

DECISION DOCUMENT RECORDING DETERMINATION OF AN APPLICATION FOR A PPC PERMIT

PART A – INTRODUCTION

A1: Administrative Information

- Operator: **AIRBUS UK Limited**
- Installation: **Broughton Aircraft Works**
- Permit Number: **BM3965**
- Account Manager: **Jim Morris**
- Permit Team: **Mike Hughes**
- Permit Administrator: **Elaine Frankland**
- Components: **5**
- Fee: **£27625**

- Status Log

Detail	Date	Comment
Application BM3965	Received 24/05/02	Duly made 06/06/02
Response to Schedule 4 Information Notice	Request dated 13/09/02	Response dated 18/09/02
Request by Agency to extend determination from 06/10/02 to 31/10/02	Request dated 25/09/02	Request accepted 03/10/02
Request by Agency to extend determination from 31/10/02 to 15/11/02	Request dated 28/10/02	Request accepted 05/11/02

A2: Regulatory History

The installation has not been regulated by the Agency under the EPA 90 or the PPC Regs. The surface coating processes were regulated by Flintshire County Council under EPA 90.

The Application resulted from substantial change to an existing installation. There are proposed additions to the combustion plant and new surface treating plant. The new surface treatment plant involved 9 new tanks each having a capacity of 300 m³, well over the Regulation threshold of 30m³ in aggregate. The new combustion plant totalled 40 MW, close to the threshold of 50 MW and involved new equipment, the use of gas engine driven CHP plant. The applicant expressed a wish to apply for a permit covering the complete installation, rather than just the substantially varied section. The Agency accepted this. The other two permit holders agreed to follow the Airbus lead.

Superseded Licenses/Consents/Authorisations relating to this installation

Issued By	Reference Number	Date of Issue
Flintshire County Council	PP/0036	5-7-1995
Environment Agency	CG0333801	12-5-1999

A3: Determination Procedure

- The Application was advertised in the London Gazette and the Chester Chronicle on 12 July 2002.
- Note types of statutory consultees
The Application correctly identified the following statutory consultees:
 - Flintshire County Council
 - North Wales Health Authority
 - United Utilities
 - CCW
 - Food Standards Agency
 - The National Assembly Government (for the Secretary of State)In addition the following were consulted:
 - English Nature
- Copies of the Application were sent to all consultees on 7 June 2002
- It was not considered necessary to undertake any extended consultation.
- Appendix Part D contains a summary of consultee responses received.
- Additional information was provided by Airbus on 27 August and 19 September, following discussions with Airbus and Parsons Brinkerhoff. The additional information was copied to all consultees.
- A sch-4 notice was issued on 13 September 2002 and the response was received on 18 September 2002. The response was copied to all consultees.

A4: Consideration of Regulation 10(3) and 10(4)

Regulation 10(3): Competence

The Regulations require that the Agency is satisfied the applicant is the person who will have control over the operation of the installation and that he will be able to operate the installation so as to comply with the conditions which would be included in the permit.

- Airbus UK Ltd (the Applicant) is the owner and operator of the installation. The holding company is Airbus SAS, registered in France. Airbus UK is able to operate in accordance with the conditions of the Permit.
- Airbus UK Ltd (the Applicant) will operate the installation so as to comply with the conditions.

Regulation 10(4): Requirements for specified waste management activities

The Regulations require that for these activities the operator must be a fit and proper person and planning permission must be in force.

- There are no specified waste management activities being carried on in the installation. Latest guidance from DEFRA specifically excludes effluent treatment plant from being classified a SWMA.

PART B – DETERMINATION OF PERMIT CONDITIONS

B1: Part I of the Permit

Part 1 of the Permit deals with the activities comprised in the installation and its geographical extent.

Condition 1.1.1: The Permitted Installation

The definition of “installation” is contained in R2 of the Regulations and Government guidance on its interpretation is provided in “IPPC: A Practical Guide”.

