.

Recommendation:

no change.

Ground 1.6: Condition 3.12.1

Condition 3.12.1 requires that the surface water drainage system meet a certain minimum standard within 9 months of obtaining the licence. Again this will require on-site works and capital expenditure, so the company requests that this time frame is increased to 15 months.

Submission on Objection

Site is unsuitable and in close proximity to NHA area. Request EPA to adhere to proposed timeframes.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The TC considers that an extended time period should be allowed to upgrade the surface water drainage system in accordance with that requested in the objection.

Recommendation

Amend Condition 3.12.1 - Within 15 months.....

Ground 1.7: Conditions 3.12.1d & 5.4.4

Condition 3.12.1(d) and 5.4.4 stipulates that all clean surface water discharge to the stream at one location (SW1). However, as a minimum, the site requires 2-3 surface water discharge points, as the stream borders the site and it is not possible to direct all clean surface water to one point only.

Submission on Objection

Vital that the outflow is capable of control and immediate monitoring in event of an incident. It is possible to route all clean water to one outlet. More cost effective to monitor one outlet.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The TC notes the comment from the objector that it is not possible to direct all clean surface water to one point only. The TC considers that the number of the clean surface water discharges should be minimised but that any other clean surface water discharges should be monitored.

Recommendation

Amend Condition 3.12.1.d

Unless otherwise agreed.....

Amend Condition 5.4.4

Unless otherwise agreed,,,

Amend Schedule E: Note 3 to Table E1.

Any other discharges from the facility shall be labelled and monitored in accordance with Table E.5.1.

Ground 1.8: Condition 3.15.2

Condition 3.15.2 requires that a noise attenuation barrier be installed along the boundary of the facility. If noise is problematic at the site, the noise source will be first treated. The company request that this

condition be removed from the licence and further noise surveys to be undertaken as part of the waste licence will determine if problems exist.

Submission on Objection

Noise barrier is essential. Request that local residents agree to any noise barrier construction.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The TC notes the comment of the objector and the submissions on the objection. We consider that the installation of a noise attenuation barrier is necessary to minimise the effect of noise emissions from the facility on the environment.

Recommendation

No Change.

Ground 1.9: Conditions 3.13.2 & 3.11.1(ii)

Condition 3.13.2 requires that all process water storage tanks be enclosed within 12 months of granting the licence. The company requests that this be changed to 18 months, as this will require large capital expenditure.

Condition 3.11.1(ii) requires that appropriate odour filtration systems be placed at outlet vents on all process/goodie water storage tanks and a system of aeration be installed on each process water storage tank. This will require a longer time frame to complete: 24 – 36 months. Also, the company suggests that after enclosure of the compost production areas, there will be low levels of process water on-site.

Submission on Objection

They support timescale and the improvements listed in PD (which are covered in Grounds 1.9 to 1.12 incl.). Phase II process is malodorous. No confidence in breathable membranes as sidings as this is an attempt by company to evade capital expenditure to fully enclose and comply with conditions.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The TC notes that emissions from the process/goodie water storage tanks represents 33% of the total odours from the site as identified in the OdourNet Report commissioned on behalf of the Agency. We consider that the timeframe stipulated in the PD should not change. The TC considers that such tanks should be enclosed and that a system of aeration and odour filtration should be provided in such tanks (under Specified Engineering Works). The timeframe for undertaking such works should remain at 12 months.

Recommendation

No Change.

Ground 1.10: Condition 3.11.1(iii)

Condition 3.11.1(iii) requires all Phase I and Phase II production processes be carried out in fully enclosed buildings within 18 months. The company would require a time frame of 24 months to complete this project. In addition, the company request that it will need a period of 24 hours in which Phase I compost can be left outside in order to re-inoculate the micro life, as this is crucial for production of quality mushroom compost.

Technical Committee Evaluation

Condition 3.11.1 (iii) requires all of the Phase I and Phase II production process to be carried out in fully enclosed buildings within eighteen months of the date of grant of the licence. While some of the Phase I operations are partially enclosed, the Phase II process already takes place indoors. The technical committee notes that the Phase I process accounts for 50% of the total odour emissions arising from this facility whereas only 3% of the total odours arise from the Phase II process. On this basis, the TC recommends that the Phase I process (including the transfer of intermediate compost into the pasteurisation tunnels) should be fully enclosed (agreed with Agency as Specified Engineering Works) and the timeframe for completion of such works should remain at eighteen months from the date of grant of the licence.

Recommendation

No Change.

Ground 1.11: Condition 3.11.1(iv)

Condition 3.11.1(iv) requires that a system of collecting air emissions from all production areas be installed within 24 months of granting the licence. The company requests that this timeframe is increased to 36 months. The company is fully aware of the needs of the mushroom industry regarding Phase III composting as outlined in the Goodbody Report. The company request that only emissions from Phase I areas should be collected as emission from Phase II are not malodorous. The company states that it would not be viable to finance any further capital expenditure on its existing Phase II complex as it is outdated.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The TC notes the significant potential for odours to arise from the Phase I process, and considers that the timeframe for installation of the air collection system should remain unchanged. Likewise, the air collection system should be installed at the other significant sources of odours (i.e. poultry litter storage, process/goodie water storage tanks, bale breaking/blending lines, poultry litter shredding). However, it is considered that the requirement to collect the air emissions from the Phase II process should be removed on the basis that they are not a significant contributor (3%) to the overall odour emissions from the site. The TC also notes that an assessment of the effectiveness of the completed odour control works is required by Condition 3.11.2 and if needed, additional measures should be installed under Condition 3.11.3.

