



**OFFICE OF
LICENSING &
GUIDANCE**

**REPORT OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ON
OBJECTIONS TO LICENCE CONDITIONS**

TO:	Directors
FROM:	Technical Committee - LICENSING UNIT
DATE:	
RE:	Objection to Proposed Decision/Determination for 136-2, Waste

Application Details	
Class(s) of activity:	3-11, 3-12, 3-13, 4-2 (P), 4-3, 4-4 and 4-13
Location of activity:	Sarsfieldcourt Industrial Estate, Sarsfieldcourt, Glanmire, Co. Cork
Licence application received:	06/05/03
PD issued:	05/01/04
First party objection received:	One
Third Party Objection received	None
Submissions on Objections received:	None

Company

The application relates to the review of a licence for an existing non-hazardous waste transfer station. The facility is owned and operated by Greenstar Recycling (Munster) Ltd. and is situated in an industrial estate 8km northeast of Cork city and 5km north of Glanmire.

Consideration of the Objection

The Technical Committee, comprising of Maeve McHugh (Chair) and Marie O'Connor, has considered all of the issues raised in the Objections and this report details the Committee's comments and recommendations following the examination of the objections together with discussions with the inspector, Regina Campbell, who also provided comments on some the points raised.

This report considers the first party objection.

First Party Objection

A.1. Activities Licensed, Schedule A

These parts of the Proposed Decision Licence 136-2 mention only use of source-segregated materials for the composting process. This does not facilitate the potential use of non-source-segregated materials that may be retrieved from the waste streams entering the facility. These materials could be removed by handpicking, in a picking line, by machine grab/loader or by a trammel screen.

Greenstar seeks to have the words '*source separated*' deleted from the Proposed Decision of Waste Licence 136-2.

Technical Committee's Evaluation: The TC feels that in order to clarify the purpose of source segregation of biodegradable waste intended for composting the interpretation should include definitions of compost and stabilised biowaste. This will not preclude the licensee from producing stabilised biowaste but it will clarify that stabilised biowaste will have to be disposed of.

Recommendation:

Insert new Condition (after Condition 1.6) to read as follows:

1.7 Only the wastes as outlined in Schedule A: Waste Acceptance of this licence and as listed under Annex 1 of the EC Working Document 'Biological Treatment of Biowaste' (2nd draft) or subsequent amendments shall be accepted at the facility for the production of compost. Waste types outlined in Schedule A: Waste Acceptance of this licence and not listed under Annex 1 of the EC Working Document 'Biological Treatment of Biowaste' (2nd draft) should be disposed of, unless otherwise agreed by the Agency the Agency.

Change the numbering of the following conditions, as appropriate, so that Condition 1.7 becomes 1.8 etc.

Insert the following definitions into the Interpretation:

Compost	Stable, sanitised and humus like material rich in organic matter and free from offensive odours resulting from composting, of separately collected biowaste which complies with the environmental quality classes outlined in <i>Schedule F: Compost Quality</i> of this licence.
Stabilised Biowaste	Waste resulting from the mechanical/biological treatment of unsorted waste or residual municipal waste including treated biowaste, which does not comply with the environmental quality classes outlined in <i>Schedule F: Compost Quality</i> of this licence.

A.2 Condition 1.5

The applicant objects to the condition as the wording may lead to confusion between varying types of waste management permits and asks for wording to be changed to 'waste collection permit' from 'waste permit'.

Technical Committee's Evaluation: Agreed.

Recommendation: For the purposes of clarity the condition should be amended to read as follows:

*Waste shall only be accepted at the facility from customers who are holders of a waste **collection** permit, unless exempted, under the Waste Management (Collection Permit) Regulations 2001 or from other licensed/permited facilities.*

A.2. Condition 1.9.2

The condition allows the facility to operate during the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm Monday to Friday inclusive and 8.00am to 2.00pm on Saturdays. The applicant objects to this condition and seeks to operate twenty-four hours a day seven days a week to allow for operational flexibility and the meeting of customer requirements.

Technical Committee's Evaluation:

The hours referred to in Condition 1.9.2 of the Proposed decision are the same as in the original licence (136-1). The request to operate the facility on a 24-hour basis was not referred to in the review application and cannot be considered at this stage. It would comprise a significant change to the operation of the facility and any such proposal as part of a licence application would have to be available for the information of members of the public at an earlier stage in the application process.

Recommendation: No change.

A.3. Condition 1.9.3

The applicant objects to this condition, as it seeks to operate on Sundays and Bank Holidays to allow for operational flexibility and meeting of customer requirements. No change is sought to the days on which waste may be accepted.

Technical Committee's Evaluation:

As per A.2 above.

Recommendation: No change.

