

Please note – this document is to assist in making a decision  
and may not necessarily cover all information required  
See [TGN8.01](#) for all required information

Details	
Deployment Reference Number:	PAN-015178
Permit Reference Number:	EPR-GP3792SK
Permit Holder:	ByProduct Recovery Ltd.
Site Address:	Farchwel, Talybont, Conwy, LL32 8UY
Grid Reference:	<p>Farm location: SH 7668 7005</p> <p>Fields:</p> <p>Field 1 - SH 7695 7071 - Coordinates (x,y): 276950, 370710</p> <p>Field 2 - SH 7707 7065 - Coordinates (x,y): 277070, 370650</p> <p>Field 3 - SH 7695 7054 - Coordinates (x,y): 276950, 370540</p> <p>Field 4 - SH 7702 7039 - Coordinates (x,y): 277020, 370390</p> <p>Field 5 - SH 7691 7035 - Coordinates (x,y): 276910, 370350</p> <p>Field 6 - SH 7679 7047 - Coordinates (x,y): 276790, 370470</p> <p>Field 7 - SH 7680 7033 - Coordinates (x,y): 276800, 370330</p> <p>Field 8 - SH 7689 7016 - Coordinates (x,y): 276890, 370160</p> <p>Field 9 - SH 7699 7013 - Coordinates (x,y): 276990, 370130</p> <p>Field 10 - SH 7678 7020 - Coordinates (x,y): 276780, 370200</p> <p>Field 11 - SH 7678 6997 - Coordinates (x,y): 276780, 369970</p> <p>Field 12 - SH 7708 6992 - Coordinates (x,y): 277080, 369920</p> <p>Field 13 - SH 7712 6971 - Coordinates (x,y): 277120, 369710</p> <p>Field 15 - SH 7678 6873 - Coordinates (x,y): 276780, 368730</p> <p>Field 16 - SH 7706 6865 - Coordinates (x,y): 277060, 368650</p> <p>Field 21 - SH 7806 7306 - Coordinates (x,y): 278060, 373060</p> <p>Field 22 - SH 7813 7329 - Coordinates (x,y): 278130, 373290</p> <p>Field 23 - SH 7823 7307 - Coordinates (x,y): 278230, 373070</p> <p>Storage:</p> <p>278290,372990</p> <p>278290,372990</p>

Administrative Checks- by permit support officer	
	Comments
Consultation	<p>Waste reg team: <a href="mailto:IndustryRegulation&amp;Waste.NW@cyfoethnaturiolcymru.gov.uk">IndustryRegulation&amp;Waste.NW@cyfoethnaturiolcymru.gov.uk</a></p> <p>Environment team: <a href="mailto:ConwyEnvironmentTeam@cyfoethnaturiolcymru.gov.uk">ConwyEnvironmentTeam@cyfoethnaturiolcymru.gov.uk</a></p> <p>NLO: <a href="mailto:Ewan.Marshall-Harries@environment-agency.gov.uk">Ewan.Marshall-Harries@environment-agency.gov.uk</a></p>
Date due:	18/09/2021
Are fields on Anglesey? If yes, then send application.	No: N/A
Permit compliance rating and multiplier	Rating B - 100%

Please note – this document is to assist in making a decision  
and may not necessarily cover all information required  
See [TGN8.01](#) for all required information

