



ENVIRONMENTAL PERMIT VARIATION APPLICATION

SUPPORTING STATEMENT

**TRECATTI LANDFILL SITE
FOCHRIW ROAD
MERTHYR TYDFIL
GLAMORGAN
CF48 4AB**

**Document Reference: BF5029/05.r1
February 2021**



**Project Quality Assurance
Information Sheet**

***ENVIRONMENTAL PERMIT VARIATION APPLICATION – SUPPORTING STATEMENT
TRECATTI LANDFILL SITE, FOCHRIW ROAD, MERTHYR TYDFIL***

Report Status : Draft

Report Reference : BF5029/05.r1

Report Date : February 2021

Prepared for : Biffa Waste Services Limited

Prepared by : Sirius Environmental Limited
The Beacon Centre for Enterprise
Dafen
Llanelli
SA14 8LQ

Reviewed by :

**Dylan Thomas BSc (Hons) PGDip MCIWM
Principal Environmental Consultant**

**Reviewed & :
Approved by**

**Mark Griffiths BSc (Hons) MSc MCIWM CGeol
Environmental Director**

Revision	Date	Amendment Details	Author	Reviewer
1	February 2021	Further information in response to NRW e-mail of 9/12/2020	D Thomas	M Griffiths

This report is written for the sole use of Biffa Waste Services Limited and their appointed agents. No other third party may rely on or reproduce the contents of this report without the written approval of Sirius. If any unauthorised third party comes into possession of this report, they rely upon it entirely at their own risk and the authors do not owe them any Duty of Care or Skill.

**TRECATTI LANDFILL SITE
FOCHRIW ROAD
MERTHYR TYDFIL
GLAMORGAN
CF48 4AB**

ENVIRONMENTAL PERMIT VARIATION APPLICATION

SUPPORTING STATEMENT

CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Scope	1
1.2	Background.....	1
1.3	Site Setting	2
1.4	Summary of Variation Application Requirements	3
2.0	VARIATION REQUIREMENTS	4
2.1	Additional Waste Codes.....	4
2.2	Extension of Wastes Imported Under Existing Waste Codes	4
2.3	Waste Acceptance Criteria for Additional and Extended Waste Streams	5
2.4	Changes to the Treatment of Monocell Waters/Leachate.....	5
2.5	Alternative Monitoring System & Removal of Inclinatorimeters	6
3.0	TECHNICAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	8
3.1	Leachate Management and Hydrogeological Risk	8
3.2	Landfill Gas Risk Assessment Review	12
3.3	Stability Risk Assessment Review	12
4.0	OTHER CONSIDERATIONS.....	13
4.1	Financial Provision.....	13
4.2	Amenity Risk Assessment.....	13
4.3	Closure Plan	13

LIST OF DRAWINGS

BF4857/10/01	Site Location Plan
BF4857/10/03	Site Development and Waste Deposition
BF4858/02/002	SNRHW Cell Construction - Section Details

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1	Pre-Application Consultation Correspondence
Appendix 2	List of Additional Wastes
Appendix 3	Trade Effluent Consent
Appendix 4	Leachate Quality Data and Charts (Non-Hazardous Landfill)
Appendix 5	Stability Risk Assessment

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1:	Waste Acceptance Criteria for SNRHW for disposal into the monocell	5
Table 2:	Comparative summary of SNRHW and non-hazardous waste source terms and sewer discharge limits	8

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Scope

- 1.1.1 Sirius Environmental Limited (Sirius) has been commissioned by Biffa Waste Services Limited to prepare an application to vary the existing landfill operations authorised under Environmental Permit EPR/RP3733PC.
- 1.1.2 The changes specifically relate to the monocell that is currently permitted to receive Stable Non-Reactive Hazardous Waste (SNRHW) in the form of asbestos containing waste materials only, with cover provided in the form of inert wastes. There are no changes proposed to the main non-hazardous landfill operations or the Multipurpose Waste Treatment and Remediation Pad (MWTRP) that are also permitted at the site. Waters that have percolated through the waste deposits in the monocell will continue to be extracted for discharge, but will instead be treated within the on-site leachate treatment plant prior to discharge to sewer.

