

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

TO:	Directors	
FROM:	Technical Committee	- LICENSING UNIT
DATE:	19 th May 2006	
RE:	Objection to Proposed Decision for Greenstar Limited, Bray Depot, Fassaroe, Bray, County Wicklow. Waste Licence Register No. 53-3	

Application Details	
Class(s) of activity: (P = principal activity)	3 rd Schedule: 11, 12 (P) and 13 4 th Schedule: 2, 3, 4, 11, 12 and 13
Location of activity:	Fassaroe, Bray, County Wicklow
Licence application received:	10/09/04
PD issued:	07/02/06
First party objection received:	03/03/06
Third Party Objection received	06/03/06 Dr Noreen Keane, Prof. Frank Keane, Mr Philip Lardner & Mr Gerard Lardner
Submission on Objection received:	05/04/06 Dr Noreen Keane, Prof. Frank Keane, Mr Philip Lardner & Mr Gerard Lardner

Company

This report relates to an application by Greenstar Limited for a review of the existing waste licence (Reg. No. 53-2) for their Bray Depot located at Fassaroe, Bray, County Wicklow. The existing licence (Reg. No. 53-2) was issued on 3rd April 2003 to Noble Waste Disposal Limited now trading as Greenstar Limited (formerly Celtic Waste Limited).

The facility is currently licensed to operate a non-hazardous waste transfer station accepting 129,502 tonnes per annum consisting of household, commercial, construction and demolition wastes and hazardous waste. The existing license requires that the closed on-site landfill be reclaimed and restored.

A mixture of agricultural, quarrying, commercial and residential land surrounds the facility. There are approximately 17 residences within 250m of the site, the nearest of which is located along the southeastern facility boundary. The existing transfer station building is approximately 65 m from the nearest residence.

The facility is currently licensed to operate from 07.30hrs to 21.00hrs Monday to Saturday, with waste acceptance from 07.30hrs to 19.00hrs Monday to Saturday.

There were five submissions received in relation to this application and the Board considered each of these prior to the issue of the PD on 7th February 2006.

Consideration of the Objection

The Technical Committee, comprising of Mr. Stuart Huskisson (Chair) and Ms. Ciara Maxwell, has considered all of the issues raised in the Objections and this report details the Committee's comments and recommendations following (i) the examination of the objections and (ii) discussions with the inspector, Ms. Pernille Hermansen, who provided comments on the points raised.

This report considers the first party objection which was prepared for Greenstar Limited by O'Callaghan Moran & Associates, Cork, one third party objection and one submission on objection both received from Dr. Noreen Keane, Prof. Frank Keane, Mr Gerard Lardner and Mr Philip Lardner. The main issues raised in the objections and submission on objection are summarised below, however, the original documents should be referred to at all times for greater detail and expansion of particular points.

First Party Objection

The licensee makes 7 points of objection in relation to the Proposed Decision.

For clarity, any submission on objection made by the third party in relation to the first party objection is dealt with in association with the objection to which it relates. The Agency has considered only the points of the submission on objection which relate to the objection.

Objections

A.1. Condition 1.6.2

*The licensee requests that the condition be modified to allow the operational hours for **internal** waste processing activities to be amended subject to the Agency's approval.*

The licensee states that the grounds for the Agency's refusal to allow amendment of this condition are based on the concerns raised by local residents relating to noise. Greenstar Limited state that these concerns relate to impacts from external waste processing and there is no evidence to indicate that noise from internal activities is a cause of concern.

The licensee states that Condition 6.8 of the PD requires the implementation of measures to reduce noise impacts and to carry out noise monitoring at noise sensitive locations. It is stated that it will be an objective of the latter to establish if noise from internal activities are a source of nuisance.

Submission on Objection: The submission raises concern at the noise levels currently generated from the machinery operating inside the buildings and from automatic proximity warning hooters. The submission states that the doors of the buildings are never closed either during working hours or during the night, even though this has been raised with Greenstar on numerous occasions.

The levels of noise and dust generated by the vehicles on and around the site are 'highly objectionable' and a 'serious nuisance'. It states that any further increase in the volume of traffic or the hours that vehicles access the site would further degrade the tranquillity of the area.

In the submission the objectors state that they have no confidence that Greenstar will not abuse any further extension granted to them.