Recommendation

Amend Condition 3.11.1 (iv) as follows:

Within twenty four months of the date of grant of this licence, the licensee shall provide a system for the collection of all air emissions from the following sources:

(i) poultry litter storage (ii) process/goodie water storage tanks (iii) bale breaking/blending lines, poultry litter shredding and Phase I process (up to and including transfer of intermediate compost into the pasteurisation tunnels). Negative pressure shall be maintained throughout such areas so as to ensure that there is no significant escape of fugitive odours.

Ground 1.12: Condition 13.11.1(v) (sic)

Condition 13.11.1(v) requires that all air emissions from the composting process are passed through an appropriate abatement system within 36 months of granting the licence. The company requests that this is increased to 48 months to allow sufficient time to research all the desired technologies. 36 months is impractical, due to the volume of other works to be undertaken as part of the waste licence and due to the lack of successful abatement technologies for Irish composting companies, suited to Irish condition, currently available.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The TC considers that technologies are available for the abatement of air/odour emissions from the composting process and these will have to be agreed with the Agency prior to their installation (under Specified Engineering Works). The timeframe for the installation of the air abatement system should remain at thirty-six months from the date of grant of the licence.

Recommendation:

No change

Ground 1.13: Schedule E2

Schedule E2 requires that dust deposition be monitored at 4 locations, 3 times per year. Dust deposition monitoring was carried out as part of the initial Waste Licence Application. This report concluded that the dust deposition level recorded at this site was not problematic and under 350mg/m²/day. The company understands that it is necessary to monitor emission in order to determine where problems exist. However the extent of dust deposition monitoring specified in Schedule E2 is excessive for the nature and scale of activities on the site. The company object to this and wish to change the stipulations to 2 locations (1 upwind and 1 downwind of the site), once per year only.

Submission on Objection by EVRC

Noise and dust are an issue for residents. EPA should stand by monitoring regime in PD.

Technical Committee's Evaluation

The Technical Committee notes that submissions expressing concern over dust emissions from this facility were received during the application process. The dust monitoring requirements specified in Schedule E.2 are considered appropriate at this time. Condition 7.2 of the PD allows the Agency to amend the frequency, locations and scope of monitoring if necessary following on from the assessment of the dust monitoring results submitted.

Recommendation

No Change

Ground 1.14: Schedule E4

Schedule E4 requires that noise be measured at 2 noise sensitive locations twice per year. The noise level (Leq) here in September 1999 was 51.6dB(A), which is well below the EPA limit of 55dB(A). Therefore the requirement to monitor noise twice per year is excessive for the scale of activities here. Noise levels will not change within the site from year to year. Therefore the company request that this condition is changed to annually, for one noise sensitive location only.

Submission on Objection

See Submission to Ground 1.13 above.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The TC is concerned regarding the elevated noise emissions from the facility. In particular the night-time noise level. The mitigation measures proposed were dealt with separately in Ground 1.8 above.

Recommendation

No Further Change

Ground 1.15: Schedule E8

Schedule E8 requires that treated sewage be monitored annually. There is no treated sewage generated on the site, so the company wishes to have this condition removed.

Submission on Objection

With the number of employees on site sewage must be collected in sewage tank, treated and monitored at least annually.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The TC is concerned that sewage generated on-site may not be dealt with appropriately. We consider that sewage generated on site should be treated to appropriate standards and that any sludge production is disposed of in accordance with best practice (see Condition 3.14). The technical committee considers that the treatment system should be monitored on an annual basis to verify the performance of the system and Condition 7.2 of the PD allows the Agency to amend the frequency, locations and scope of monitoring if necessary.

Recommendation

No Change

Ground 1.16: Condition 11.1.1

Condition 11.1.1 requires that the company pay €15,437.84 annually to the EPA. This amount is excessive, given the cost already imposed by the waste licence on infrastructure, monitoring and reporting. The fee does not seem to be based on the scale of activities at this site, where only "10,000 tonnes of waste chicken litter is processed". The company requests that this fee is reduced to reflect the size of the activities at this site.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The TC considers that the annual contribution to be paid to the Agency is appropriate for the activity licensed and should remain unchanged. This fee should cover the assessment of various proposals and reports, specified engineering works and regular site inspections and audits by Agency personnel.

Recommendation

No Change.

Objection 2 from Patrick and Maureen Harten, Kilcogy, Co. Cavan

Ground 2.1: Condition 1.3

They request that the hours of operation are restricted to 8am – 7pm Monday to Friday, 8am – 1pm on Saturdays and no working on Sundays or Bank Holidays. They request that the hours for despatch of product off-site be brought in line with hours of deliveries on site.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The TC considers that the objector's request to limit the hours of despatch of product offsite is fair and that doing this will reduce the impact of the operation of the facility on neighbouring residents. For reasons described under Ground 2.3 below, the TC also proposes to limit the use of noise generating mobile plant at the facility to reduce the potential for noise emissions.

Recommendation

Change Condition 1.3 as follows:

On-site **and off-site** deliveries of wastes, raw materials or product shall be confined to the hours of 08.00 to 19.00 Monday to Friday, and between 08.00 and 13.00 hours on Saturday. There shall be no on-site **or off-site** deliveries of wastes, raw materials or product on Sundays or bank holidays. **Unless otherwise agreed with the Agency the use of noise generating mobile plant and equipment shall be restricted to the hours referred to in this Condition.**

Ground 2.2: Condition 2.4.1 Management of the Facility

Since relations between them and the neighbouring facility are frayed, they request that a copy of all recording and reporting for public inspection is held at the local environmental department at Cavan County Council so as to reduce any possibility of intimidation.