<b>Administrative Checks- by determining permitting officer</b>		
<b>Item</b>	<b>Action completed, or document provided? (Yes, No or n/a)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Is the base permit still live? Has there been any variations we need to be aware of?	Y	Checked - EA public register Status: modified.  Therefore, it has not been surrendered.
Correct application form	Y	
Correct fee	Y	See permit compliance multiplier above and <a href="#">Charging Scheme</a> page 43
Fee on MyNRW	Y	Amount: £1018.00 Date cleared on MyNRW: 31/08/2021 Transaction number: #2093099 Reference: PSCAPPBYPRO0991
Location map	Y	Doc Reference: FF Maps (2021)
Benefit statement	Y	Doc Reference: FF ABS (2021)
Waste Analysis	Y	Doc References: 4.1 Alaw, Alwen, Cefni Cakes 4.2 Bryn Cowlyd liquid 4.3 Cefni liquid 4.4 Cwellyn liquid 4.5 Dolbenmaen liquid 4.6 Llyn Conwy liquid 4.7 Mynydd Llandegai liquid 4.8 Garreglwyd liquid 4.9 Liquid Waste AD Supplies_Aber Falls 4.10 Waste interpretation
Soil Analysis	Y	Doc References: 5.1 Farchwel Soils 2020. 16 5.2 Farchwel Soils 2020. 712 5.3 Farchwel Soils 2020. 1316,21,22. 5.4 Farchwel Soils 2020. 23
EIA Agri Regulations evidence	N	
Site Specific Risk Assessment	Y	Doc Reference: 6. FF SSRA (2021)

Please note – this document is to assist in making a decision  
and may not necessarily cover all information required  
See [TGN8.01](#) for all required information

<b>Application Form</b> <a href="#">Word versions of online forms - NRW View (sharepoint.com)</a>	<b>Y N n/a</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Has there been any pre-application discussions?	N	
Has the permit number been provided?	Y	
Has the permit holder name been provided?	Y	
What permit is being deployed under?	SR2010 No4	
Has contact information been provided?	Y	Details for Chris Ash provided.
Has the technically competent manager details been provided?	Y	Mr Ian Holden
Has the nominated competent person details been provided?	Y	Mr Richard Evans
Has the address and grid reference of the main farm address been given?	Y	
Does the farm address match the grid reference?	Y	SH 7668 7005
What type of land do they want to treat?	Agricultural land	
If it is agricultural land; has the holding number been given?	Y	In LPD1 form: 532021  From MyMap searches:  Fields 1 -13 53/020/0021  Fields 15 -16 53/020/0021  Fields 21 -23 53/020/0021
Has all of <b>parcels of land</b> table been completed?	Y	Doc Reference: 1.2 FF Supplement (2021)
Is the total area of land to be treated less than 50 ha, or 100 hectares for a single continuously managed area of land?	Y	<50 ha
Is the land to be treated within a 10 miles radius of the main address?	Y	

Please note – this document is to assist in making a decision  
and may not necessarily cover all information required  
See [TGN8.01](#) for all required information

Is this deployment one of a batch (multiple deployments) for the same area of land?	N	
Is the permit holder the owner or occupier of the land you want to spread on/treat?	N	
Have details of the land owner or occupier been provided?	Y	From application: Mr William Roberts  From MyMap searches: Fields 1 -13 WO and TD Roberts  Fields 15 -16 WO and TD Roberts  Fields 21, 22, and 23 WO and TD Roberts
Has consent been given to carry out the activity?	Y	William Roberts (WO Roberts)
Has all of the <b>previous land treatment</b> table been completed?	Y	PAN-011432 expired 06/10/21
Which risk band does the activity fall within?	High	
Is the risk banding correct?	Y	
If Medium risk (2) of High risk deployment has a SSRA been provided?	Y	Doc Reference: 6. FF SSRA (2021).
What type of risk assessment has been submitted?	site-specific risk assessment	Doc Reference: 6. FF SSRA (2021).
Does the land onto which the specified waste is to be spread as part of this deployment fall within scope of the Environmental Impact Assessment (Agriculture) (Wales) Regulations 2017 as semi-natural (habitat)?	N	
If yes has the screening opinion provided by Welsh Government been provided?	N/A	
If no have details of the assessment evidence to support this conclusion been provided?	N/A	
Has all of the <b>waste types</b> table been completed?	Y	
Are the wastes listed in the deployment specifically listed in the permit?	Y	
Can you verify the waste producer (source of waste) is correct in terms of production, coding, and description?	Y	Majority of waste from DCWW so clearly appropriately coded.  02 07 02 – Appears to be from Aber falls distillery but limited information queried in RFI.