- *Assessment of response to Question B1.1*
A revised answer to question B1.1 was submitted on 6 June 2002, the duly made day. This correctly described the Installation. The installation comprises the whole process of the manufacture of aircraft wings and components, from the delivery of raw materials, to the despatch of the completed wings. Wing parts are shipped out either by a specially adapted aircraft or in future will also be shipped by road transport and barge. The aircraft movements are not regulated by this permit. The movement of road vehicles on site is controlled by the permit.
- *Explanation of permit table 1.1.1 provisions*
The various activities making up the installation are described in Table 1.1.1. The specified activities are Combustion plant, which consists of approximately 80 dispersed units, the surface treating plant, consisting of three separate lines and the surface coating plant again consisting of three separate lines. The associated activities are the component machining, grit blasting, component assembly using autoclave adhesive techniques and the effluent treatment plants associated with each surface treatment line.
- *Explanation of the first table on page (iv), of the Permit Introduction.*
There are three operators of parts of the installation. The majority is under the control of Airbus UK, including some of the combustion plant, all the surface treatment and coating plant, the effluent treatment plant and most of the wing manufacturing. The CHP plant is operated by Stiell UK Ltd and supplies heat and power to Airbus. There is an associated activity carried out by Metal Improvement Company. This involves the treatment of metal surfaces by shot blasting, to shape the surface and to condition it by producing indents, which increase the resistance of the surface to tension cracking. MIC also operate a small space heating plant which is part of the installation but is considered to have an insignificant environmental impact.
- *In the case of a multi-permit installation, confirmation that the permits adequately cover the whole installation but that there is no duplication.*
The whole installation is covered by the three permits and there is no overlap of any of the activities.

Condition 1.1.2: The Permit Plan/Site Report

The permit plan/site report area should include all the land over which any of the activities comprised within the installation (or the part of it that is applied for) may take place. The site report submitted with the application should be satisfactory

- *Assessment of response to Question B1.*

A number of plans have been provided, which together adequately show the boundaries of the installation, the boundaries between the different activities operated by the three permit holders and the location of the activities and the release points from the installation.

The original Phase 1a report was followed up by an intrusive Phase 1b survey. The results of that survey concluded that there are elevated levels of contaminants present, but they are localised in particular “hot spots” around the Airbus site. There do not appear to be any areas of the site that have potential contaminants present, where the levels of those contaminants warrant immediate action. The targeted sampling regime conducted, appears to be reasonable, to establish the level and spread of those contaminants across the site, associated with historic activities, or uncontrolled spillages and events.

Condition 1.1.3: Pre-operation conditions

Regulation 12(9)(d) allows the imposition of conditions in respect of “steps to be taken prior to the operation of the installation”.

- *Explanation of whether conditions have been imposed in respect of “steps to be taken prior to the operation of the installation”.*

The installation is existing and being substantially changed. The permit regulates the whole of the substantially changed installation. It is not considered necessary to impose any pre-operation conditions.

B2: Part 2 of the Permit

General Note – for Parts 2 and 6 of the Permit

The determination of BAT under Regulation 3 should be based on an assessment of a range of techniques for the prevention or reduction of emissions from the installation, taking account of their “costs and advantages” and considering in particular, the factors set out in Schedule 2 of the Regulations. When setting emission limit values (“ELVs”) based on BAT, the technical characteristics of the particular installation, its geographical location and the local environmental conditions” (R12(6)), should also be considered. Consideration should also be given to whether any EC EQSs “require” stricter ELV’s to be imposed (R12(7)). This will depend on the extent to which the proposals contribute to any breach or overloading of an EQS (see IPPC: A Practical Guide). In addition to the requirement to set ELV’s or “equivalent parameters or technical measures” based on BAT the PPC Regulations require a consideration of whether it is also appropriate to set further conditions to deliver the general principles described in Regulation 11 and the particular matters identified in Regulation 12(9).

Any Technical Guidance which is available for an IPPC sector will have already involved a BAT assessment, based on the above principles, sufficient to set indicative BAT standards in terms of both ELVs/benchmarks and the technical measures which underpin them. The same is true for the cross-sectoral “General Technical Guidance”. Considerable research and consultation on these assessments will have been undertaken at both European (in terms of the development of the BREFS) and UK levels. The Technical Guidance (section 2) divides the techniques, measures and issues to be considered in determining an IPPC application into 16 main sections. The IPPC application form also requires applicants to provide information on the proposals for their installation in accordance with these 16 subject areas. Operators are required to address all of the issues set out in the relevant sections of the Technical Guidance in each case and to justify their proposals against any indicative requirements contained in the Guidance and against the other requirements of the Regulations.

The conditions in Part 2 of the permit also mirror these 16 subject areas and the text below addresses each condition in turn, highlighting the particular parts of the PPC Regulations which are being addressed in each case, and recording the Agency’s assessment of the relevant part of the application and reasoning for the imposition of conditions in each case.