Technical Committee's Evaluation:

The Technical Committee note that the licensee has requested that Condition 1.6.2 be amended to allow for changes in the **internal** operation hours 'subject to the Agency's approval'. The Technical Committee also note that the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and the licence application included the request to allow the hours of operation to be amended with the Agency's agreement.

The Technical Committee recognise that some flexibility in the operation of waste management facilities is required and consider that this has been provided within Conditions 1.6.1 and 1.6.3 of the PD issued. The term '...subject to the Agency's approval' is included in the operating hours licence conditions granted for other facilities to provide for moderate alterations, subject to the satisfactory management of operations and in particular any noise nuisance potential.

The licensee provided an inadequate assessment of the environmental impacts of any further increase to the internal operating hours within the licence application, EIS and objection.

The Technical Committee note that two submissions were received in relation to the noise levels at the facility. Based on an assessment of the licence application, the Licensing Inspector recommended a reduction in the hours of operation, (compared with the existing licence Reg. No. 53-2), due to the rural location of the activity and concern for potential noise emissions. The issue of internal noise is also raised in the Submission on Objection.

The Technical Committee does not consider it appropriate to amend the condition as requested by the licensee. Given the concerns expressed by the third parties and the proximity to residences, it is considered appropriate that any future request for amendment of operational hours to permit night-time operation should be by review application process thereby formally permitting third-party involvement in the decision.

The Technical Committee consider that the other issues raised in the Submission on Objection are addressed by conditions included in the PD. Condition 6.8.2 of the PD requires the licensee to submit a proposal to further reduce the noise impact by the installation of noise reduction measures at the facility. This proposal shall consider such measures as reversing strobe lights in addition to a muted siren or 'smart alarm' systems. Condition 6.8.3 requires the licensee to carry out a feasibility study to assess the benefits of acoustic cladding of the waste processing building.

Condition 6.2.4.1 requires that dust curtains, or equivalent, be maintained on the entry/exit points from the waste transfer building(s) and all other doors in the building(s) shall be kept closed where possible. The condition also requires the licensee to ensure that the doors to the biowaste reception building remain closed at all times other than to facilitate the delivery/removal of wastes from the building.

Condition 5.4 requires that the road network in the vicinity of the facility be kept free from any debris caused by vehicles entering or leaving the facility. Any such debris or deposited materials shall be removed without delay.

Condition 6.2.3 requires that in dry weather, site roads and any other areas used by vehicles be sprayed with water as and when required to minimise airborne dust nuisance.

The Technical Committee consider that the volume of road traffic generated by the activity is a matter for the Planning Authority.

Recommendation: No change.

A.2. Condition 8.1

The licensee objects to this condition which requires all waste processing (except wood shredding and composting) to be carried out inside the waste transfer building(s) from the date of grant of licence.

Greenstar Limited state that a condition within their existing licence (53-2) required that the processing of Construction and Demolition (C&D) and Commercial and Industrial (C&I) waste be moved indoors by April 2005, unless otherwise agreed by the Agency. Greenstar Limited sought, as part of the review to allow for the external processing of C&D waste beyond April 2005. The licensee originally intended to relocate the C&I processing line inside the Phase 1 building in 2005, but due to the advent of pay by use/weight and the surge in demand for dry recyclable processing capacity Greenstar Limited state they were forced to relocate this latter activity into the Phase 1 building.

The licensee accepts that both C&I and C&D waste must be processed indoors in the future. Greenstar Limited explain the delays in construction of Phase 2 buildings, and detail the development plan for additional buildings at the site.

Greenstar Limited request the amendment of Condition 8.1 to allow for the continued external processing of C&D and C&I waste until the Phase 2 building has been constructed (expected September 2007). The licensee states that if this is not allowed it may, result in facility closure and have a detrimental effect on waste recovery rates in Wicklow.

Submission on Objection: *The submission states that during the original planning application for the facility, Greenstar assured the local people that C&D waste processing would be carried out within the new buildings. It states that since then the plans have changed numerous times, with time extensions being granted to the deadline for internalising the processing of this C&D waste. The submission states that Greenstar continue to procrastinate in meeting their obligations. The objectors state in their submission that 'any further latitude by the EPA would allow Greenstar to continue to string out this process indefinitely' and they request that the Condition remain as it stands.*

Technical Committee's Evaluation: It is recognised that market forces can influence the volume of each waste stream requiring processing, e.g., 'pay, by use/weight' which caused the surge in demand for dry recycling capacity. Increasing the processing capacity for a particular waste stream, however, does not negate the licensee's obligation to manage the other waste streams in line with the conditions of its licence.