Please note – this document is to assist in making a decision  
and may not necessarily cover all information required  
See [TGN8.01](#) for all required information

Has all of <b>waste storage</b> table been completed?	Y	
Is the storage given no more than 1250 tonnes shall be non-stackable waste, and no more than 3000 tonnes of all other wastes?	Y	
Has checklist been completed?	Y	
Has confidentially been claimed?	N	
Has national security been claimed?	N	
If signing on behalf of a relevant person, has written confirmation from a relevant person been given?	Y	
Has the operator confirmed they will comply with the conditions of the rule set?	Y	
Has a relevant person or approved person signed the declaration?	Y	

Location	Y N n/a	Comments
<b>Has determining officer completed MyMap screening report?</b>	Y	
Do the grid references match the site plan?	Y	
If there is storage; do the grid references match the site plan?	Y	
If land was previously deployed on, and waste is stored in temporary field heaps; are the storage locations in the same or different locations?	Different	
The map must include the following details in relation to both <b>storage</b> and <b>spreading</b> (TGN 8.01, box 3.1)		
surface water courses ( <b>permit condition:</b> no spreading within 10 meters) (buffer zones needed)	Y	Fields 1 -13 all surface waters appropriately buffered.  Fields 15 and 16: all surface waters appropriately buffered  Fields 21-23: all surface waters appropriately buffered.
groundwater source protection zones ( <b>permit condition:</b> no spreading in SPZ1) (high risk deployment if in SPZ2)	n/a	Nearest SPZ >5km away.
any well, spring (or issue) or borehole <u>used</u> for the supply of water for human consumption including from a private water supply or supplies. ( <b>permit condition:</b> no spreading within 50 meters)	n/a	My Map Layers  Fields 1 -13 and Fields 21-23. No wells, issues, springs, or boreholes used for human consumption nearby.



Please note – this document is to assist in making a decision  
and may not necessarily cover all information required  
See [TGN8.01](#) for all required information

		<p>Fields 15-16: closest is 290m away but is for environmental purposes.</p> <p>Raster Map:</p> <p>Fields 1-13: there is an issue located within field 7. This is appropriately buffered.</p> <p>Field 21-23 there is an issues 200m to the west of the site.</p>
location of all storage sites for the waste to be spread	Y	
any spring (or issue), well or borehole not used to supply water for domestic or food production purposes within 50m (shown on map)	n/a	<p>My Map Layers</p> <p>Fields 1 -13 and Fields 21-23. No wells, issues, springs, or boreholes used for human consumption nearby.</p> <p>Fields 15-16: closest is 290m away but is for environmental purposes.</p> <p>Raster Map:</p> <p>Fields 1-13: there is an issue located within field 7. This is appropriately buffered.</p> <p>Field 21-23 there is an issues 200m to the west of the site.</p>
any spring (or issue), well or borehole used to supply water for domestic or food production purposes within 250m (shown on map)	n/a	<p>My Map Layers</p> <p>Fields 1 -13 and Fields 21-23. No wells, issues, springs, or boreholes used for</p>



Please note – this document is to assist in making a decision  
and may not necessarily cover all information required  
See [TGN8.01](#) for all required information

		<p>human consumption nearby.</p> <p>Fields 15-16: closest is 290m away but is for environmental purposes.</p> <p>Raster Map:</p> <p>Fields 1-13: there is an issue located within field 7. This is appropriately buffered.</p> <p>Field 21-23 there is an issues 200m to the west of the site.</p>
any European designated sites- Natura 2000 (SPA, pSPA, SAC or cSAC) or Ramsar- or SSSI within 500m (shown on map)	Y	<p>Within 500m of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Morfa Uchaf, Dryfifin Conway SSSI</li> <li>• Ceunant Dulyrn SSSI</li> <li>• Aber Afon Conwy SSSI</li> </ul>
location of any public rights of way (shown on map)	Y	<p>Map showing fields 1-13. Shows relevant PRoW.</p> <p>Missing near fields 15 and 16.</p> <p>See FF Maps (2021) V2 in the RFI Response all PRoW now shown.</p> <p>No PRoW near -21-23</p>
any buildings or houses within 250m (shown on map)	Y	<p>All buildings shown on map – applicants map and the screening maps.</p>
<p>the location of any other designated environmentally sensitive sites within 500m. Including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protected Species</li> <li>• Protected Habitats</li> </ul>	Y	<p>See My Map report which highlights the majority of</p>