Condition 2.1: Management Techniques

Management techniques are one of the available techniques for emission prevention and control and are therefore part of the determination of BAT for the installation.

- *Assessment of response to Question B2.1*
Quality control of the manufacturing process is required by the Civil Aviation Authority, who regulate the manufacture under a series of protocols which are audited by the CAA. The standard is JAR-21 which is the equivalent of ISO 9000.

Airbus are working to have in place an EMS in accordance with ISO 14001, which should be in place early 2003 and subject to independent external auditing from that time. An Improvement Condition has been inserted to require this.

- *Explanation of permit table 2.1.1*
No further explanation is considered necessary.
- *Explanation of any additional conditions (i.e. 2.1.6/7)*
No additional conditions have been added.

Condition 2.2: Raw Materials (including water)

The use of raw materials and water are some of the available techniques for emission prevention and control and are therefore part of the determination of BAT for the installation. "The consumption and nature of raw materials (including water) used in the process" is also one of factors which is considered in determining which of the other available techniques for prevention and control of emissions are BAT (see Schedule 2 of the Regulations).

- *Assessment of response to Question B2.2*
The manufacturing operations are heavily regulated by the Civil Aviation Authority and this regulation specifies many of the raw materials which may be used. There are international programmes to research less hazardous materials and Airbus are involved in this process. The main issues are the use of VOC in surface cleaning and coating operations and the use of chromium in the surface treatment. The use of VOC in paints is minimised by the use of compliant paints, which meet the requirements of the Secretary of State's Guidance, PG6/40. The use of chromates is to be eliminated in Airbus manufacture by 2008. An improvement condition has been inserted requiring a report on progress to be submitted to the Agency every two years.
There is an ongoing programme for the monitoring of water consumption, which forms part of the EMS.
The usage of raw materials, together with the ongoing minimisation programmes is considered to be BAT
- *Explanation of permit table 2.2.1*
No further explanation is considered necessary.
- *Explanation of any additional conditions (i.e. 2.2.2)*
No further explanation is considered necessary.

Condition 2.3: Techniques for Prevention and Control of Emissions and Waste ("operating techniques")

The design of the installation and operating techniques proposed will be key techniques for emission prevention and control and are therefore part of the determination of BAT for the installation. Regulation 12(9) also requires a consideration of appropriate conditions for the "minimisation of long distance and transboundary pollution"; ensuring "appropriate protection of the soil and groundwater"; and for "periods when the installation is not operating normally, including start-up, leaks and malfunctions and momentary stoppages". Conditions imposed under 2.3; in conjunction with those imposed under 6 ahead, secure these aims.

- *Assessment of response to Question B2.3*

In general the installation and specifically that part of it operated by Airbus is considered to be employing BAT, with a few Improvement conditions. These will ensure that the improvements are introduced in accordance with a timetable which is BAT, considering the age of the plant. Specific comments are given below for the main activities.

1-Surface Treatment

The surface treatment process is regulated very heavily by the CAA and changes can therefore only be implemented after extensive research. The existing and new processes use chrome anodising as the basis and this is currently the only available technique. International efforts are being directed to find alternatives, with the aim of phasing out the use of chrome in the aircraft construction industry and it is the aim of Airbus to achieve this by 2008. The change over from chrome anodising is due to take place in 2005. The anodising vats are fitted with air extraction and the exhaust air is passed through scrubbers prior to discharge to atmosphere.

- *Explanation of permit table 2.3.1*

No further explanation is considered necessary.

- *Explanation of any additional conditions (i.e. 2.3.2)*

No further explanation is considered necessary.

Condition 2.4: Groundwater Regulations 1998

A PPC permit should not be issued unless the relevant requirements of the Groundwater Regulations have been met.

- *Assessment of response to Question B2.4.*

The response to question 2.4 is appropriately and adequately addressed in sections 2.4.2. to 2.4.12 of the application. The main conclusions are that there is a potential for in-direct discharges into groundwater from non-associated activities, such as the airfield. There is also a potential discharge from the use of septic tanks in parts of the complex. The commitment to phase out the use of septic tanks at Airbus, will result in the elimination of any potential discharges from these sources. Only one septic tank remains in use at the time of issue. The identification of potential fugitive releases from tanks and vessels is more akin to the sections on accidents and emergencies. However, the hazards presented have all been identified, and improvement plans are proposed where it is considered necessary, although risk has not been properly quantified in all cases. This only relates to potential accidental releases and not deliberate discharges.