Within the licence review application the licensee requested an increase in the total quantity of C&D waste, which could be processed at the site, and this increase has been included within the PD. The Technical Committee consider that this increase has been allowed on the basis that the C&D waste processing be carried out indoors.

The delays in the construction of the additional buildings, which would have provided capacity for indoor C&D and C&I waste processing, are noted, however, the Technical Committee consider that the licensee has been provided with sufficient time to develop the necessary infrastructure to process these wastes indoors.

The Technical Committee are aware that the Inspectors Report for the previous licence (Reg. No. 53-2) detailed that exceedance in the dust and noise levels had been recorded at the boundary of the facility. After assessing the information at that time, the Inspector included a timetable for the licensee to relocate the C&D and C&I waste processing indoors, in order to minimise the potential impacts from these activities.

The Inspectors Report for this licence review detailed that the most recent noise monitoring has shown exceedance of the daytime noise emission limits at two of the four boundary locations and at both of the two noise sensitive locations. This was attributed to traffic noise on and off site, machinery on site and construction off-site. The noise survey did not state if all the outdoor waste processing was in operation during the survey. Dust monitoring at the facility showed exceedance at the four monitoring locations in August-September 2005, one exceedance in November-December 2005 and one exceedance in December-January 2005-2006. The Inspector commented that the dust monitoring results indicate 'a serious problem with waste management procedures at the facility'.

The Technical Committee note that there have been four complaints in relation to dust since July 2005.

The Technical Committee consider that the licensee has not provided sufficient information on how the continued outdoor processing of C&D and C&I waste would meet the specified dust and noise emission limit values.

Recommendation: No Change.

A.3. Condition 8.4.3

The licensee objects to this condition which requires the covering of the aerated static piles (ASPs) while curing is taking place. Greenstar Limited state that there is no overwhelming environmental reason to cover the ASPs and that covering them would prevent rainfall on the composting mass and require additional mains water to maintain sufficient moisture content for biological activity. The licensee states that the ASPs will operate under suction air pressure with the collected air being discharged through a biofilter, limiting odour and dust generation. Greenstar Limited state that given the nature of the material the potential for wind blown debris is negligible and the requirement to provide a cover over the ASPs will make composting at the facility commercially unviable.

Submission on Objection: *The submission refers to a visit, by the objectors, to a composting facility operated by Celtic Compost Limited and the objectors state that they were impressed by the way this facility was run. The submission recommends that similar projects be run to the same stringent conditions. The objectors state that they have no confidence in Greenstar running a similar facility.*

The submission states that the issue of residual steaming odour emanating from aerated static piles (ASPs) was discussed with a representative of Celtic Compost Limited. The representative suggested that covering the piles would not only reduce odour but could also assist the air suction through the ASPs. The submission states that such covers would not adversely affect the process or time period for curing the material in the ASPs.

Technical Committee's Evaluation: The Technical Committee agree that the operation of the ASPs, i.e. drawing air through each compost pile, which is then discharging through a biofilter, will minimise the potential odour emissions from the curing process.

The Technical Committee consider that, as detailed by the Inspector, the requirement to cover the Aerated Static Piles (ASPs) has been included within the PD to ensure that nuisance, such as litter does not arise. The Technical Committee have the view that if non source segregated biowastes are composted, litter (such as small

pieces of plastic) is likely to be present and this could easily become wind blown or carried by birds.

The Technical Committee consider that the covering of the ASPs with a material which would restrict the airflow through the compost pile or prevent rain ingress was not the intention of the condition. The Technical Committee is satisfied that Condition 8.4.3 was included to control the litter nuisance associated with non source segregated biowaste and that it should be amended to clarify the type of cover required.

Recommendation: Replace Condition 8.4.3 with the following:

The aerated static piles (ASPs) **of non-source segregated biowaste** shall be covered **with netting** while the curing process is taking place **to prevent litter nuisance**.