Technical Committee Evaluation

Condition 2.4.1 of the PD requires the licensee to put in place a Communications Programme to inform and involve the local community. This is a requirement of the licence and the onus is on the licensee to ensure that the requirement is met. As part of the Communications Programme the licensee may propose to disseminate the information directly to interested parties or to Cavan Co. Co. The Communications Programme will also be assessed by the Agency as part of the enforcement of the licence, if granted.

Any persons who are dissatisfied with the implementation of this licence condition may make a complaint and the licensee is required to take actions as a result of all complaints (ref. Condition 9.4).

Recommendation

No change

Ground 2.3: Condition 3.2.1

They request that additional temporary noise impact and any permanent additional noise impact from fixed or mobile plant resulting from any engineering works be assessed. And that any reporting or certification comes from a wholly independent and suitably qualified person.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The TC notes the objectors' concerns in relation to noise. The licence requires noise monitoring and noise emission limits are set in Schedule D. The TC has recommended restrictions on the use of noise generating mobile plant and equipment (see Ground 2.1 above). Other noise control measures provided for under the Conditions of the licence include the installation of a noise barrier and the enclosure of fans (Conditions 3.15.1 and 3.15.2).

Recommendation

No change

Ground 2.4: Condition 3.3.2

They request that the notice board be in place as soon as possible within at least two to three weeks of any grant of licence.

Technical Committee Evaluation

Condition 3.3.1 requires the notice board to be put in place. As no timeframe is specified for installing the notice board, it should be put in place immediately upon issue of the licence.

Recommendation

No change

Ground 2.5: Condition 3.5.1

They request that all the engineers assessing the yard surface be wholly independent and suitably qualified.

Technical Committee Evaluation

Condition 3.5.1 already requires that the assessment of yard surfaces and drains be carried out by “a suitably qualified independent engineer”. All specified engineering works are covered under Condition 3.2.

Recommendation

No change

Ground 2.6: Condition 3.5.4

Please note that kerbing ought to be installed around bridge and bale storage area on other side of the river to prevent contamination of surface water.

Technical Committee Evaluation

This condition relates to kerbing around areas where contaminated surface water or process water arise. The TC notes that the area referred to be used only for the storage of clean straw bales and that installation of kerbing is therefore unnecessary at this location.

Recommendation

No change

Ground 2.7: Condition 3.7.1

Odour Net UK Ltd recommends the use of silos for the storage of raw materials. They request that EPA say the use of silos to store these materials is obligatory.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The TC consider that the use of silos for the storage of poultry litter would be appropriate to ensure that odour emissions are controlled and that access to this material by vermin is properly controlled.

Recommendation

Change Condition 3.7.1 as per TC’s response to Ground 1.4 of objection 1 above.

Ground 2.8: Condition 3.11.1

They note from Condition 3.11 that the effectiveness of these improvements will not be known for as long as four years. They request that any time-scales for these improvements be reduced to three years.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The TC considers that the timeframes specified in the PD are appropriate for the installation of the specified infrastructure. These were discussed above (grounds 1.9 to 1.12 inclusive.)

Recommendation

No further change.

Ground 2.9: Condition 3.11.5

They request that doors that lead to any area that has smells or noises emanating be closed by necessity and that there be no possibility of over-ride.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The TC note that Conditions 3.11.4 and 3.11.5 of the PD specify measures to keep doors closed as much as possible.

Recommendation

No change

Ground 2.10: Condition 3.12.1

They request that the pipework on site plans is checked by an independent engineer (not Gaffney & Cullivan) and that figures for surface water are recalculated to ensure that all tanks are of large enough capacity and can accommodate long and extended periods of rainfall.

Technical Committee Evaluation

See response to ground 2.5 above.

Recommendation

No change

Ground 2.11 Condition 4.1.2

They have found poultry carcasses from the chicken litter in their gardens that animals have taken from Greenhills Compost's storage facilities. Silos would be more effective as storage facilities. Any load of chicken litter that is deemed unsuitable should be detected immediately and turned away. They would request that there would be no temporary storage facilities for unsuitable waste.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The TC consider that the use of silos for the storage of poultry litter would be appropriate to ensure that odour emissions are controlled and that access to this material by vermin is properly controlled. Condition 4.1.2 requires waste inspections to be carried out on incoming poultry litter, and Condition 4.1.4 requires any unsuitable waste to be stored in "fully enclosed containers to avoid putrefaction, odour generation, the attraction of vermin and any other nuisance". The TC consider that these Conditions will provide adequate control over the acceptance and management of incoming wastes

Recommendation

Change Condition 3.7.1 as per TC's response to Ground 1.4 of objection 1.

Ground 2.12: Condition 4.2.2 Composting Process

In Schedule C the technology approved for process control on Phase I and Phase II is aeration pads and fans. These were installed on some bunkers since August 2002. The additional noise that was generated was considerable. The resulting continuous smell is undeniable. They request that any additional fans/aeration pads are subject to enclosure of motors and that use of these are restricted to normal operating hours until such time as the complete process is enclosed.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The TC notes the objector's concerns in relation to noise. The licence includes a number of noise control measures, monitoring and emission limits which are discussed further under Ground 2.1 and 2.3.1 above. The enclosure of the composting process and the treatment of air emissions, as set out in the Conditions of the licence, should ensure that the facility does not cause environmental pollution.

Recommendation

Change Condition 1.3 as per TC's response to Ground 2.1 above.

Ground 2.13: Condition 4.2.3

When it is necessary to turn the clamps every three days, they request that management organise their schedules so this takes place during normal working hours and not on Saturday afternoons, Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Technical Committee Evaluation

It is up to management to organise their own schedule. However, the noise-generating mobile plant and equipment is restricted in accordance with Condition 1.3 (see Ground 2.1 above).