1.2 Background

- 1.2.1 Trecatti Landfill Site is approximately 3km west of Rhymney at National Grid Reference SO 082077, as shown in **Drawing No. BF4957/10/01**. It is located within an area of historic open-cast coal and ironstone working and lies to the north-west of the Gelligaer and Merthyr Common. The site is immediately surrounded by common land that includes vegetated colliery spoil tips and is used for rough grazing. The nearest residential area is Dowlais Top which lies approximately 200 metres to the northwest of the landfill. Access to the site is from the unclassified Fochriw Road to the east. The main watercourses present in the vicinity are the River Taff and Rhymney River, which flow in a general southerly direction 3.5km west and 2.1km east of the site respectively.
- 1.2.2 The permitted installation includes all areas of the existing and proposed landfill and site infrastructure in addition to the landfill gas utilisation and leachate treatment plants. The following non-listed directly associated activities are also included as part of the permitted installation: discharge of treated leachate to sewer; discharge of surface water drainage to a controlled watercourse; and gas flaring.
- 1.2.3 Merthyr Tydfil Borough Council commenced landfilling at Trecatti in 1986 and operated the site up until 1992 when the management transferred to Biffa Waste Services Limited. The site was licensed at that time to receive domestic, commercial and industrial wastes including difficult and special wastes. Engineered containment principles were introduced at Trecatti from 1993 in Phase 1 within the north-western corner. Subsequent landfilling took place within Phase 2, which then formed the basal containment for Phases 2A, 3A, and 4A. Phase 2A also forms the basal containment for all the remaining 7 Phases to be developed. The approved landfill development layout is illustrated in **Drawing No. BF4857/10/03**.
- 1.2.4 Trecatti Landfill has been constructed above the regional groundwater table of the Coal Measures strata and therefore no permanent groundwater management system is required. However, temporary underliner drainage systems have been installed beneath the phases developed to date due to the presence of perched groundwater. Leachate accumulating within the site is abstracted and treated at the on-site treatment plant. Landfill gas is collected and pumped to an on-site gas management plant with surplus gas flared off.

- 1.2.5 The landfill is also permitted to allow the deposit of asbestos containing wastes within a dedicated cell constructed on the engineered southern side slope area of the landfill. The deposit of stable Non-Reactive Hazardous Wastes (SNRHW) including asbestos, was previously authorised through the original PPC permit issued for the site but was removed by a permit holder-initiated application in December 2007. Conditions stated in the permit allow asbestos containing waste materials to be accepted at Trecatti Landfill Site in accordance with stringent regulatory standards.
- 1.2.6 This permit includes permitted waste activities associated with an onsite MWTRP.
- 1.2.7 The MWTRP allows the following permitted waste treatment and processing activities to take place:
- Waste Treatment Facility (WTF) – treatment and bioremediation of hazardous and non-hazardous waste including soils and sludges; and
 - Green Waste Composting Facility (GWCF).
- 1.2.8 The MWTRP comprises a single impermeable surfaced pad. The northern most part of the pad is used for the composting of green waste at approximately 3,250m². Adjoining this is an area used for the bioremediation of contaminated soils or sludges, with a footprint of approximately 6,000m². Each area is separated by a low-level bund. The MWTRP site infrastructure is located in the southern area of the site which includes two process water tanks (within a bunded enclosure), a biofilter, air/water separators, attendant process equipment and a substation. The area to the west is used for processing green waste and compost. Additionally, there are two surface water drainage lagoons; one located within the southern part of the site and the other within the north-eastern part of the site.
- 1.2.9 A composting facility permitted under Standard Rules Permit set SR2012 No. 8 is also authorised to operate on the multipurpose pad.
- 1.2.10 The most recent variation of the permit (Ref.: EPR/RP3733PC/V011) introduced an asbestos picking station and appropriate European Waste Codes (EWC) to allow the onsite acceptance, transfer and processing of asbestos contaminated soils and fire damaged wastes (contaminated with or without hydrocarbons).

