

Environmental Permitting: pre-application discussion

Record of pre-application discussion

Operator name:	Kronospan Ltd
Facility name and/or address:	Holyhead Road Chirk Wrexham LL14 5NT
Case Reference:	XP3830HX EA/EPR/BW99999IG/V005.
Date/s of discussion/s:	

Record of officer/s carrying out pre-application discussions

Name:	Julia Frost
Job title:	RCLO
Office:	Buckley
Contact number:	726 4558
Date form completed:	11 th Aug 2010

Name:	Neil Taunt
Job title:	Technical Specialist, Development and Flood Risk
Office:	Buckley
Contact number:	
Date form completed:	

****Please ensure this document is saved to EDRM ****

Issues to discuss (See <u>Operational instruction</u> topic sections)
<p>What is the boundary of the facility?</p> <p><i>No change</i></p>
<p>Is it likely to be a high public interest application?:</p> <p><i>Although Kronospan is a SHPI I do not believe that this application needs to be advertised anywhere. The change is to install a new lagoon with a potential to link into the existing lagoons and discharge to the surface water. The proposal has been discussed at the liaison meeting.</i></p>
<p>Are there any confidentiality or national security issues:</p> <p><i>N/A</i></p>
<p>What are the key priorities for this type of facility:</p> <p><i>I believe that this application is a simple standard (minor technical) variation.</i></p> <p><i>The regulation at Kronospan is split between EA and WCBC as the result of a Direction by the SoS. The surface water discharge from the site is included in the EA Environmental Permit as a directly associated activity. The majority of the site drainage comes from the part of the site that is regulated by WCBC.</i></p> <p><i>As part of a bigger project the Operator is proposing to re-profile the log yard and install an additional lagoon. (Long term there is a possibility that the whole of the log yard will be concreted).</i></p> <p><i>A variation to the permit is required as there is a link between the new lagoon and the existing lagoon. There is therefore a potential for the surface water collected in the new lagoon to enter controlled water. This would be via the existing emission point.</i></p> <p><i>Main priorities are the discharge to controlled water and the issues associated with flood risk. What EMS procedures exist to cover this change on site?</i></p> <p><i>Variation needs to acknowledge potential for an increase in the discharge. Also need to consider whether we need to impose any control over how the surface water is managed at logyard / new lagoon (ie maintaining levels to ensure there is enough capacity in the new lagoon for an increased rainfall event).</i></p> <p>Please call Julia Frost to discuss during the determination stage and ensure area are given an opportunity to comment on the draft variation.</p>
<p>Any other issues discussed:</p> <p><i>A number of comments were made by JF and NT on the draft variation application that was made. Copies of these comments are attached.</i></p> <p><i>JF main concern related to the sizing of the lagoon and whether it was adequate.</i></p> <p><i>Based on the information provided it would appear that....</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. The discharge from the logyard into the existing lagoon is gravity fed. The discharge is restricted to 224l/s by the sizing of the pipe. Any rain fall above this rate would be held back on the log yard (there is a retaining wall around part of the lagoon). The log yard is designed to retain up to 900m³.</i> <i>2. The risk from an off site flooding point of view appears to be minimised and excess rainfall will be retained within the logyard.</i> <i>3. Under normal conditions the water collected from the log yard will be discharged into the new lagoon, treated and re-used on site.</i> <i>4. During extended periods of heavy rain there may be a discharge, by gravity, from the new</i>

lagoon into the existing lagoons.

Recording time spent on pre-application discussions			
Date	Officer name	Summary of information provided and issues discussed	Time (hours)
25/3	JF	Operator outlined proposals associated with the rail siding project. Advised that as there was a potential discharge to controlled waters from new lagoon a variation would be required Operator advised me that there were no planning requirements associated with proposal.	0.5
13/4	JF	Advised that the variation likely to be simple standard. Requested lagoon sizing calculations. After this meeting a number of emails were received with information relating to the project but not the sizing calculations.	1
13/7	JF	Draft variation application received which included the sizing calculations (this is the first time these had been supplied even though they were requested in April. A number of comments were made by JF on these (copies attached). NT was also asked to comment on the basis of the sizing and design of the lagoon from a flood risk point of view.	7
16/8	JF	Comments back based on revised information submitted by Giffords	3
6/10	JF	Updated contents of variation discussed with Operator. A few minor points were raised. These will be addressed and application likely to be submitted at the end of this week. Appendix I states it is CiC. The Operator has said that this is not the case and he will include within the application that he is happy for the content to be placed on the PR. Operator aware of fee and number of copies to provide Neil Taunt confirmed he was happy with the content.	1

Charging for pre-application discussions	Y or N	Date
Pre-application time exceeds 15 hours?	N	
Standard letter sent explaining need to commence charging?		
If no, decision made not to charge? Provide written justification for decision.		
Operator agreement to charging received and filed?		
If no, ceased pre-application discussion?		