A.4. Condition 3.2.1

The applicant objects to this condition, as it requires them to give at least two months prior notice for all specified engineering works, their present licence 136-1 required a two week notice period and the applicant feels that period works well in a commercial environment and seeks to have it retained.

Technical Committee's Evaluation:

The original waste licence (136-1) was issued on 26/07/01 and many standard licence conditions have evolved since that time. A two-month period for submission of proposals for Specified Engineering Works is now, and has for some time been considered by the Agency to be appropriate. Given the significance of specified engineering works in the context of environmental protection at a waste facility it is essential that the Agency be given adequate notice for evaluation and consideration.

Recommendation: No change.

A.5. Condition 3.4.1

The applicant objects to this condition as they do not own the property at the entrance to the industrial estate and feel there could be planning issues and objections from neighbours. They are willing to erect CCTV on site that will monitor traffic entering and leaving the site.

Technical Committee's Evaluation:

The TC feels that the maintenance of a CCTV system at the entrance to the facility should be sufficient and suggests removing the requirement for CCTV at the entrance to the industrial estate.

Recommendation: Reword Condition 3.4.1 to read as follows:

Security gates shall be installed and maintained at the entrances to the facility and a security wall shall be provided around the perimeter of the facility to a minimum height of 2.5m. The base of the fencing shall be set in the ground. The licensee shall maintain a CCTV monitoring system at the entrance to the facility.

A.6. Condition 3.5.2

The applicant objects to this condition as they feel the provision of concrete under all areas listed in the condition excessive and wish to have the condition amended to allow for the use of tarmac under parking areas.

Technical Committee's Evaluation:

Condition 7.4 of the Proposed Decision states that all waste for disposal stored overnight at the facility shall be stored in suitably covered and enclosed containers within the waste transfer building. No waste can therefore be stored in the vehicles to be parked in the parking area. This being the case the TC considers that the use of tarmac will be sufficient in the parking area.

Recommendation: Reword Condition 3.5.2 to read as follows:

The licensee shall provide and maintain an impermeable concrete surface at the facility entrance area, all areas where vehicle movement takes place and the waste handling and storage areas. All waste handling and storage areas at the facility shall be concreted and constructed to British Standard 8110. Parking areas shall be surfaced in impermeable hardstanding.

A.7. Condition 3.14.3

The applicant objects to this condition as they wish to recirculation leachate generated by the composting process for use at the feedstock preparation stage, which they feel, can be significant and beneficial re-use. They wish to have the condition amended to allow this.

Technical Committee's Evaluation:

The recirculation of leachate generated by the composting process should be allowed as an option.

Recommendation: Change Condition 3.14.3 to read:

*All leachate generated from this activity shall, **unless re-used in the composting process**, be diverted to the wastewater collection system.*

A.8. Condition 5.1 and 5.4.4

The applicant objects to these conditions as they wish to carry out the trommelling of composted waste, aerated curing of compost and storage of final compost out-doors. The area required to carry out these activities inside (600m² for aerated curing) would present significant, if not insurmountable difficulties. The applicant lists other facilities, which carry out these activities outdoors, Galway County Council, Ballinasloe Landfill (27-2), Waterford City Composting Facility, and Waterford Ballinamuck Civic Amenity Site

Technical Committee's Evaluation:

Because of the proximity to residential properties it is not considered by the TC to be appropriate to allow significant waste processing or composting (other than in-vessel composting) to be carried out out-of-doors. The Inspector's Report accompanying the PD recommended that trommelling and all other composting operations, other than in-vessel composting, be undertaken within the transfer building due to concerns about odour, dust and noise nuisance at neighbouring commercial and residential properties. It also referred to the fact that the licensee is required to undertake an odour control programme at the facility. With regard to the other facilities referred to by the objector it is important to note that each facility should be considered on its own merits and site specific matters should be taken into account. For example two of the facilities mentioned are in association with landfills.

Recommendation: No change.

A.9. Condition 5.4.5

The applicant objects to this condition as due to peaks in source segregated food waste they require up to 20 tonnes stored at the facility at any one time. Peaks are caused by such factors as 50% of the weekly food waste stream production at weekends and holidays. Furthermore processing not occurring within 24 hours due to weekend or holidays and machine failure may necessitate the storage for up to 48 hours. Also, green and wood waste for composting are delivered on a batch basis

and up to 70 tonnes of storage capacity may be required. The applicant requires the condition be amended to allow for these occurrences.