1.3 Site Setting

- 1.3.1 Trecatti Landfill is located at NGR SO 082 077 to the immediate north-east of Merthyr Tydfil and approximately 3km west of Rhymney. The site is developed within void created by historical, open-cast coal and ironstone mining. It currently comprises of two areas of landfilling; the historic landfill to the north-east (the “Merthyr Waste Area”), and an area of artificially engineered containment landfilling to the west.
- 1.3.2 The site lies within an area of relatively elevated ground, with the topography falling towards the west and east, towards the Taff and Rhymney valleys respectively. The main surface water courses present in the vicinity of the site are the River Taff and Rhymney River, which flow in a general southerly direction, passing 3.5km to the west and 2.1km to the east of the site respectively. A number of tributary drains and streams drain the land immediately surrounding Trecatti Landfill.

1.4 Summary of Variation Application Requirements

1.4.1 The primary aims of the this application include:-

- The extension of Schedule 2 Table S2.4 of the permit to include additional waste codes that are classified as Stable Non-Reactive Hazardous Wastes (SNRHW); and
- Extend the hazardous characteristics displayed by wastes imported under waste codes 17 05 03 and 19 13 01, limited to inorganic substances only;
- The discharge of treated waters/leachate from the SNRHW monocell to sewer following initial treatment in the on-site Leachate Treatment Plant (LTP); and
- Removal of the requirement to install, maintain and monitor inclinometers within the separation bund constructed around the edges of the SNRHW monocell.

1.4.2 The details of the application have been discussed with the facility's Local Area Officer from Natural Resources Waste (NRW), Richard Taylor, as part of pre-application consultation held in the latter part of 2019. A copy of the original correspondence summarising the application proposals and the Compliance Assessment Report (CAR) acknowledging the discussions held on site in December 2019 is included in **Appendix 1**. As part of the pre-application consultation, it was confirmed that the application would constitute a 'Minor' Variation. An application fee of £1,311 therefore accompanies this application.

1.4.3 Upon submission and following an initial review of the scope of the application NRW have confirmed that the application constitutes a standard variation. The application fee has been subsequently calculated at **£15,196.00** based on the OPRA charging score of **262** and current charging scheme multiplier of **£58**.

2.0 VARIATION REQUIREMENTS

2.1 Additional Waste Codes

- 2.1.1 It is sought to increase the range of waste permitted for disposal in the monocell, as currently listed in Schedule 2 Table S2.4 of the permit. The current list is limited to asbestos containing waste materials, including asbestos contaminated soils from construction and demolition sources and the on-site Soils Treatment Facility (STF).
- 2.1.2 Details of the additional waste codes and descriptions to be added to Schedule 2 Table S2.4 of the permit are presented in **Appendix 2**. Many of these relate to the hazardous mirror entries to the non-hazardous entries already permitted for disposal within the main non-hazardous landfill void, although they will not consist of organic/biodegradable wastes streams. Further details relating to the waste acceptance criteria for the additional waste streams are discussed in **Section 2.3**. Note, all additional codes consist of solids and sludges only.
- 2.1.3 When the permit was first issued on 9th March 2005, the permit allowed for receipt of asbestos wastes and a wider range of stable non-reactive hazardous wastes within a monocell. Biffa took the decision to apply to vary the permit to remove all stable non-reactive hazardous wastes, having not constructed the monocell, variation V003 being issued to that effect on 18th January 2008.
- 2.1.4 It was later decided to apply to vary the permit to reinstate the monocell, variation V007 issued to that effect on 27th February 2015. This variation seeks to add further stable non-reactive hazardous wastes, in line with the original permit issued on 9th March 2005.
- 2.1.5 It should be noted that although the monocell has only accepted asbestos wastes to date, prior to issue of the PPC permit in March 2005, the site had operated under a Waste Management Licence, as a hazardous waste landfill, co-disposing a range of non-hazardous and full hazardous wastes together. Therefore waste deposits within the existing landfill have already comprised non-hazardous, stable non-reactive hazardous wastes including asbestos and full hazardous wastes. The leachate source term within existing areas of the landfill, outside of the monocell, is therefore representative of that from a former co-disposal site. It should also be noted that financial provision for the landfill already took account of former waste deposits and was therefore never reduced when the PPC permit was issued, or when the monocell was later removed from the permit.