Please note – this document is to assist in making a decision  
and may not necessarily cover all information required  
See [TGN8.01](#) for all required information

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scheduled Ancient Monument</li> <li>• Local Nature Reserve</li> <li>• National Nature Reserve</li> <li>• Ancient Woodlands</li> <li>• Local Wildlife Sites (SINC)</li> <li>• National Park</li> <li>• Nitrate Vulnerable Zone (NVZ)</li> <li>• Groundwater Safeguard Zone</li> <li>• Hedges</li> <li>• Ditches</li> </ul>	<p>environmentally sensitive sites.</p> <p>In addition, the presence of ditches was not confirmed following a look across the site using aerial view with contours and slopes (all layers on MyMap)</p> <p>A review of Google earth and the MyMap aerial view layer did not identify any additional areas of thick hedging other than those covered by other designations.</p>
What is the slope of the fields?	<p>0-7 degrees (transparent)- fields: 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 13.</p> <p>7 -12 degrees (yellow)- fields: 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 15, 16, 21, 22, 23.</p> <p>12 degrees plus (red)- fields: 1, 2, 3, 16 and 22.</p> <p>See Section below</p>

<b>Waste Analysis</b>	<b>Y N n/a</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Is the waste analysis report less than 12 months old at time of application?	Y	
Does the analysis include the following?		
• pH	Y	
• Nitrogen (N)	Y	
• Phosphorus (P)	Y	
• Potassium (K)	Y	
• % dry matter	Y	
Does the analysis include the following? If it is a required parameter for the waste (see section below) and has not been tested for; has adequate justification been provided?		
• Zinc	Y	
• Copper	Y	
• Nickel	Y	
• Lead	Y	
• Cadmium	Y	
• Mercury	Y	



Please note – this document is to assist in making a decision  
and may not necessarily cover all information required  
See [TGN8.01](#) for all required information

• Magnesium	Y	
• Sodium	Y	
• Sulphur	Y	
Check Appendix A of TGN 8.01 for the wastes types applied for.		
• Are there any special testing requirements?	N	Aluminium missing DCWW Alwen and DCWW Alaw
• If yes; have they been tested for?	n/a	
If spreading waste soil, has the analysis been carried out at an MCERTS Lab?	n/a	
If the spreading is in a groundwater safeguard zone ( <b>permit condition 2.1.8</b> ); are any wastes “high readily available nitrogen wastes”? i.e. organic wastes in which more than 30% of the total nitrogen content is available to the crop at the time of spreading.	N	
• If yes, have they stated condition 2.1.8 of the permit will be complied with?	n/a	

Soil Analysis	Y N n/a	Comments
Is the soil analysis report less than 4 years old at time of application?	Y	
Does the analysis include the following?		
• pH	Y	
• Potassium (K)	Y	
• Phosphorus (P)	Y	
• Magnesium (Mg)	Y	
If the waste analysis shows high PTE's; have these been tested for in the soil?	N/a	
Have the soil indices for P, K and Mg on each field been given?	Y	
Does analysis show that the soils are deficient in the nutrients or properties required by the proposed cropping?	Y	

Benefit Statement	Y N n/a	Comments
Does the writer of the benefit statement have appropriate technical expertise? (TGN 8.01 6.1)	Y	
Does the activity meet the definition of recovery? (TGN 8.01 6.2)		
• Is there a clear benefit from the activity?	Y	Section 6.3 of ABS. Query about distillation wastes
• Is the material suitable for its intended use?	Y	Section 6.3
• Is the minimum amount of waste being used to achieve the intended benefit?	Y	Section 6.3
• Is the waste being used as a substitute for a non-waste material?	Y	Section 6.3 confirms alternative would be bagged mineral fertiliser.
• Will the proposal be completed to an appropriate standard? NOTE: For this activity, the standard is the deployment application that has been assessed and approved. Any deviation from this which has not been agreed is likely to be viewed as disposal.	Y	