Technical Committee's Evaluation:

The comments of the objector are noted in relation to peaks in delivery periods. However, a large proportion of the waste types referred to are source segregated food waste and, as such have the potential to generate odours. The TC is of the opinion that the licensee should not accept any waste that cannot be placed in the in-vessel units within a period of 24 hours or less. This is particularly important as the nearest residence to the facility is 150m from the boundary and there are 18 residences within approximately 0.5km of the facility. The PD allows the licensee to accept 5,000 tpa of source separated biodegradable waste for composting. This is equivalent to approximately 17.5 tonnes per day, based on facility operation 5.5 days per week. This figure approximates more closely to the 20 tonne figure requested by the applicant than the 10 tonnes per day figure, which was suggested by the applicant in the application and subsequently placed in the PD. The TC feels that it is therefore appropriate to allow the storage of 20 tonnes of biodegradable waste for composting at the facility at any one time, subject to the requirement that it will be placed in the in-vessel unit within 24 hours of arrival.

The applicant stated in the objection that in addition to the acceptance of 20 tonnes per day of source-segregated waste for composting they also want to be permitted to accept up to 70 tonnes per day of 'bulking agent' such as green waste and wood waste. With regard to the waste types listed in Schedule A of the PD clearly green waste and wood waste fall under the category of 'source separated biodegradable waste for composting' and, as such are subject to the 5,000 tpa limit applied therein.

Recommendation: Change Condition 5.4.5 to read as follows:

*'No more than **20 tonnes** of biodegradable waste for composting shall be stored at the facility at any one time. This waste shall not be stored for longer than 24 hours at the facility prior to being placed in the in-vessel composter'.*

A.10. Condition 5.4.6

The applicant objects to this condition as in order to be consistent with the information submitted in the application the word 'waste' in the condition should only refer to 'biodegradable waste intended for composting' and should be reworded.

Technical Committee's Evaluation:

Condition 5.4 refers entirely to compost and the composting process. The figure of 1200 m³ in the review application refers to the available in-vessel capacity for composting at the facility at any one time. In addition to this the licensee will be allowed to accept 20 tonnes per day of material for composting and to store final compost end product, subject to the restrictions in Condition 5.4.4. The TC therefore feels that the limit of 1,200 tonnes of waste and compost is inappropriate. The TC feels that Condition 5.4.6 could be removed from the licence, as the restrictions in Conditions 5.4.4 and 5.4.5 should suffice to control the biodegradable waste intake and processing capacity at the facility as well as the storage of both biodegradable material prior to composting and final compost end product.

Recommendation: Delete Condition 5.4.6

A.11. Condition 5.7.2

The applicant objects to this condition as there are no lagoons at the facility and the condition should be removed.

Technical Committee's Evaluation:

The TC feels that this condition can be deleted for the reasons outlined by the objector.

Recommendation: Delete Condition 5.7.2.

A.12. Condition 7.4.3.1

The applicant objects to this condition as in the past they have had problems with the use of dust curtains for reasons of reduced visibility for vehicles and personnel leading to health and safety concerns. They wish to be allowed to propose alternatives and the condition to allow for this with the alternative approved by the Agency.

Technical Committee's Evaluation:

The TC agrees that the dust curtains need not necessarily be required and that good operational practices e.g. keeping doors, entries and exits closed as much as possible will suffice. As suggested by the objector the TC feels that alternative measures for the control of dust can be agreed with the Agency.

Recommendation: Change Condition 7.4.3.1 to read

'Unless otherwise agreed in advance by the Agency dust curtains shall be maintained on the entry/exit points from the waste transfer building. Doors in the waste transfer building shall be kept closed where possible.'

A.13. Condition 9.4.4

The applicant objects to this condition as any deterioration seen in the quality of local wells would be based solely on third party monitoring results. It is felt that an investigation would be necessary to establish the cause before they are required to provide an alternative water supply and implement necessary remedial measures. They seek to have this condition removed.

Technical Committee's Evaluation:

The condition states that for remedial action to be required the facility must be shown to be having an adverse effect on local wells. The condition does not

prescribe monitoring to be undertaken nor does it specify what party(s) should be responsible for it.

Recommendation: No change.

A.14. Condition 10.2 (b)

The applicant objects to this condition as the wording is vague and would be clearer if the word 'waste carrier' was replaced with just 'carrier' as the licence already requires that they only accept waste from persons who are holders of a waste collection permit.

Technical Committee's Evaluation:

The licence requires that the licensee accept waste from persons who are holders of a waste collection permit. Condition 10.2(b) requires that this be recorded for each load of incoming and outgoing waste. The condition refers to waste loads therefore it is implicit that the word carrier refers to 'waste'. In the cases where exemptions apply under the Waste Collection Permit Regulations the waste carrier registration details may not necessarily need to be recorded.

Recommendation: No change.

Overall Recommendation

It is recommended that the Board of the Agency grant a licence to the applicant

- (i) for the reasons outlined in the proposed determination and
- (ii) subject to the conditions and reasons for same in the Proposed Determination,
- and
- (iii) subject to the amendments proposed in this report.

Signed

Maeve McHugh

for and on behalf of the Technical Committee