2.2 Extension of Wastes Imported Under Existing Waste Codes

- 2.2.1 It is also sought to extend the scope of hazardous wastes that can be accepted under waste codes 17 05 03 and 19 13 01. Currently, these wastes are restricted to sources that display hazardous characteristics owing to having an asbestos content in excess of 0.1%wt/wt. It is therefore proposed to extend the hazardous characteristics acceptable for these wastes to be included other inorganic substances (e.g. metals, metalloids, sulphate, chloride etc). Further details relating to the waste acceptance criteria for the extended waste streams are discussed in **Section 2.3**.
- 2.2.2 Wastes disposed of at the site under EWC codes 19 13 01 will be from imported sources and the on-site STF.

2.3 Waste Acceptance Criteria for Additional and Extended Waste Streams

- 2.3.1 All additional and extended waste streams will accord with the criteria for hazardous waste acceptable at landfills for non-hazardous waste pursuant of the Landfill Directive and Schedule 10 of the Environmental Permitting Regulation 2016 (as amended), details of which are re-produced in **Table 1**.

Table 1: Waste Acceptance Criteria for SNRHW for disposal into the monocell

Parameter	Limit Values ¹
Leachable Concentrations (mg/kg L/S 10 l/kg)	
Arsenic	2
Barium	100
Cadmium	1
Chromium (total)	10
Copper	50
Mercury	0.2
Molybdenum	10
Nickel	10
Lead	10
Antimony	0.7
Selenium	0.5
Zinc	50
Chloride	15,000
Fluoride	150
Sulphate	20,000
Total Dissolved Solids ²	60,000
Dissolved Organic Carbon at own pH of pH 7.5-8.0	800
Parameters Determined on the Waste - Total Concentrations	
Total Organic Carbon (%w/w)	5% ³
pH	>6

¹ - limits relate to granular waste only.

² - The values for TDS can be used alternatively to the values for sulphate and chloride

³ - If this value is not achieved, a higher limit value maybe admitted by the competent authority, provided that the DOC value of 800 mg/kg is achieved at L/S = 10 l/kg, either at the material's own pH or at a pH value between 7,5 and 8,0.

- 2.3.2 Wastes from the on-site STF will consist of wastes with residual contamination following the reduction/removal of hydrocarbons in the treatment process.
- 2.3.3 Note, it is not proposed to increase the annual throughput for the monocell above the current limit of 50,000 tonnes.

2.4 Changes to the Treatment of Monocell Waters/Leachate

- 2.4.1 Rain flaps are currently installed on the existing sidewall liner on which the monocell is being developed. Surface water diverted by these rain flaps flow to the existing surface water lagoon for subsequent testing and discharge.
- 2.4.2 Surface waters from operational areas of the monocell are currently managed on the surface of the monocell by directing to the outer edges of the cell. Upon visual inspection for asbestos fibres, oils and grease, and testing for chemical contamination the waters are currently pumped for discharge to surface water.
- 2.4.3 A side-riser extraction system, comprising a 450mm Ø perforated pipe with gravel and geotextile surround buried as the waste as levels raise is used to monitor and extract any infiltrating water as appropriate. Construction details of the side riser is presented in **Drawing No. BF4858/2/002**. The side-riser has and will continue to be constructed in 6m sections, extended as the depth of the waste deposits demand. To date, no waters have been extracted from the riser,

which suggest that only a limited quantity of water is infiltrating through the waste deposits from the surface.