Recommendation

Change Condition 1.3 as per TC's response to Ground 2.1 above.

Ground 2.14: Condition 4.3 Landscaping

They request that they are consulted as to the height, size, type and nature of any screening that takes place on their direct line of vision. Greenhills Compost Ltd. has erected a 6m barrier fence directly in front of their front door. This was erected without planning permission and as such is an unauthorised structure. The facility was also refused planning permission for building two bunkers and a bagging shed and Greenhills Compost Ltd. should not be licensed until it is legally compliant with the Planning legislation.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The TC note that the Agency is not the competent authority in relation to planning matters. Any comments to be made by the public on the visual aspects of the noise attenuation barrier or landscaping can be considered by the Agency under the enforcement of the licence. Condition 2.4.1 also requires a Communications Programme to be set up by the licensee with the local community and this will also provide an opportunity for residents to comment on landscaping proposals.

Recommendation

No change

Ground 2.15: Condition 4.4.2

They request that any lights employed at the facility are screened and directed in towards the areas where operatives are working and that security lighting be of a minimal intensity. All they can see from their front door at night is an orange neon glare. This is light pollution and as they are keen on astronomy, they cannot look at the night sky.

Technical Committee's Evaluation

The Technical Committee considers that the applicant should submit a report to the Agency within six months of date of grant of the licence examining the use of light restrictors, and passive infrared lighting. The findings of this report should be implemented as agreed with the Agency.

Recommendation

Insert new Condition 4.4.3. Renumber subsequent sub-conditions.

The licensee shall submit a report to the Agency within six months of date of grant of this licence on limiting the use of security lighting at night, and assessing alternative systems so as to avoid nuisance and visual intrusion. The findings of this report shall be implemented as agreed with the Agency.

Ground 2.16: Condition 5.1

They request that odours are considered an emission and as such should be part of Schedule E and F for the purpose of this licence.

Technical Committee Evaluation

Schedules E and F of the PD refer to monitoring to be carried out and recording/reporting requirements. Monitoring of odours in an objective and consistent manner can be difficult and is not presently included in Schedule E of the licence. Subjective odour monitoring is required however under Condition 7.9.1 as part of the daily nuisance inspections. The TC note that compliance with the Conditions of the licence should significantly reduce the amount of odour emissions from the facility - as predicted in the Odournet UK report which is described in the Inspector's report.

Recommendation

No change

Ground 2.17: Conditions 5.5.1 and 5.5.2

When designating noise sensitive locations, they wish their residence to be considered a noise sensitive location. They require that low noise emitting plant (fixed and mobile plant), be employed at all times.

At present a conveyer belt system produces a clearly audible impulsive component to the noise levels experienced at their residence.

Technical Committee Evaluation

Schedule E.1.1 requires the locations of the noise sensitive locations (which are to be monitored) to be agreed with the Agency. The exact locations of these will be dealt with under the enforcement of the licence and will be decided based on the proximity and sensitivity of nearby receptors to noise emissions from the facility. The control over noise emissions from the facility is discussed further under Grounds 2.1 and 2.3.1 above.

Recommendation

No further change.

Ground 2.18: Condition 7.1

Monitoring noise at two noise sensitive locations, bi annually and details being written up by the licensee seems inadequate, infrequent and open to manipulation. They request that the current noise levels are re assessed by an independent assessor and noise sensitive locations and the monitoring schedule are revised in advance of granting any licence to Greenhills Compost.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The control over noise emissions from the facility is discussed further under Grounds 2.1 and 2.3.1 above. In relation to monitoring, Condition 2.1.2 of the licence requires that all personnel carrying out specifically assigned tasks shall be qualified to do so. The Agency will also carry out its own noise monitoring to verify the findings of such monitoring carried out on behalf of the licensee. To ensure that noise emissions from the facility are adequately assessed, the TC considers that the number of noise sensitive locations to be monitored should be increased from two to four. The TC note that the number of locations to be monitored by the licensee can be reduced with the agreement of the Agency at a later date if necessary under the provisions of Condition 7.2.

Recommendation

Amend the noise stations listed in Table E.1.1 to read as follows:

NSL1
NSL2
NSL3
NSL4

Ground 2.19: Condition 7.6.1

Their well water was contaminated for over a week in May 1 – May 10, 2003. A Northern Regional Fisheries Board employee, Mr Frank Berry discovered that Greenhills Compost Ltd was the source of the contamination as a broken pipe gushed out its contents onto their property. Total coliforms and faecal coliforms were present thus rendering it unfit for human consumption. Ms Sarah Nolan of Oldcastle Laboratories made the following recommendations:

- Treat well before using it again – chlorinate it;
- Install UV lamp to protect well from further incident;
- Monitoring 4 times a year; or
- Act on incident.

They have no confidence in their well at the moment. They were not approached by the management of the facility to provide them with an alternative water supply, to remedy the damage done or to compensate them in any way for the inconvenience caused. They request that all of Sarah Nolans recommendations be implemented by Greenhills Compost in advance of any grant of licence.

