

Your ref:

Our ref:

14 June 2016

Mr Saul White  
Senior Permitting Officer  
Natural Resources Wales  
Rivers House  
St Mellons Business Park  
St Mellons  
Cardiff  
CF3 0EY



**Peter Brett Associates LLP**  
Caversham Bridge House  
Waterman Place, Reading  
Berkshire RG1 8DN  
T: +44 (0)118 950 0761  
F: +44 (0)118 959 7498  
E: reading@peterbrett.com

Dear Saul

**RE: Docksway Draft Substantial Permit Variation (EPR/DP3733BK)**

On behalf of our Client and the permit holder, Newport City Council, we thank you for sending us the draft permit for review, following the application for a substantial variation made on the 14<sup>th</sup> May 2015. We received the draft permit on the 31<sup>st</sup> May 2016, and an amended version on the 8<sup>th</sup> June 2016.

We have reviewed the draft permit (including amended version) and have the following comments.

1. Introductory Note – Paragraph 3 – we suggest inserting ‘closed’ between ‘existing’ and ‘landfill’. Also – what does the sentence ‘The site has accepted no waste materials.’ mean? Both Area 1 and Area 2 have accepted waste materials.
2. Condition 1.2.2 – is a repeat of Condition 1.2.1.
3. Table S2.3 – What does the asterisk mean in Table S2.3?
4. Condition 2.6.10 – refers to ‘hazardous’ waste – we believe should this be amended to Stable Non Reactive Hazardous Waste (SNRHW)?
5. Condition 3.1.8 and also 3.5.4 (f) that refers to Table S3.9 – air monitoring requirements. The principle behind the air monitoring is to check for asbestos fibres for the protection of human health and therefore we consider that the monitoring requirements need only to include a test and limit for the presence of asbestos fibres. The requirements for PM<sup>10</sup> and deposited particulate are unnecessary and not appropriate. In addition the limit value provided for ‘deposited particulate’ is a default ‘complaints likely’ value and not relevant here based on the principle of protection of human health. In addition, the required reference period of 24 hours is inappropriate and impractical. The equipment would need to be left on site for this period and would require to be guarded against theft and/or vandalism. We consider that it is appropriate to set the time period and the time of monitoring to coincide with asbestos disposal operations in the cell. Therefore it is recommended that the time period is 8 hours during asbestos disposal operations.
6. Condition 3.5.1 – (g) (h) that refers to Table S3.10 – asbestos cell stability monitoring requirements.  
Other inclinometer related conditions – 4.1.1 (viii), 4.2.2 (h), Table S3.10, Table S4.1  
Please refer to separate Technical Note DP001.
7. Condition 3.5.4 – we are not sure this makes sense? This refers to MCERTS accreditation being required for monitoring specified in Condition 3.3.1 – however the only monitoring referred to in 3.3.1 is perception based odour monitoring.

J:\14739\155 - Permit Revision 2015\Draft Permit Review\Formal response letter.docx

**Registered Office:** Caversham Bridge House, Waterman Place, Reading, Berkshire, RG1 8DN. UK. T: +44 (0)118 950 0761 F: +44 (0)118 959 7498  
**Peter Brett Associates LLP** is a limited liability partnership and is registered in England and Wales with registered number OC334398.  
A list of members' names is open to inspection at our registered office.



8. Condition 4.1.1 (d) (vi) – refers to hazardous waste deposits – we believe this needs amending to SNRHW?
9. Table S1.1 – Limits of specified activity – ‘There will be a 12 month pause from filling when the waste reaches a height of 33.5m AOD’ – we believe the temporary cessation of filling should be related to pore-water pressure and not be time related. Therefore, this condition should instead state that the hold period should be until the pore-water pressure in the alluvium is at an equivalent piezometric head of 10.88m OD or less. Similarly where it states ‘there will be a 6 month pause from filling when the waste reaches a height of 33.5m AOD’, it should instead state that the hold period should be until the pore-water pressure in the alluvium is at an equivalent piezometric head of 12.60m OD or less. This is in accordance with the revised Stability Risk Assessment.
10. Table S1.3 – 11 – This requirement is very vague and needs to be more specific. Is this actually referencing monitoring of inclinometers? If so – this is dealt with elsewhere (see Point 6 above).
11. Table S2.2 – Permitted waste types – we are unclear why a number of permitted waste types been removed? Eg 19 01 to 19 05
12. Table S3.2 – point source emissions to water. This appears to be indicating a requirement to sample from the side risers and sump of the drainage infrastructure installed within the asbestos/SNRHW cell. This is unnecessary and inappropriate because the water will be pumped from the sump and side risers through a filter system and into a lagoon where it is then sampled prior to being discharged. Additionally, there is no justification for the limits set, for example acceptable pH is set between 6 and 8, however all the surface water limits at the site are based on a pH of between 6 and 9. There should at least be consistency across the site.
13. Table S3.4 landfill gas monitoring requirements. The table refers to monitoring points GP05\_23, GP06\_25, GP05\_26, GP06\_26 and GP06\_27. GP05\_23 has been replaced with GP12\_23 for which there are currently no limits set. There is no GP05\_26 and GP06\_26 – these have been replaced with GP12\_26. GP06\_27 has been replaced with GP12\_27 and there is also GP06\_24 for which limits are not required.
14. Table S3.6 – requires the depth to the base of leachate monitoring points to be recorded quarterly – however for all other types of monitoring point, the depth to the base is only required annually. We suggest they are all set for annual measurement.
15. Table S3.8 – SW monitoring requirements. This is not required because SW26 is the subject of a discharge consent with these parameters in it.
16. Table S3.11 – Process Monitoring Requirements. In this table there is a requirement for a total of six vibrating wire piezometers. It is not clear if this is 6 in total over the remaining area to be developed or within Cell 3 that is currently being developed. At the current time there are proposals for four vibrating wire piezometers to be installed within Cell 3, and this is considered to be reasonable and proportionate.

Yours sincerely

Kate Riley  
**Principal Engineer**  
For and on behalf of  
**PETER BRETT ASSOCIATES LLP**