- *Explanation of permit table 2.4.1.*

The commitment to reduce the reliance upon septic tanks is identified within additional correspondence dated 22nd August 2002 (item 32). Only one of the three septic tanks at Airbus remains in use. Improvements are planned.

- *Explanation of any additional conditions (i.e. 2.4.2 and/or 6.2.5).*

No further conditions considered necessary

Condition 2.5: Waste Handling and Storage

Waste handling and storage techniques are some of the available techniques for emission prevention and control and are therefore part of the determination of BAT for the installation. Regulation 12(9)(b) also requires consideration of appropriate conditions for the management of waste generated by the installation.

- *Assessment of response to Question B2.5*

Each of the waste streams are identified, and segregated and stored appropriately, pending their off-site recovery or disposal.

- *Explanation of permit table 2.5.1*

No further explanation is considered necessary.

- *Explanation of any additional conditions (e.g. 2.5.2/2.5.3)*

No additional conditions are considered necessary.

Condition 2.6: Waste Recovery and Disposal

Regulation 11 requires a consideration of appropriate conditions to ensure that "waste production is avoided or where waste is produced it is recovered where technically and economically possible, or if not disposed of while avoiding or reducing any impact of the environment".

- *Assessment of response to Question B2.6.*

Segregation of waste streams wherever possible maximises the recovery potential for the waste streams. The fiscal value of some of the waste streams e.g. swarf is also a financial driver and materials of fiscal value are therefore recovered. The increased levels of co-operation throughout the installation, and performance review and target setting for minimisation and recovery of wastes, means that streams are identified and minimised wherever possible, and managed in accordance with the recognised waste hierarchy. This is explained in detail at several stages within the application, and accords with best practice.

- *Explanation of permit table 2.6.1*

No further explanation is considered necessary.

- *Explanation of any additional conditions (i.e. 2.6.2).*

No additional conditions are considered necessary.

Condition 2.7: Energy Efficiency

The efficient use of energy would be an available technique for the prevention and reduction of emissions (i.e. a BAT technique). Energy efficiency is also one of the factors listed in Schedule 2 which should be taken into account in determining which is the best of the range of techniques for prevention and reduction of emissions. In addition Regulation 11 requires appropriate conditions to be imposed in order to secure that "energy is used efficiently". However, in the case of installations which are the subject of climate change levy or trading agreements, some of these requirements are met through those agreements and not through permit conditions.

- *Assessment of response to Question B2.7*

The response to question 2.7 provides comprehensive information regarding the energy consumption on the installation, including the parts operated by Airbus and Stiell. Some clarification and resubmission of the data was required. Airbus provided specific energy consumption figures based on electricity consumption

only, revised figures were needed to include oil and gas consumption. These were obtained through a Sch-4 notice issued on 13 September, the response being received on 18 September. The main work to decrease energy consumption lies with the expansion programme, which involves the replacement of the centralised boiler plant with dedicated heater units, using CHP where practicable. A number of energy efficiency measures have been identified in an energy management plan. An implementation timetable was required and was obtained through the sch4 notice. The use of energy, combined with the improvement programme is considered to be BAT. There is no climate change levy agreement.

- *Explanation of permit table 2.7.1*
No explanation is considered necessary.
- *Explanation of any additional conditions (i.e. 2.7.2)*
No explanation considered necessary.

Condition 2.8: Accidents

Regulation 11 requires the consideration of appropriate conditions to secure "the necessary measures are taken to prevent accidents and limit their consequences".

- *Assessment of response to Question B2.8*
Airbus have an accident management plan which identifies the hazards, assesses the risks and identifies the techniques for reducing the risk. The AMP is part of a documented procedure, part of the site environmental management system. I believe the system provides for adequate identification of hazards and the techniques to minimise their environmental impact. This meets the requirements of the IPPC General Sector Guidance (IPPC S0.01) and is considered to be BAT.
- *Explanation of permit table 2.8.1.*
No explanation considered necessary.
- *Explanation of any additional conditions (i.e. 2.8.2)*
No explanation considered necessary.

Condition 2.9: Noise and Vibration

Noise is defined as an emission in the Regulations and therefore BAT should be used to prevent or reduce noise and vibration.