Submission on Objection by Applicant

In relation to the issue of groundwater contamination, they have no knowledge or evidence of such contamination and they believe the well in question to be upstream and upslope of the facility.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The TC note that in the submission from the applicant on this objection, the applicant states that they have no knowledge or evidence of groundwater contamination in this instance, and that the well

referred to is upstream and upslope of the facility. The Fisheries Board did not inform the Agency of this incident. Condition 7.6.1 and Schedule E.1.1 of the licence requires all private wells within 250m of the facility to be monitored. In the event that monitoring of such wells indicates that the facility is having an adverse affect, Condition 8.4.3 requires this to be treated as an emergency and the licensee is required to provide an alternative supply of water. Pending the provision of dedicated infrastructure to treat sewage arising at the facility (refer to Ground 1.15 of objection 1), the TC considers that the frequency of groundwater monitoring (as specified in Table E.7.1) should be increased from bi-annual to quarterly.

Recommendation

Amend Table E.7.1 (Schedule E.7) so that the monitoring frequency for each parameter is Quarterly.

Ground 2.20 Condition 8 Contingency Arrangements

They request that if such incidents are ongoing or frequent that the manner in which an alternative water supply is provided is agreeable to them. If well contamination persists then Greenhills Compost Ltd should bore a new well for them.

Technical Committee Evaluation

See TC's response to Ground 2.19 above.

Recommendation

No change

Objection 3 from John Beglan, Erne Valley Concerned Residents, Kilcogy, Co. Cavan

Ground 3.1: Condition 1.3 Deliveries to Site

They request that restrictions on hours for dispatch of product from the plant be the same as hours for deliveries to the site.

Technical Committee Evaluation

See TC's response to ground 2.1 of objection 2 above.

Recommendation

Change Condition 1.3 as per ground 2.1 of objection 2

Ground 3.2: Hours of Operation

They propose that the hours of operation also be designated and they propose hours of operation to be 8am – 7pm Monday to Friday and 8am-1pm on Saturdays and no hours of operation on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Technical Committee Evaluation

See TC's response to ground 2.1 of objection 2 above.

Recommendation

Change Condition 1.3 as per ground 2.1 of objection 2

Ground 3.3: Condition 1.6.2

That all works are undertaken within the time scale contained in the notice. They request that there is no flexibility or relaxing of this point. The time-scale for the implementation of improvements is to be adhered to and in some cases reduced to a shorter time scale.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The TC notes that Condition 1.6 appears twice in the PD and consider that the numbering of Conditions here should be corrected. The reference in the objection to Condition 1.6.2 relates to the Notices which the Agency may issue following a non-compliance with the Conditions of the licence. The onus is on the licensee to meet all of the requirements of the licence, including those timeframes for the completion of certain works. The TC consider that the wording of Condition 1.6.2 (which will now become Condition 1.7.2 under the revised Condition numbering) is adequate to allow the Agency to issue Notices in the event that the licensee does not comply with the requirements of the licence.

Recommendation

Change the Condition numbering (and sub-condition numbering) under Condition 1 to read as follows:

- 1.6 The following shall constitute.....**
 - a)
 - b)
 - c)
 - d)
- 1.7 Where the Agency considers that.....**
 - 1.7.1
 - 1.7.2
 - 1.7.3
 - 1.7.4
 - 1.7.5
- 1.8 Every plan, programme.....**

Ground 3.4 :Condition 2.4 Communications Programme (Cond. 2.4.1)

They request that copies of this public information be kept at the local environmental office at Cavan County Council.

Technical Committee Evaluation

See TC's response to Ground 2.2 of objection 2 above.

Recommendation

No change.

Ground 3.5: Condition 3.2 SPECIFIED ENGINEERING WORKS

They request that any new Engineering Works that result in permanent or mobile plant or machinery to be assessed for noise impact. Existing plant and machinery already cause too high levels to emanate from factory yard.

Technical Committee Evaluation

See TC's response to Ground 2.3 of Objection 2 above.

Recommendation

No change.

Ground 3.6: Conditions 3.2.2 and 3.2.3

They request that the person who is present at all times is a competent, suitably qualified person. This person should be appointed by agreement with the local residents group. They request that the validation report is sent to EPA as a matter of course, rather than *on request*.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The TC note that these requirements are adequately met by Condition 2.1 of the PD. Agency personnel will visit this facility on a regular basis and examine the site infrastructural works and can request that validation reports be submitted if require

Recommendation

No change

Ground 3.7: Condition 3.3.2 Facility Notice Board

They request that the facility notice board be in place within 2-3 weeks of the grant of the licence.

Technical Committee Evaluation

See TC's response to Ground 2.4 of objection 2 above.

Recommendation

No change.

Ground 3.8: Condition 3.5 Facility Roads/Surface

This should be an appointed engineer, agreeable to the local residents group to wholly ensure independent opinion.

Technical Committee Evaluation

See TC's response to Ground 2.5 of objection 2 above.

Recommendation

No change.

Ground 3.9: Condition 3.7 Storage Areas for Chicken Litter and Gypsum

Time scale of nine months is too long. A survey of sources of odours carried out by Odour-Net UK Ltd April 2001 states a preference for storage of such raw materials in silos.

They request

- That the time scale for improvements in storage area be shortened.
- That the use of silos is mandatory
- In the event of the "enclosed structures" requires planning permission that Greenhills Compost show copy of planning grant to EPA before proceeding with these structures.

Technical Committee Evaluation

See TC's response to Grounds 1.4 and 2.7 above.

Recommendation

Change Condition 3.7.1 as per TC's response to Ground 1.4 of objection 1 above.

Ground 3.10: Condition 3.11.1 Odour Control Infrastructure

- (i) 12 months to enclose bale breaking and blending line is too long a time scale.
- (ii) Enclosing Phase I and Phase II should be sooner than 18 months. This phase generates three quarters of all odours in the composting process. All abatement technologies should be of a necessary high quality especially if sensitive receptors are in close proximity to the site (Residents 60m from site).
- (iii) Collection of air emissions (24 months). To wait two years for collection of air emissions is too long considering that the use of aeration pads and fans is rendered useless if a collection and treatment system is not in place.
- (iv) Treatment of air emissions (36 months). They will have three years of untreated stench to live with. They have already lived with over ten years of this. The company had the ability financially to improve this but chose profit over public relations.