A.4. Condition 8.4.4 & Schedule F

The licensee requests that Condition 8.4.4 and Schedule F, which specify the quality standards which compost must meet if it is not to be considered a waste, be amended to be consistent with the existing licence (Reg. No.53-2) and with the conditions of another Greenstar Limited facility licence (Reg. No 136-1).

Greenstar Limited state that Schedule F allows for only one class of compost, which is a significant alteration to the existing licence (Reg. No.53-2), which allows for three categories of compost (Class 1, Class 2 and Stabilised Biowaste - derived from the draft EC Working Document on Biological Treatment of Biowaste).

Submission on Objection: *The submission highlights the licensee's willingness to do only the bare minimum instead of standing out as industry leaders. The submission requests that the EPA do not relax the condition and therefore request that only Class 1 compost is allowed. The text goes on to state that in the licensee's objection to Condition 8.4.6, 'Greenstar Limited suggest that the compost produced will be 'a clean product for agricultural use', if this is true, then there is no requirement for a permit to produce Class 2 or Stabilised Biowaste as only Class 1 compost may be used for agricultural purposes without limits'.*

Technical Committee's Evaluation: The Technical Committee note the Standards for Compost Quality in the previous licence (Reg. No. 53-2) included three compost categories; Class 1, Class 2 and Stabilised Biowaste.

In the EIS for the development, Greenstar Limited state that biowaste for composting will initially comprise of green waste, food waste and **other wastes** capable of being biologically treated. Greenstar Limited state that it is envisaged that over time the percentage of mixed waste will reduce significantly and that the bulk of biowaste material will be source separated. The facility is sized to be capable of meeting Wicklow County Council requirements to treat source separated waste from households.

The Technical Committee note that initially the waste to be composted is unlikely to be exclusively source segregated biowastes and hence it would be unlikely that all the compost produced would be of Class 1 standard. It is envisaged that when the majority of waste received is source segregated, a greater proportion of the output would be of Class 1 quality.

The Technical Committee consider that the setting of a single quality standard for the compost from this facility at this time would be too restrictive, and may

potentially reduce the output quantity of acceptable materials. The Technical Committee recommends that *Schedule F: Standards for Compost Quality* be amended in line with the European Commission Working Document on 'Biological Treatment of Biowaste' (second draft). The Schedule takes into account the quantity of waste to be treated and the possible use of shredded waste timber in the composting process.

Recommendation: Amend Schedule F to read as follows:

SCHEDULE F: Standards for Compost Quality

Compost Quality

No sample shall exceed 1.2 times the quality limit values set.

[The following criteria (where they apply to compost) are deemed a quality standard for the use of compost as a soil improver and should not be deemed as criteria for fertiliser. In addition N, P, K, NH₄-N, NO₃-N, pH and dry matter content should also be measured].

1. Maturity (Compost)

The state of the curing pile must be conducive to aerobic biological activity.

Compost shall be deemed to be mature if it meets two of the following groups of requirements:

1. Respiration activity after four days AT₄ is ≤10mg/O₂/g dry matter or Dynamic Respiration Index is ≤1,000mgO₂/kg VS/h.
2. Germination of cress (*Lepidium sativum*) seeds and of radish (*Raphanus sativus*) seeds in compost must be greater than 90 percent of the germination rate of the control sample, and the growth rate of plants grown in a mixture of compost and soil must not differ more than 50 percent in comparison with the control sample.
3. Compost must be cured for at least 21 days; and
Compost will not reheat upon standing to greater than 20°C above ambient temperature.
4. If no other determination of maturity is made, the compost must be cured for a six month period. In addition, offensive odours from the compost shall be minimal for the compost to be deemed mature.
5. Or other maturity tests as may be agreed with the Agency.

2. Trace Elements (Compost) ^{Note 1, 2 & 3}

Maximum Trace Element Concentration Limits ^{Note 4}

Parameter (mg/kg, dry mass)	Compost Quality Standards ^{Note 5}		Stabilised Biowaste ^{Note 5}
	Class 1	Class 2	
Cadmium (Cd)	0.7	1.5	5
Chromium (Cr)	100	150	600
Copper (Cu)	100	150	600
Mercury (Hg)	0.5	1	5
Nickel (Ni)	50	75	150
Lead (Pb)	100	150	500
Zinc (Zn)	200	400	1500
Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCB's)	-	-	0.4
Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH's)	-	-	3

Impurities >2mm ^{Note 6}	<0.5%	<0.5%	<3%
Gravel and Stones >5mm ^{Note 6}	<5%	<5%	-

Note 1: These limits apply to the compost just after the composting phase and prior to mixing with any other materials.