- *Assessment of response to Question B2.9.*
A Technical Report establishing baseline noise levels was received by the Agency on 18th September 2002. This Report raises some issues which merit further discussions and investigations, which have been initially progressed with Flintshire County Council, w/c 14/10/2002. These issues centre around a possible conflict between theoretical noise calculations for the planning consent, and the data established by baseline monitoring. Further information has since been received from Airbus on 22nd October 2002. Although indicative noise limits for the installation can be produced, these cannot currently be verified. Consequently, it has been proposed that a rolling program of monitoring is introduced at the site, and from that a profile and limit of actual achievable noise levels is set. The current Planning noise limits have been imposed on the new works and improvement conditions have been imposed to ensure the necessary monitoring is

carried out. The site has a low record of complaints, with only two in the last 12 months, both relating to aircraft movements on the airfield, which is not part of this installation and is not covered by this permit. A number of environmental activists are aware of the possible issue of a PPC Permit and that the permit will include conditions to regulate noise from the Installation. We anticipate an increase in the number of complaints. An improvement condition requires Airbus to have in place a robust procedure for handling complaints.

- Explanation of permit table 2.9.1.
No further explanation is considered necessary.
- Explanation of any additional conditions (i.e. 2.9.2)

The introduction of noise limits should be considered after the permit is issued, and once the audit monitoring at the installation is carried out.

- Explanation of any noise limits set in Condition 6.6.
The noise limits set in conditions 6.6.1 and 6.6.2 are those imposed in the Planning permission for the new manufacturing facilities on the site. They are considered to be the most appropriate limits, pending the results of further noise monitoring as the new facilities are commissioned.

Condition 2.10: Monitoring and Sampling

Regulation 12(9)(f) requires consideration of appropriate conditions to address "emission monitoring requirements specifying measurement methodology, frequency and evaluation procedure". Conditions 2.10.2 and 2.10.3 set standard requirements for provision of access to sampling/monitoring points for the Agency. These conditions are considered to be appropriate in terms of this Regulatory requirement.

- Assessment of response to Question B2.10.

Paint booths

The usage of the paint booths is very intermittent and the use of abatement equipment such as incinerators is not considered to be BAT. Paint particles are removed by the use of disposable dry filters. VOX emissions are minimised by the use of low solvent paints, as set out in the Secretary Of States Guidance PG 6/40. The installations are prescribed under the Solvents Emissions Directive, which requires an ELV of 50 mgC/NM3 for painting and 50 for curing. Extractive monitoring is carried out annually. Visual and olfactory checks are carried out daily.

Chrome Anodising and ET plants

Extractive monitoring is carried out annually. The pH of the scrubber liquor is checked every day. Visual and olfactory checks are also carried out daily.

Combustion Plant

The majority of the combustion plant is very small scale gas fired and does not warrant continuous monitoring. Annual performance checks, including combustion quality check will be carried out. The three large (7.5MW) boilers are fitted with oxygen trim control and will be fitted with continuous oxygen monitoring equipment. The monitoring of emissions of oxides of nitrogen will be carried out annually.

Further noise monitoring will be carried out as part of a rolling annual program, as outlined in the Application, together with specific exercises as part of complaint investigations, and monitoring to audit compliance with any set levels.

- *Explanation of permit table 2.10.1.*
No further explanation is considered necessary.
- *Explanation of any additional conditions (i.e. 2.10.4).*
An improvement condition has been inserted, requiring a full review of all monitoring, for all emissions, following on from an assessment of actual releases based on the first 6 months operation of the installation, including the substantially changed sections. This condition has also been imposed on the other Operators.
Specific achievable noise limits can only be set for the whole installation after completion of commissioning and after further monitoring exercises have been undertaken at the installation. This is likely to lead to the insertion of a specific improvement condition for monitoring.

Condition 2.11: Decommissioning

The Regulations require consideration of appropriate conditions in terms of steps to be taken after the definitive cessation of operations at the installation (Regulation 12(9)(d)) and steps that will help to ensure that "upon the definitive cessation of activities the necessary measure are taken to avoid any pollution risk and to return the site of the installation to a satisfactory state" (Regulation 11).