The company flagrantly defy the planning regulations. There are unauthorised structures on site. Planning was refused for 6 no. Phase III spawn growing tunnels together with ancillary buildings, erect 2 no. Phase I bunkers and retain existing bagging shed.

Greenhills Composts management simply built the 2 no. Phase I bunkers a few feet from where it had requested planning permission and now still retain the bagging shed. The residents group held a meeting with the local planning officer (Mr Paddy Connaughton, the local environment officer Mr Peter Cork). They were given assurances that the unauthorised structures would be removed. They remain in place today. Written confirmation was requested from Cavan County Council that such unauthorised structures exist and this as yet has not been obtained. They enclosed minutes of this meeting, a copy of the letter sent to Mr Connaughton and a copy of the letter sent to Mr Seamus Neely, Director of Services, Cavan County Council. It is hard to believe that the EPA would licence a facility that is not legally compliant with the planning laws. Secondly, they have no confidence that the management of this facility will comply with the rules and regulations as set out by the conditions of this proposed licence. They request that no structures be allowed without obtaining planning permission and that the company's habit of erecting any old structure and then applying to retain it be outlawed.

Technical Committee Evaluation

See TC's response to Grounds 1.5, 1.9, 1.10, 1.11 and 1.12 of Objection 1 above. The TC note that the Agency is not the competent authority in relation to planning matters.

Recommendation

Change Condition 3.11.1 (iii) as per TC's response to Ground 1.11 of Objection 1 above.

Ground 3.11: Condition 3.11.2

They request that the EPA rather than the licensee assess if the odour management measures are effective.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The TC notes that the onus is on the licensee to ensure compliance with the licence. However the operation of the odour management system will be assessed by the Agency during audits and site inspections as part of the enforcement of the licence.

Recommendation

No change

Ground 3.12: Condition 3.11.3

Again rather than the licensee assessing if there is a need for additional odour control they request that the EPA make these assessments and make any recommendations for additional odour control.

Technical Committee Evaluation

See TC's response to Ground 3.11 above.

Recommendation

No change

Ground 3.13: Condition 3.11.5

They request that all doors into the bale blending and chicken litter shredding area, Phase I and Phase II enclosures and bagging enclosures remain shut as a basic requirement for managing odours and preventing the escape of same from structures.

Technical Committee Evaluation

See TC's response to Ground 2.9 of objection 2 above.

Recommendation

No change

Ground 3.14: Condition 3.12.1 Surface Water Management, parts a-d and Condition 3.13.1 Process/Goodie Water, parts a-d

These points completely evade the fact that the facility is wrongly sited. (Dames and More Geological/Water Survey, Waste Licence Application) and if a major incident were to occur, it would devastate the local river and NHA area downstream.

They request that the pipework on site plans is checked by an independent engineer (not Gaffney and Cullivan) and that figures for surfacewater are recalculated to ensure that all tanks are of a large enough capacity and can accommodate long and extended periods of rainfall.

Technical Committee Evaluation

Compliance with the Conditions of the licence should ensure that the facility will not cause environmental pollution and will provide adequate protection of surfacewaters. Also see the TC's response to Ground 2.10 of objection 2.

Recommendation

No change

Ground 3.15: Condition 3.13.2

They request that this is recommended rather than by agreement and the time scale is 12 months or less.

Technical Committee Evaluation

Enclosure of the process water storage tanks is required under Condition 3.13.2. Also see TC's response to Ground 1.9 of Objection 1.

Recommendation

No change.

Ground 3.16: Condition 3.14

Septic Tanks are not compliant with treatment systems as outlined in the Agency's Waste Treatment Manual, "Treatment Systems for Single Houses". There are no site tests with the planning application and They feel that the ground in the area cannot support these systems (See Dames and Moore Geological Survey, Waste Licence Application).

Technical Committee Evaluation

See TC's response to Ground 1.15 of Objection 1.

Recommendation

No change.

Ground 3.17: Condition 3.15 Noise Control

They request that this is a definite recommendation with the enclosure of all motors, of both fixed and mobile plant mandatory to eliminate noise. They request that this be carried out after three months of date of grant of this licence.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The TC considers that this requirement is adequately met by Condition 3.15.1 of the PD.

Recommendation

No change

Ground 3.18: Condition 3.15.2 “..... a noise attenuation barrier....”

What sort of visual impact will this have? They request that local residents agree to any noise barrier construction or plantation. Any construction that gives rise to serious visual impact should be agreed with the nearest resident 60m adjacent to the facility.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The TC considers that a noise attenuation barrier is required as detailed in the TC’s response to Ground 1.8 of Objection 1 above. The TC notes that the installation of noise control infrastructure is listed in Schedule B of the licence as a specified engineering works (SEW) and proposals to be received by the Agency relating to this will therefore be available for public inspection. Any comments to be made by the public on the visual aspects of the noise attenuation barrier can be considered by the Agency under the enforcement of the licence.

Recommendation

No change

Ground 3.19: Condition 3.16.1(iv)

They request that the EPA should designate odour abatement control parameters rather than being agreed by the EPA.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The specific technologies to be employed at this facility for the purposes of odour abatement will be agreed by the Agency as a specified engineering works. Until such proposals are agreed by the Agency and the technology becomes known, it would not be appropriate to set specific control parameters for the operation of this system.