Note 2: Incoming sludges (other than sewage sludges) shall be monitored quarterly (on a client by client basis) for the parameters outlined in this table in addition to Selenium (Se) and Molybdenum (Mo).

Note 3: **Monitoring of Arsenic (As) is required if waste timber is used in the composting process.**

Note 4: The above alone should not be taken as an indication of suitability for addition to soil as the cumulative metal additions to soil should be first calculated.

Note 5: Normalised to 30% organic matter content.

Note 6: Compost must not contain any sharp foreign matter measuring over a 2 mm dimension that may cause damage or injury to humans, animals and plants during or resulting from its intended use.

3. Pathogens (Compost)

Pathogenic organism content must not exceed the following limits:

<i>Salmonella spp.</i>	Absent in 50g	n=5
<i>Faecal Coliforms</i>	≤ 1000 Most Probable Number (MPN) in 1g	n=5

Where: n = Number of samples to be tested.

4. Monitoring (Compost)

The licensee shall submit to the Agency for its agreement, prior to commencement of the composting operations, details of the sampling protocol, methods of analyses and sample numbers.

A.5. Condition 8.4.6

The licensee objects to the requirement that the screening of compost be carried out inside the waste transfer building(s) or any other adequate indoor facility as agreed by the Agency.

The licensee states that screening of finished compost is essential if good quality compost for higher value uses is to be produced. The compost produced will be a clean product for agricultural use with little or no contamination and therefore will have little potential for wind blown litter. Internal screening is not BAT for composting facilities and internal screening is not required in the waste licence for another Greenstar Limited facility (Reg. No. 136-2), which is of a similar size.

The licensee states that the compost on the ASPs will be maintained at the optimum moisture content to promote biological activity (50-60% moisture) and this range is not conducive to dust generation.

The licensee lists the reasons why it is not practical to carry out internal screening: -

- Screening will be done at intervals, so that stockpile of pre and post-screened product will develop. There is no existing internal capacity to accommodate this.*
- Screening cannot be carried out in the compost reception building due to Animal-by-Products restrictions. These restrictions will also apply in the other buildings on-site where Animal-by-Products will be handled.*
- Constructing a dedicated compost screening building would make development of a composting facility at Faccaroe commercially unviable.*

Greenstar Limited request that the Condition be amended to remove the requirement to screen compost inside the waste transfer buildings.

Submission on Objection: *The submission points out that Fassaroe is not an industrial estate like the Waterford City Facility and has many private dwellings within a few hundred yards of the facility. At the screening stage, the carbon, oxygen and nitrogen ratios are irrelevant as is the moisture as active composting has more or less ceased. The submission refers to the visit to the Celtic Compost Limited facility stating that the material at the screening stage was 'finely divided enough to become wind blown in anything stronger than a moderate breeze'. The submission considers that the internal screening of this material is especially important to eliminate wind blown dust problems and to eliminate the residual odour of ammonia. The submission also refers to the noise of the engines used in the screening process and it urges the EPA to maintain the requirement for screening to take place indoors.*

Technical Committee's Evaluation: Due to the proximity of residential dwellings to the facility, the Technical Committee do not consider it appropriate to allow significant waste processing other than wood shredding (for six months) or composting (which shall be carried out at the biowaste treatment facility) to be carried out outdoors. The Inspector's Report recommended that all waste processing other than composting and wood shredding, be carried out indoors from the date of grant of licence due to the concerns of odours, dust and noise nuisance at the nearby residential dwellings.

The Technical Committee note that Condition 8.4.6 does not specify the building in which compost screening should take place and provides for screening to take place in an 'adequate indoor facility as agreed by the Agency'. The necessary measures should be taken, including the selection of the location for compost screening, to comply with the conditions of the licence and the Animal by-Product Regulations.

With regard to the other facility referred to by the licensee, it is important to note that each facility should be considered on its own merits and site-specific matters should be taken into account.

Recommendation: No change.

A.6. Schedule C.6

The licensee objects to the frequency of groundwater monitoring proposed.