- 2.4.4 Due to the acceptance of asbestos wastes and inert soils for cover requirements, surface water managed from the operational areas of the monocell is not significantly contaminated, with the exception for the potential for asbestos fibres. Testing to date has confirmed that fibres are not present in the water and treatment has not therefore been necessary. Similarly testing has also confirmed that the waters have been suitable for discharge to surface water. Only where testing would have confirmed additional (chemical) contamination of these waters, would they have been discharged to sewer, or pre-treated in the existing LTP prior to discharge to sewer.
- 2.4.5 The introduction of additional/alternative wastes streams with higher leachable thresholds presents a higher risk potential to the environment. On this basis all waters collected at the surface and the base of the SNRHW monocell will be directed to the onsite LTP prior to discharge to sewer.
- 2.4.6 Upon completion of the monocell a 2 metre (minimum) thick inert soil cover layer will be provided over the final waste surface. The surface will be subsequently capped and restored to the current approved design. Surface water run-off from the capped and restored surface of the monocell will subsequently be managed by the wider site collection and management network of ditches and attenuation lagoons to be constructed at the site. Upon installation of the cap only a small quantity of water will infiltrate the wastes within the monocell each year (generally modelled as 50mm/yr as a conservative estimate in terms of leachate balance purposes). Any leachate that does collect within the sump will be extracted and treated in the leachate treatment plant (or transferred off-site for treatment) until the source concentrations reduce to an appropriate level.

2.5 Alternative Monitoring System & Removal of Inclometers

- 2.5.1 The Environmental Permit requires that inclinometers be installed and raised within the separation bund constructed around the edge of the asbestos monocell, to monitor any potential movement. It is understood that the purpose of the inclinometers is to verify the conclusions of the SRA (*Doc. Ref.: BF4857SRAR(rev1)*) prepared in support of variation application EPR/RP3733PC/V008 - specifically the long-term movement of the bund as the adjacent non-hazardous wastes degrade and reduce in volume.
- 2.5.2 Due to the restriction of not drilling into the bund post-construction, as a result of the inherent risk associated with the presence of asbestos containing materials, the inclinometers are having to be installed in lifts, as the bund is constructed. However, due to the operational environment within which the inclinometers are being installed, there is a high risk of damage, with one of the original inclinometers installed already having been damaged beyond repair.
- 2.5.3 However, it is considered that the conservative risk modelling carried out in support of variation application EPR/RP3733PC/V008 provides sufficient confidence that the design of the bund will ensure that the movement will not significantly impact on the integrity of the separation bund (in providing separation between the two waste types) in the short-term (during in-filling) or long-term (after in-filling), therefore meeting the requirements of the Landfill Directive.
- 2.5.4 Moreover, the results of the inclinometer readings recorded to date have been used to calibrate an updated quantitative stability model, which accounts for the

volumetric reduction in MSW from biodegradation, as well as the proposed changes to the waste types for disposal in the mono-cell. The results of the updated model demonstrate that the existing measures (already in place to address the potential separation of the bund in the corners) are still satisfactory.

- 2.5.5 To address the limitations of the inclinometer-based system outlined in Section 5.2 of the SRA, an alternative survey-based monitoring system is proposed to be implemented that will provide a more robust method of monitoring the bund during and after infilling. This alternative monitoring system is explained in Section 5.3 and 5.4 of the SRA.