Recommendation

No change

Ground 3.20: Condition 4.1.4 Acceptance of Unsuitable Waste

They request that the temporary storage of unsuitable waste should not be an option. Unsuitable waste should be discovered on inspection and the delivery turned away. They have no confidence in the management implementing proper facilities for the storage of unsuitable waste based solely on their experience of finding carcasses in the vicinity of the plant, in particular at the nearest resident’s property where dogs/foxes have carried them from the facility.

Technical Committee Evaluation

See TC’s response to Ground 2.11 of objection 2.

Recommendation

No further change.

Ground 3.21: Condition 4.2 Composting Process (Cond. 4.2.1 – The pre wetting of all bales)

In some areas of this licence the language used is very vague and open to interpretation. They request that the manner in which this process is managed is described to the management with more detail.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The licence includes a number of Conditions to control the operation of the facility which include the provision of certain infrastructure, the adoption of certain management practices and the monitoring of environmental media to establish the impact of those activities. The licence sets out the requirements under which the waste activities may be carried out. The onus for compliance with the Conditions of the licence rests solely with the licensee, and the manner in which this is achieved is up to licensee.

Recommendation

No change

Ground 3.22: Condition 4.2.2 Schedule C Process Control

Use of aeration pads/fans. These are recommended for use before the enclosure of

- (a) Bale breaking line -12 months
- (b) Phase I and II - 18 months
- (c) Treatment of air emissions – 24 months

They request that there be no operation of fans or aeration pads outside of normal operating hours, ie, 8am – 7pm Monday to Friday, 8am – 1pm Saturdays and no operation of them on Sundays or Bank Holidays. It is known that the use of fans/aeration pads is useless unless enclosure of processes is in place (Odour Net UK Ltd, Survey, April 2002). Therefore the recommendation to enclose the entire process should either reduce in time-scale or, use of aeration pads/fans restricted to normal working hours until this is in place.

Technical Committee Evaluation

Full compliance with the Conditions of the licence should ensure that the facility does not cause environmental pollution and that noise and odour emissions are controlled. Condition 3.11 sets out a phased programme for the enclosure of the composting process and the provision of odour abatement infrastructure. Condition 4.2.2 and Schedule C requires the licensee to carry out composting in a controlled manner and to monitor certain process controls. The operation of fans and other noise emitting plant is discussed further under Grounds 2.1 and 2.3 of objection 2.

Recommendation

No further change.

Ground 3.23: Condition 4.2.3 Pending the completion of the odour abatement system referred to in Condition 3.11, all outdoor clamps of intermediate compost shall be mechanically turned at least every three days. This may give the impression for the necessity to work Sundays and Bank Holidays. They request that the facility manage their process so that no operations are carried out outside the normal hours of operation.

Technical Committee Evaluation

Pending the completion of the odour abatement system, the regular turning of outdoor clamps is necessary to prevent anaerobic conditions forming which give rise to significant odour emissions. See also grounds 2.1 and 2.13 above.

Recommendation

Change Condition 1.3 as per TC's response to Ground 2.1 of objection 2.

Ground 3.24: Condition 4.3 Landscaping

After conditions 3.11.1 (i-v) and Conditions 3.11.2 and 3.11.3 have been fully met the eventual height of the structures at the facility may be too high to be effectively screened. They request that a higher proportion of more mature trees in conjunction with saplings form the basis of the planting schemes, rather than the use of saplings alone. They would request that some agreement is necessary between the local residents and the management of the facility as to what forms the screening of the facility.

Technical Committee Evaluation

See TC's response to Ground 2.14 of objection 2.

Recommendation

No change

Ground 3.25: Condition 4.3.2 Licensee assessing whether additional screening is necessary

They request that the local community should have involvement and comment as to whether additional screening is necessary.

Technical Committee Evaluation

See TC's response to Ground 2.14 of objection 2.

Recommendation

No change

Ground 3.26: Condition 4.4.2

They accept that it is important for the safety of operatives that adequate lighting is essential. However, They request that all night-time lights be screened from the rear and directed inwards and down into the yard. They request that the same be carried out for any security lighting in order to reduce light pollution from the factory.

Technical Committee Evaluation

See the TC's response to Ground 2.15 of objection 2.

Recommendation

Change as per Ground 2.15 to Objection 2 above.

Ground 3.27: Condition 4.5.3

They request that strict contingency measures are put in place and approved by the EPA in case such a tanker has an accident/emergency while driving through NHA area.

Technical Committee Evaluation

Condition 4.5.3 requires that all wastes removed off-site shall be transported in a manner which will not adversely affect the environment. Notwithstanding this, the TC consider that any significant spillages of process water during its transport off-site should be regarded as an emergency, and the contingency arrangements specified in Condition 8 would then apply.

Recommendation

No Change.

Ground 3.29: Condition 4.6.2 Maintenance

Any calibration etc. of treatment/abatement and emission controls should be written up by an independent person and not done by licensee.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The TC notes that Condition 4.6.1 is the relevant Condition, which refers to the calibration and maintenance of emission control equipment. The TC consider that the present wording of this Condition is appropriate, given that it requires all calibration and maintenance to be done in accordance with the manufacturer/supplier/installer's instructions.

Recommendation

No change

Ground 3.5: Condition 5 Emissions

There is no schedule for odour emissions and no limits are set and no monitoring mandatory as part of this proposed licence. Why is there no odour monitoring ongoing as part of this licence since odour nuisance is a major complaint. They request for this licence that odour be considered as an emission and included in Schedule D and E, *Emission Limits* monitoring.

Technical Committee Evaluation

See TC's response to Ground 2.16 of objection 2.