Greenstar Limited state that the reason for amending the groundwater monitoring from quarterly to monthly is unclear, as there is no direct emissions to ground at the site and the groundwater monitoring programme has not identified significant groundwater contamination. Greenstar Limited requests that the Schedule be amended to revert to a quarterly frequency.

Submission on Objection: The submission requests that the frequency of groundwater monitoring not be reduced. The submission refers to occasional personal inspections of the site boundary at river level which have revealed what appears to be black leachate pooling at the base of the landfill area close to the river. Sampling is suggested in this area.

Technical Committee's Evaluation: The Technical Committee note that the Inspectors Report indicates that the groundwater monitoring has not identified any significant impact on groundwater quality associated with facility activities, apart from the impact on Borehole BH-5 arising from the on-site septic tank and percolation area. The septic tank and percolation area will no longer be used due to connection to the

foul sewer. The Technical Committee consider that there is no significant benefit in increasing the frequency of groundwater monitoring from quarterly to monthly.

With regard to the Submission on the Objection, as detailed above, the groundwater monitoring has not identified any significant impacts on the groundwater quality. The PD contains considerable surface water monitoring requirements at four locations on the Glenmunder River located to the northeast of the facility, including weekly visual and odour inspection, quarterly monitoring of key parameters and annual monitoring of additional parameters.

Based on the risk of groundwater and surface water contamination from the facility, the Technical Committee consider that the monitoring schedule, with quarterly groundwater monitoring, is adequate. Condition 6.18 of the PD provides for the Agency to amend the frequency of sampling and analysis based on evaluation of test results.

Recommendation: Amend Schedule C.6 *Groundwater Monitoring* to read as follows:

Groundwater Monitoring

Emission Point Reference No.: BH-02, BH-5, P-BH-6, BH-7

Location: Location of monitoring points as shown on Drawing No. 03072-01 Rev. A Existing & Proposed Monitoring locations

PARAMETER ^{Note 1}	Monitoring Frequency
Visual Inspection/Odour ^{Note 2}	Monthly Quarterly
Groundwater Level (wells)	Monthly Quarterly
Dissolved Oxygen	Monthly Quarterly
Electrical Conductivity	Monthly Quarterly
Ammoniacal Nitrogen	Monthly Quarterly
Chloride	Monthly Quarterly
pH	Monthly Quarterly
Sulphate (SO ₄)	Annually
Metals / non metals ^{Note 3}	Annually
List I/II organic substances (Screen) ^{Note 4}	Annually
Mercury	Annually
Nitrate	Annually
Total P/orthophosphate	Annually
Faecal Coliforms	Annually
Total Coliforms	Annually

Note 1: Where appropriate all the analyses shall be carried out by a competent laboratory using standard and internationally accepted procedures.

Note 2: Where there is evident gross contamination, additional samples should be analysed and the full suite of parameters shown tested.

Note 3: Metals and elements to be analysed by AA/ICP should include as a minimum: boron, cadmium, calcium, chromium (total), copper, iron, lead, magnesium, manganese, nickel, potassium, sodium and zinc.

Note 4: Samples screened for the presence of organic compounds using Gas Chromatography / Mass Spectrometry (GC/MS) or other appropriate techniques and using the list I/II Substances from EU Directive 76/464/EEC and 80/68/EEC as a guideline. Recommended analytical techniques include: volatiles (US Environmental Protection Agency method 524 or equivalent), semi-volatiles (USEPA method 525 or equivalent, and pesticides (USEPA method 608 or equivalent).

A.7. Schedule C.6

The licensee objects to the requirement to continuously monitor the oxygen content within the composting process and requests that it be removed.

Greenstar Limited state that this is not considered necessary to ensure quality control and that temperature is a good indicator of biological activity. It is stated that aeration in the tunnels will be controlled using validated systems that will ensure that

oxygen levels are maintained at sufficient levels. This validation is required only at the facility commissioning stage. The licensee states that continuous monitoring would be surplus to requirements for most of the lifetime of the facility.

Technical Committee's Evaluation: The requirement to continuously monitor the oxygen concentration within the composting process has been introduced as a standard requirement for composting facilities in recent times. The Technical Committee consider that continuous monitoring of the oxygen concentration allows for more precise control over the composting process and assists in ensuring that anaerobic conditions do not occur. Such monitoring is considered to be BAT.

Recommendation: No change.