Please note – this document is to assist in making a decision  
and may not necessarily cover all information required  
See [TGN8.01](#) for all required information

Benefit should be assessed against the following criteria. If the chosen benefit, has information been given on? (TGN 8.01 6.3)		
• Plant nutrient requirements	Y	
• Timing of application	Y	
• Amount of waste to be applied and application rate	Y	
• Soil chemical properties (e.g. liming and pH)	n/a	
• Soil physical properties (e.g. organic matter and soil structure)	Y	
• Soil water content	Y	
• Levelling the land	n/a	
If an operator wants to apply more nutrients than is recommended in RB209 have they? (TGN 8.01 6.3)		
• Justified the nutrient level with appropriate technical expertise	N	
• Included the nutrient level in their environmental risk assessment	N	
• Stated the source of information that they used to set the nutrient level.	N	
Have any potential negative impacts of the activity been addressed? (TGN 8.01 6.5)	Y	Section 7 ABS
Is the application rate appropriate (i.e. not be applied in excess of crop or soil need as this may not meet the principles of waste recovery) in terms of? (TGN 8.01 6.7)		
• Waste type	Y	
• Waste analysis	Y	
• Crop nutrient requirements	Y	
If multiple wastes are being mixed: (TGN 8.01 6.8)		
• Does each waste confer benefit in its own right?	Y	
• Is it only for operational purposes?	Y	
• Have individual application rates for each waste been given?	Y	
• If mixing ratios have not been given, is there a statement saying that the highest limiting parameter will be used as the maximum application rate allowed to be spread, i.e. the waste will be spread at the lowest application rate.	Y	
Application of waste (TGN 8.01 6.10)		
• Is method of application appropriate for the waste type and cropping?	Y	Surface spreading is appropriate given the waste to be spread (low sodium and low conductivity)
• Is the timing of application appropriate?	Y	Section 4.1 confirms late Feb to Apr (early spring). This seems consistent with a typical growing season. Target periods after cutting of silage and prior to grazing through summer and autumn.
• Have they stated when the waste will be spread?	Y	
• Have they stated how often the waste will be spread?	Y	
Have the total nutrients supplied by the waste been given?	Y	
Does the total nutrients supplied match NRW calculations?	Y	
Has total nutrients supplied been given in oxide format?	Y	

Please note – this document is to assist in making a decision  
and may not necessarily cover all information required  
See [TGN8.01](#) for all required information

Has the SNS for each field been provided? Or enough information provided to calculate the SNS?	Y	
If the operator has stated (or intelligence from local teams have told us) that other sources of nutrients have been applied in the last 12 months; have they stated:		
• What material was spread?	Y	
• How much material was spread?	Y	LPD1 form
• At what application rate material was spread?	Y	LPD1 form
• The nutrients supplied by the material?	Y	PAN-011432 expired 06/10/21

Site specific risk assessment (TGN 8.01 2.2)	Y N n/a	Comments
If the deployment is in a high-risk location as per LPD1 has a site-specific risk assessment been submitted?	Y	
If there are other designated environmentally sensitive sites within 500 meters has a site-specific risk assessment been submitted?	Y	
Does the site-specific risk assessment identify all potential?		
• Sources of pollution or hazards. Potential hazards include but are not limited to dust, odours, run-off, leachate etc.	Y	
• Pathways	Y	
• Receptors that can be affected by that source of pollution. Receptors include but are not limited to environmentally sensitive sites, watercourse, local residents, public rights of way, housing, schools, workplaces, and recreational facilities etc.	Y	
• Measures that will minimise or mitigate the impact will be put in place	Y	

Appendix 4 assessment	Y N n/a	Comments
Is the site within 500 meters of a SSSI?	Y	
• If yes, the complete an Appendix 4 CroW assessment.		
Has a likely significant effect been identified?	N	
• If yes, consult with the relevant NRM team.		
• If no, save the Appendix 4 to the DMS as information only		