- *Assessment of response to Question B2.11.*
A site closure plan is included in the Application, together with a commitment to maintain this in an up to date form during the life of the Installation. The site report will also be updated and will form part of the decision making for the site closure plan. This is considered to be BAT and condition 2.11.2 has been inserted to confirm the requirement for updating. The Phase 1b report provides sufficient coverage to ensure that contamination and deterioration issues that occur as a result of the authorised activities, are quantified, and any necessary remediation can be carried out.
- *Explanation of permit table 2.11.1.*
No further explanation is considered necessary
- *Explanation of any additional conditions (i.e. 2.11.2).*
No further explanation is considered necessary

Condition 2.12: Consideration of Multi Operator Installations

Where there is more than one operator in an installation it may be appropriate to set additional conditions to secure the satisfactory operation of the installation as a whole.

- *Assessment of response to Question B2.12*
The three Applications cover the whole installation, without any gaps or overlaps. To ensure that the installation continues to operate as a coherent unit monthly meetings are held by representatives of Airbus, Stiell and MIC.
- *Explanation of permit table 2.12.1*
No further explanation is considered necessary.
- *Explanation of any additional conditions (i.e. 2.12.2)*
This condition has been inserted to ensure that all three operators have a common commitment to the monthly meeting proposed by Airbus.

B3: Part 3 – 5 of the Permit

General Note

Parts 3 to 5 of the permit contain mainly standard conditions on records, reporting and notification. There are no specific application questions on these subjects so no assessment of the application is recorded in this part of the decision document.

Condition 3: Records

Effective record keeping is considered to be one of the management techniques for emission prevention and control. The permit contains standard conditions (3.1.1 to 3.1.7) for record keeping which are all considered to be appropriate BAT conditions, in this respect.

- *Explanation of any additional non-standard conditions included in the permit.*
There are no additional conditions.

Condition 4: Reporting

Regulation 12(9)(f) requires consideration of appropriate conditions in respect of the reporting of monitoring results. The permit contains standard reporting conditions which are considered appropriate in this regard.

- *Explanation of any additional non-standard conditions included in the permit.*
Condition 4.1.6 requires annual reporting of energy consumption.

Condition 5: Notification

Regulation 12(9)(f) requires consideration of appropriate conditions for notification of incidents or accidents which may cause significant pollution. The permit contains standard notification requirements which are considered appropriate in this regard.

- *Explanation of any additional non-standard conditions included in the permit.*
No additional Notification conditions are considered necessary.

B4: Parts 6 – 10 of the Permit

General Note

Part 6 of the permit contains conditions which are ELVs for the purposes of the Regulations and Part 9 is the improvement programme. The substance of the rationale for these two sections may appear more fully in section B2.3 above. Part 8 allows for the imposition of off-site conditions.

Condition 6: Emissions

The Regulations require PPC permits to contain emission limit values for emissions based on BAT, the technical characteristics of the particular installation, its geographical location and the local environmental conditions. Analysis of the techniques which are being permitted for this installation on the basis of BAT is contained in Section B2 (and particularly B2.3), of this document. The ELVs imposed in Section 6 of the permit are based on the techniques considered to meet the requirements of the Regulations, however the Agency's assessment of the applicant's environmental assessments carried out in response to questions B3, 4 and 5 is also key to determining BAT for both the ELVs and the underpinning techniques. ELVs (and potentially other conditions) may also be affected by other legal requirements, which are also assessed below. (See also the General Note to Part 2).

PPC Environmental Assessment

- *Assessment of responses to Question B3.1 and B4.1 having regard to the benchmark ELVs in the relevant technical guidance and the requirements of R12(6).*

There are 68 items of combustion plant within the Airbus activities and an additional two as part of the expansion project. In addition Stiell will be

operating 14 items as part of their activity. The MIC activities include 12 small space heating units.

Dispersion modelling has been carried out by Airbus and submitted as appendix 9 of their Application, covering the whole Installation. In order to simplify the modelling, those units having a heat release of less than 0.5 MW have been ignored. I consider this approach to be justifiable and proportionate. The IPC regulations (SI472) excluded plant having a capacity of less than 3 MW from the aggregation rules and the PPC Regulations exclude waste burning combustion equipment rated less than 0.4 MW from the Part B. Most of the smaller combustion equipment is gas fired, with 3 units being gas oil fired, and the units omitted from the modelling have a total heat input of 6.5MW, or about 8% of the total. A condition has been inserted requiring the Operators to maintain an up to date inventory of all combustion equipment forming part of their activities.