Recommendation

No change

Ground 3.30: Condition 5.5.1

Noise sensitive locations should be designated with the nearest residence numbered among the noise sensitive locations.

Technical Committee Evaluation

See TC's response to Ground 2.17 of objection 2.

Recommendation

No change

Ground 3.31: Condition 5.5.2

They request that low noise emitting plant, (including mobile plant and machinery), is mandatory. This condition relies/depends on good management practices – which are consistently proven to be poor.

Technical Committee Evaluation

See TC's response to Grounds 2.1 and 2.3 of objection 2.

Recommendation

Change as per Ground 2.1 above.

Ground 3.32: Condition 7.1 Monitoring as per Schedule E

There are only two noise sensitive location stations in Schedule E. They request that more noise sensitive locations are added in here with the nearest resident 60m away numbering among them. Thirty minutes bi-annually seems infrequent for monitoring noise emanations from the facility. They feel that noise monitoring should be random and carried out independently. (A licensee can turn off machines for noise monitoring). They request that a survey is carried out on current noise emanations from the facility and if levels are above what are shown in the waste licence application, that the frequency of monitoring is revised.

Technical Committee Evaluation

See TC's response to Ground 2.18 of objection 2.

Recommendation

Amend the number of noise sensitive locations specified in Table E.1.1 as per TC's response to Ground 2.18 of objection 2.
--

Ground 3.33: Condition 7.6 Groundwater Monitoring

There has already been an incident with a local well. The well of Patrick and Maureen Harten (residents 60m from facility), was contaminated in May 2003 when a pipe carrying process water burst and drained for days onto the adjacent property. The management of the facility at no time contacted Mr Harten to put his well right or to compensate him in any way. They request that Mr Hartens well is put to right immediately with the agreement of Mr Harten and at the expense of the facility. They request that the schedule for monitoring this particular well be revised to at least four times a year.

Technical Committee Evaluation

See TC's response to Ground 2.19 of objection 2.

Recommendation

Amend Table E.7.1 (Schedule E.7) as per TC's response to Ground 2.19 of objection 2.
--

Ground 3.34: Condition 7.9.1 Nuisance Monitoring

They request that the daily inspections for litter, vermin, birds, flies, mud, dust and odours and the subjective daily odour assessments are fastidiously recorded and available for public inspection.

Technical Committee Evaluation

Condition 7.9.1 requires the licensee to undertake daily nuisance inspections and records of these are required to be maintained under Condition 9.3 f). Condition 2.4.1 requires a Communications Programme to be established which will allow members of the public to obtain information concerning the environmental performance of the facility. A review of nuisance controls is also required to be published in the Annual Environmental Report (as per Schedule G).

Recommendation

No change

Ground 3.35: Condition 8.4.3 Emergencies

They request that in the event that the manner in which the licensee provides an alternative water supply to those affected meets with the approval of those affected and that ongoing or frequent emergencies of that kind results in the licensee relocating and boring new wells for those affected.

Technical Committee Evaluation

See TC's response to Ground 2.19 of objection 2.

Recommendation

Amend Table E.7.1 (Schedule E.7) as per TC's response to Ground 2.19 of objection 2.

Ground 3.36: Schedule F Facility Yard and Storage Tanks Integrity Report

They request that the integrity of the facility's yard be tested every three to five years.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The TC note that the integrity of storage tanks, sumps and bunds is required to be tested every three years (Condition 3.10.5) and consider that it would be good practice to undertake a similar assessment of the yard surface and drains on a regular basis. For the purposes of clarity, the TC also recommend that Schedule F Recording and Reporting to the Agency, be amend to reflect the new monitoring/reporting frequency for such integrity testing.

Recommendation

Insert a new sub-condition 3.5.5 as follows:

The integrity of all hardstanding areas and drains shall be assessed by a suitably qualified independent engineer at least every three years and reported to the Agency on each occasion or following the installation of any new drains/areas of hardstanding and prior to their use.

Amend the second last row of Schedule F to read as follows (see below):

Report	Reporting Frequency ^{Note1}	Report Submission Date
Facility Yard and Drains Integrity Report	Every three years	Within three months from the date of grant of licence and one month after the end of the three year period being reported on (or prior to the use of new structures).

Ground 3.37: Request for an Oral Hearing

Technical Committee Evaluation

The Agency decided at a Board meeting on 1/7/03 not to hold an oral hearing in relation to this licence application.

Submission on Objections No. 2 and 3 from Raymond McKenna, Greenhills Compost Ltd., Kilcogy, Co. Cavan

Mr. Kenna comments on the outstanding planning issues highlighted in the objections from Erne Valley Concerned Residents and Patrick and John Harten. He wishes to point out that the objections raised related mostly to temporary structures which were installed to enhance the appearance of the facility and reduce odour and noise emissions. These were the only alleviating actions the company could carry out due to restrictions imposed on planning whilst awaiting EPA guidelines. It is the company's intention to fully comply with all planning regulations, and they do not consider that the reduced timeframes for the provision of infrastructure (as requested in the other objections) would be realistic in this regard.

In relation to the issue of groundwater contamination, they have no knowledge or evidence of such contamination and they believe the well in question to be upstream and upslope of the facility.

Technical Committee Evaluation

The TC notes that the Agency is not the competent authority in relation to planning matters. The TC notes the comments made in relation to the possible contamination of a local private groundwater well Conditions 7.6.1, 8.4.3 and Schedule E.1.1. of the PD as proposed to be amended under Grounds 2.19 of this report deal with potential groundwater contamination issues.

Signed:

Brian Donlon
Technical Committee Chairperson