Habitat Regulation Assessment	Comments
Is the site within 500 meters of a Natura 2000 (SPA, pSPA, SAC or cSAC) or a Ramsar site?	N

Comments
<p><b>Consultation responses:</b> Comments relating to Fertiliser, WFS status, indices levels and adherence to no spread zones/buffers require no actions.</p> <p><b>MyMap and location assessment:</b></p> <p><b><u>Slope of fields and risk of run-off.</u></b></p> <p><u>Slopes of 12+ degrees</u></p> <p>Although the slope assessment highlighted slopes of greater than 12 degrees in fields 1, 2, 3, 16 and 22 these have all been declared as no spread zones by the applicant in the drawings within their application.</p> <p><u>Slopes of 7-12 degrees</u></p>

Please note – this document is to assist in making a decision and may not necessarily cover all information required  
See [TGN8.01](#) for all required information

There are multiple areas within the following fields where there are areas that are sloped between 7 and 12 degrees: 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 15, 16, 21, 22, 23.

All areas in the following fields with slopes 7-12 degrees have been removed by no spreading zones: 16.

Assessment of the risk of run-off.

For the remaining fields an assessment of run off risk is required to assess the risk of run-off based on multiple risk factors:

- **Slope of the land:** As discussed above there are a number of areas within certain fields that have a slope between 7 – 12 degrees which have not been removed by no spread zones. An increased slope could increase the risk of run off from these areas.
- **Soil type:** Medium soils
- **wastes types applied (solid, liquid, sludge etc.):** 2 x wastes are solid wastes. All remaining wastes are liquid/sludge in type.
- **cropping type:** Grass
- **method of application:** The Operators ABS Section 7.3 states ‘Solid wastes will be spread using conventional rear discharge spreaders.’ Table 5. Waste Application also confirms ‘The cakes will be spread using conventional rear discharge spreaders as this equipment is readily available to the farmer/contractor and the most appropriate for the material and application rates used. Liquid sludges will be surface spread by tractor and tanker using a dribble bar.’
- **Weather conditions before during and after spreading:** The Operators ABS Section 7.3 states ‘Waste will only be applied to ground when the weather conditions are suitable, following CoGap’ Permit condition 2.3.2 would also ensure that waste is only spread when the receiving land is in a suitable condition (e.g. not frozen, for 12 hours or more in the previous 24hours, and not waterlogged, frozen or snow covered).

Based on the above factors we do not consider the risk of run off to be high.

**Morfa Uchaf, Dryffin Conwy, Ceunant Dulyn SSSIs and Aber Afon Conwy SSSI**

See Appendix 4 which outlines the assessment of the impact to Morfa Uchaf, Dryffin Conwy, Ceunant Dulyn SSSIs and Aber Afon Conwy SSSI from the proposed deployment. The assessment concludes that the proposed deployment is not likely to damage any of the flora, fauna or geological or physiological features which are of special interest

**Protection of habitats and ecosystems**

Not applicable.

**Agricultural benefit calculations:**

The calculations undertaken as part of our assessment during the determination match those within the Agricultural Benefit Statement provided by the operator.

**Request for information:**

RFI 1 issued: 28/10/2021. Response received: 29/10/2021.  
RFI 2 issued: 03/11/2021. Response received: 04/11/2021.

**Request For Information 1**

*Distillation wastes (02 07 02)*



Please note – this document is to assist in making a decision  
and may not necessarily cover all information required  
See [TGN8.01](#) for all required information

**1. ACTION: Update the application to make it clear the source of the distillation waste.**

You have identified 02 07 02 wastes from spirits distillation as waste stream that you would like to spread under this deployment. The source of this waste is unclear with references to AD Supplies Limited, Aber Falls Distillery, and Brewery waste included across the application documents. We assume that this is because the source of the waste is from the Aber Falls Distillery but is then passed on to a waste courier/handler who in this case is AD Supplies limited. Can you confirm that our understanding is correct? Please ensure if you apply to spread this waste again, that this is adequately explained.