The dispersion modelling shows that the impact of the installation will meet the requirements of the AQS, including the guidelines for the protection of vegetation. A review of the ambient air quality, including the existing Airbus installation, shows that there are no exceedences of the AQS guidelines in the vicinity of the installation. The annual average PC is currently 1.05 microgrammes/m³ and the expected is 1.76 microgrammes/m³. This is a low percentage of the guideline figures of 30 for the protection of vegetation and 40 for human health.

Emission Limit Values have been applied to the larger boilers for the emissions of NO_x.

ELV's have been set for the release of VOC's in the exhaust from the combined paint spray booths and curing ovens. The monitoring shows a wide variation, from 3-45 mg/m³. The limit has therefore been set at 50, which is in accordance with the Solvents Emissions Directive.

- Record consideration of R12(7) (i.e. EC EQSs).

The operation of the installation will not result in any exceedance of any Air Quality Objective Levels, as set out in the Air Quality (Wales) Regulations 2000.

- Record consideration of the requirements of R12(9)(a),(b) and (c).

There are no issues of transboundary or long distance pollution resulting from the operation of the installation.

The conditions in the Permit will provide for adequate protection of the soil and groundwater and will ensure appropriate management of waste generated by the installation.

The potential for abnormal operation has been considered and there are no issues of pollution resulting from abnormal operation of the installation.

- Record consideration of the obligation under EA95 S81 to have regard to the National Air Quality Strategy.

See notes above regarding the Air Quality (Wales) Regulations 2000.

- Explanation of the ELVs set in section 6, having regard to the techniques identified in the conditions set in section 2, all of the above considerations and demonstrating that the overall determination satisfies the general principles in R11(2).

See notes above. The conditions in the Permit will ensure that all appropriate measures are taken against pollution and that BAT is applied.

Waste Management Licensing Regulations 1994

The “relevant objectives” of the 1994 Regulations will apply to any PPC installation which involves the recovery or disposal of controlled waste within the meaning of the Regulations.

- *Assessment of response to Question B4.2.*

The response to question 4.2 and the descriptions of waste storage and handling methods in sections 2.5 and 2.6 of the application demonstrate that the relevant objectives in the 1994 Regulations have been appropriately considered

- *Explanation of any additional conditions imposed in this respect.*

No further conditions considered necessary

The Conservation (Natural Habitats etc) Regulations 1994

These Regulations impose various requirements in respect of the consideration of the impact of any proposals on a European site.

- *Assessment of response to Question B4.3.*

The Application identified the relevant European sites

The Dee Estuary

The River Dee

The Deeside and Buckley Newt Sites.

The Dispersion modelling submitted with the Application shows that the existing and the substantially changed Activities have the potential to only contribute a small percentage to the overall concentration of oxides of nitrogen in the atmosphere. Similarly the impact on acidification and dry deposition of NO_x is also a small percentage of the existing background.

The existing background ambient concentrations are below the Air Quality Strategy objectives for the protection of vegetation.

An Appendix 11 was completed and forwarded to CCW who signed it off and returned it to the Agency on 14 November 2002. The operation of the Installation is not likely to have a significant effect on any European sites.

- *Explanation of any additional conditions imposed in this respect.*

No conditions considered necessary

Consideration of a relevant environmental statement

The Regulations require consideration of “relevant information obtained or conclusion arrived at pursuant to Articles 5,6 and 7 of the EA Directive”.

- *Assessment of response to Question B5.*

The development of the installation was not subject to a requirement for an environmental statement under Council Directive 85/337/EEC on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment.

- *Explanation of any additional conditions imposed in this respect.*

Condition 7: Transfer to Effluent Treatment Plant

The use of an ETP will be one of the operating techniques for emission prevention and control. The applicant's proposals concerning any ETP will have been assessed under condition 2.3 above. However, additional specific conditions concerning transfers to ETPs may be included here.

- Explanation of any conditions imposed in section 7.
No conditions were considered necessary.

Condition 8: Off-Site Conditions

Regulation 12(12) allows for the imposition of off-site conditions, subject to compensation in accordance with the provisions of Schedule 6.

- Explanation of any off-site conditions set.
No conditions were considered necessary.

Condition 9: Improvement Programme

In the case of existing installations which are considered to meet the requirements of the Regulations at this time but which require improvement in the future in order to continue to meet the requirements over time, the use of improvement conditions will be appropriate.

- Explanation of any additional improvement conditions imposed.