Third Party Objections

One Third Party Objection was received and considered:

B. Dr. Noreen Keane & Prof. Frank Keane

Dr Noreen Keane and Prof. Frank Keane write on behalf of themselves and 2 other neighbours, Mr Gerard Lardner and Mr Philip Lardner. The objection is made on two main grounds and has been signed by Dr Noreen Keane and Prof. Frank Keane.

B.1 Condition 8.2

The objectors state that there is currently no building in which C&D waste can be processed and they 'see another stalling period by Greenstar'. They find it astonishing that the EPA has granted this new licence (Reg. No. 53-3), when for the entire duration of Licence 53-2 Greenstar never complied with Condition 5.1.1 to house their C&D waste processing. They request that the licence is not granted until the C&D waste is processed indoors. They state that the same logic applies to the housing of the wood shredder which continues to cause dust problems.

Technical Committee's Evaluation: The substance of this objection has already been addressed in the Technical Committee Evaluation of Objection A.2.

With regard to wood shredding, a number of licence conditions have been included in the PD to minimise the potential environmental impacts. Condition 3.14 requires that the wood shredder be enclosed within 6 months of grant of licence. Condition 6.3.4 requires that prior to the shredder being enclosed it shall not be operated when the wind speed exceeds 10.7 m/s (Force 5). The previous licence (Reg. No. 53-2) allowed the wood shredder to be operated up to wind speeds of 14 m/s (Force 7).

Recommendation: No change.

B.2 Condition 3.13

The objectors are opposed to the fact that the in-vessel composting units are not accessed directly from within the tipping building. They state that this will lead to more external noise from trucks, reversing beepers, etc. The objectors state there will be an increased risk of odours from the pre-composted waste even if it is transferred to the external in-vessel composting units within 24 hours of arrival.

The objectors state that external accessing of the composting unit will require continuous road surface cleaning to avoid odours and they have already made several complaints to Greenstar Limited over the past year in relation to the continuous high-tone operational noise from their mechanical sweepers.

The objectors request the composting tunnels be accessed directly from inside the tipping building. Whilst they recognise that processing 10,000 tons of biowaste per year is not a huge volume, they state that this will inevitably increase and at that stage major problems of noise and odours will ensue.

Technical Committee's Evaluation: A submission was received on this same issue during the licence application and the Inspector assessed and discussed this as part of the application assessment. The PD includes a number of specific conditions to control and minimise the noise and odour emissions from the facility. The Technical Committee is satisfied that compliance with these conditions will adequately control noise and odour from the facility.

The Licensing Unit of the Agency fully assesses any proposal submitted and determines if the specific proposal can be dealt with within the scope of a waste licence. The Agency is debarred in law from granting a waste licence unless it is satisfied that the activity concerned, carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be attached to a licence, will not cause environmental pollution

The Technical Committee would also like to point out that if the licensee wishes to increase the annual quantity of biowaste to be treated at the facility, a further licence review would be required. Condition 8.4.1 stipulates that the biowaste treatment facility shall not process greater than 10,000 tonnes of biodegradable and green waste per annum, unless otherwise agreed by the Agency. In this instance a full assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed changes would need to be assessed.

Recommendation: No change.

Note: The Technical Committee wishes to point out three typographical errors in the Proposed Decision.

- i. The date on which the PD was signed should have read '...7th day of February, 2006'.
- ii. Condition 6.2.4.1 should be amended to make the second reference to 'building' plural. This suggestion does not change the meaning of the licence.

Recommendation: Amend Condition 6.2.4.1 as follows:

Dust curtains (or equivalent approved by the Agency) shall be maintained on the entry/exit points from the waste transfer building(s), all other doors in ~~these~~ building(s) shall be kept closed where possible. The licensee shall ensure that the doors to the biowaste reception building remain closed at all times other than to facilitate the delivery/removal of wastes from the building.

- iii. The last line of Schedule D: Specified Engineering Works should be amended as the text is repeated. This suggestion does not change the meaning of the licence.

Recommendation: Amend Schedule D: Specified Engineering Works – Last line as follows:

Any other works notified in writing by the Agency. ~~Any other works notified in writing by the Agency.~~

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 Decision, and
- (iii) subject to the amendments proposed in this report.

Signed

Stuart Huskisson, Inspector,
for and on behalf of the Technical Committee