**RESOLVED – See RFI 28/10/2021 document in RFI 1 response.**

**2. ACTION: Update the Agricultural Benefit Statement to remove this waste from fields with a pH of less than 5.5.**

The 02 07 02 waste has a pH of 3.5. TGN 8.01 states in regard to wastes from spirit distillation that 'The pH of this waste can be low. Therefore, operators should not apply it to land with soils of pH less than 5.5 unless the acidity of the waste has been neutralised by adding caustic soda or similar alkali material.' The guidance would suggest this waste cannot be spread on a number fields. Your soil analysis shows that fields 4, 5, 10, 12, 14, 15, and 16 all have soils with a pH of less than 5.5.

**RESOLVED – See FF ABS (2021) V2 document in RFI 1 response.**

*National Grid References for spreading fields.*

**3. ACTION: Update the application documents to provide 12 digit National Grid References for each of the fields**

The National Grid References provided in your application (1.2 FF LFPD1 Supplement (2021).pdf) provides the National Grid References for each of the fields. However you have only provided 10 digit National Grid References. Our guidance requires that you provide 12 digit National Grid References.

**RESOLVED – See FF LPD1Supplement (2021) v2 in RFI 1 response.**

*Public Rights of Way*

**4. ACTION: Update the maps within your application to clearly demonstrate the Public Rights of Way within and around the fields you intend to spread on during this deployment.**

Our TGN 8.01 (Box 3.1) guidance requires that all Public Rights of Way should be clearly shown on your maps included in your application documents. Although you have provided this information on the map showing Fields 1-13 and 21-23 we cannot locate the Public Rights of Way located across the top and through the middle of fields 15 and 16.

**RESOLVED – See FF Maps (2021) v2 in RFI 1 response.**

*Waste Analysis*

**5. ACTION: Provide additional waste analysis that provides the content for the aluminium and iron for all DCWW wastes**

You have not provided the content of the following potentially toxic elements in the waste listed below:

- Aluminium for the following wastes: DCWW Alaw cake, and DCWW Alwen cake.

TGN 8.01 - Page 130 outlines that wastes from water clarification should be analysed for aluminium.

Please note – this document is to assist in making a decision  
and may not necessarily cover all information required  
See [TGN8.01](#) for all required information

**RESOLVED** – See Alwen analysis 10.2021 and, Alaw Analysis 10.2021 in RFI 1 response.

#### *Mixing Wastes*

6. **ACTION: Confirm whether the multiple wastes that you intend to spread will be mixed prior to spreading or whether each waste will be spread individually.**

In previous deployments you tend to include text outlined below we are unsure if this was deliberately left out of this application or it was left out mistakenly.

‘The wastes may be applied separately or in combination. If the wastes are applied in combination the total combined amount applied will not exceed 250t/ha, the total nitrogen loading will be less than 250kg/ha, and the amount of available nitrogen and total or available phosphate and potash (whichever is appropriate) will not exceed the fertiliser recommendation or the amount removed in crop offtake, whichever is the greater.’

**RESOLVED** – See RFI 28/10/2021 document in RFI 1 response.

#### **Request for Information 2**

You have provided new waste analysis for DCWW Alwen and DCWW Alaw but you have not amended the application rates in the Agricultural Benefit Statement. **Please update the ABS to ensure there are no nutrient exceedances for the fields they are applied to.**

**RESOLVED** – See FF ABS (2021) V3 document and 4.10 Waste Interpretation V2 document in RFI 2 response.

#### **Other information to note:**

N/a

#### **Decision**

Can the deployment application be approved?	Yes
Issue date	05/11/2021
Effective date	05/11/2021
Permitting Officer Date	Matthew Fryer 05/11/2021
Team leader or Transfer of Powers (ToP) approval Date	Huw Davies 05/11/2021

#### **Time recording**

Admin/consultations	60
Determination	1020
Sign off	10
Issuing	15
<b>Total</b>	<b>1105</b>