9.1	Requires a report on the establishment of an EMS
9.2	Requires the implementation of an EMS
9.3	Requires a review of the monitoring programme, as equipment is commissioned and following the commissioning monitoring programme.
9.4	Requires proposals for a noise monitoring protocol, including locations, to be agreed with the Agency and FCC
9.5	Requires a programme for implementation of noise reduction measures identified in the Application.
9.6	Requires an agreed procedure for the handling of noise complaints.
9.7	Requires background noise monitoring exercises to be carried out during the Christmas shut down.
9.8	Requires an upgrade of the oil and hazardous waste storage facilities.
9.9	Requires the chrome elimination programme to be carried out, with reports to be submitted to the Agency

B5: Other Requirements That May Lead To The Imposition of Conditions

General Note

Certain other legislative requirements need to be assessed and may lead to the imposition of conditions. These are recorded below.

Secretary of State Directions relating to Directives

A Direction has been made under the PPC Regulations by the Secretary of State in order to require the Agency to comply with Directions that have been made under EPA 90 S7(2)(b), for the implementation of community environmental obligations. Record if any Directions apply to the installation and explain how the requirements have been met in applicable cases.

- There are no known relevant Directions made under the PPC Regulations that apply to the Activities carried on in the Installation.

Environment Act 1995 – Section 4 (Pursuit of Sustainable Development)

Record how this has been addressed.

Consideration has been given as to whether any additional requirements should be imposed in terms of the Agency's duty to contribute to sustainable development under section 4 of the Environment Act 95. No further conditions were considered necessary to secure compliance with this section of EA95. The use of BAT is seen to contribute to sustainable development in the Agency document "Introductory Guidance on the Agency's Contribution to Sustainable development.

Environment Act 1995 – Section 7 (Pursuit of Conservation Objectives)

- *Record how this has been addressed.*

Consideration has been given as to whether any additional requirements should be imposed in terms of the Agency's duty to have regard to the various conservation objectives set out in Section 7 of EA95, but it is considered that existing requirements are sufficient in this regard and no other appropriate requirements have been identified. Conservation issues relevant under the Conservation (Natural Habitats etc) Regulations 1994 have been considered elsewhere in this document.

Human Rights Act 1998

The Act requires that decisions of public authorities such as the Agency do not breach the Human Rights of any person.

- *Explain consideration of Human Rights issues, if appropriate.*

No written representations were received on behalf of the operator, members of the public or other persons in relation to the permit application. The conditions of the permit are considered to accord with the statutory requirements described in this document, and there is no known reason to suggest any breach of the Human Rights Act.

PART C – CONCLUSION

- *Summarise the reasons for a grant subject to conditions or a refusal.*
The part of the Installation operated by Airbus UK Limited should be permitted subject to the conditions included in the permit, which secure the use of the Best Available Techniques (BAT) and the other requirements of the PPC Regulations. There are no reasons to suggest the operator will not be able to comply with the conditions of the permit.

J I Morris
Account Manager

M E Cox
Team Leader Regulatory (PTR/RSR)

Date: 15 November 2002.

Date: 15 November 2002

PART D - APPENDIX

Table of representations received and responses showing how they have been addressed.

CONSULTEE	RESPONSE	NOTES
Members of the Public	None	
Food Standards Agency	a) Requested clarification of the date for phasing out of chrome. b) Could not find the non-technical summary	a) The phase out deadline for chrome in all manufacturing is 2008. The deadline for eliminating chrome usage in anodising is 2005.
Hyder Welsh Water	Informed the Agency that no comments would be forthcoming.	
Countryside Council for Wales	a) Agrees that the releases of NO _x appear to be acceptable, but are unclear about the combination effects.	a) The measured background concentrations include the effect of all other emitters in the area.
English Nature	Informed the Agency that no comments would be forthcoming.	
Flintshire County Council	a) Possible need for noise monitoring near Glynne Arms. b) Suggestion for on site noise monitoring to identify areas for improvement c) Noise monitoring programme required d) Confirmed that the VOC minimisation was by the use of compliant coatings	a) Will be reviewed as part of overall review of noise monitoring. b) Covered in Noise Management Plan c) Included in Improvement Programme d) No comments
North Wales Health Authority	Informed the Agency that no comments would be forthcoming.	After further discussion they advised that this was because they considered there to be no significant public health implications associated with the Installation.
National Assembly Government	No response	