3.0 TECHNICAL CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Leachate Management and Hydrogeological Risk

Leachate Treatment

- 3.1.1 Treatment of leachate at the Site is undertaken using a Sequence Batch Reactor (SBR). The leachate treatment plant is capable of treating up to 432 m³/day, however in practice the ammonia loadings currently allow for approximately 275m³/day.
- 3.1.2 The SBR maintains and grows a microbial floc (sludge). Leachate and oxygen are fed into the sludge at a rate which allows suitable bacteria to grow and metabolise polluting components of leachate. The main objective of the plant is to reduce ammoniacal nitrogen, however, there is no specific condition within the original trade effluent consent relating to ammoniacal-nitrogen.
- 3.1.3 Notwithstanding this, the trade effluent carrier has informed Biffa that they did not want the ammoniacal-nitrogen concentrations to be greater than 40mg/l.
- 3.1.4 The process also results in other beneficial effects including:
- Reduction of dissolved organic matter measured by BOD and COD.
 - Reduction of dissolved methane to safe levels for sewer discharge.
 - Removal of sulphides.
 - Significant reduction of odours.
- 3.1.5 Each SBR works to a pre-programmed cycle, which operates as follows:
- Each SBR has an inner and outer tank. The outer tank is aerated for 24 hours. Leachate is fed into the outer tank at predetermined intervals for a set amount of time.
 - At set intervals (currently 3 daily cycles) the valve will open and the inner tank will fill up. The inner tank is not aerated, the sludge settles to the bottom and the clear effluent is decanted to the sewer pipeline;
 - The sludge is then transferred back into the outer tank;
 - The effluent is pumped to sewer and is then gravity fed down the pipeline, in accordance with the trade effluent consent issued by Welsh Water plc, a copy of which is included within **Appendix 3**.

Leachate Quality Review

- 3.1.6 A comparison of the potential leachate source term of the revised wastes streams to be deposited in the monocell to that of the leachate source term within the non-hazardous landfill cells (between 2014-2019) and the sewer discharge limits is presented in **Table 2**. Full datasets of the existing non-hazardous leachate source term are presented in **Appendix 4**.

Table 2: Comparative summary of SNRHW and non-hazardous waste source terms and sewer discharge limits

Parameter	Sewer Discharge Limit (mg/l)	Non-Hazardous Waste Source Term (2014-2019) [Mean/Max] (mg/l)	Equivalent Maximum Leachable Concentration of Future Monocell Wastes (mg/l)	Drinking Water Standard / Freshwater EQS ¹ (mg/l)
Arsenic	2 mg/l	0.18 / 1.02	0.2	0.01 / 0.05
Barium	N/S	1.4 / 4.81	10	N/S
Cadmium	2 mg/l	0.00073 / 0.0033	0.1	0.005 / 0.00045 ²

Parameter	Sewer Discharge Limit (mg/l)	Non-Hazardous Waste Source Term (2014-2019) [Mean/Max] (mg/l)	Equivalent Maximum Leachable Concentration of Future Monocell Wastes (mg/l)	Drinking Water Standard / Freshwater EQS ¹ (mg/l)
Chromium (total)	2 mg/l	0.217 / 0.717	1	0.05 / 0.032
Copper	2 mg/l	0.18 / 3.49	5	2.0 / (0.001 ³)
Mercury	N/S	<0.0002	0.02	0.00007
Molybdenum	2 mg/l	0.02 / 0.157	1	N/S
Nickel	2 mg/l	0.2 / 0.39	1	0.02 / 0.034
Lead	2 mg/l	0.014 / 0.144	1	0.01 / 0.014
Antimony	2 mg/l	0.015 / 0.108	0.07	0.005 / N/S
Selenium	2 mg/l	0.051 / 0.367	0.05	0.01 / N/S
Zinc	2 mg/l	0.24 / 3.83	5	N/S / (0.0109 ³)
Chloride	N/S	3,920 / 7,960	1,500	250
Fluoride	N/S	3.8 / 10.8	15	1.5 / 3 ²
Sulphate	1,000	75 / 933	2,000	N/S / 400

Statistical Outliers Removed; N/S – none specified

¹ - Maximum Allowable Concentration specified where available, otherwise annual average threshold used. Assumes for discharge of untreated sewer discharge during operation of storm overflow to fluvial systems.

² - based on lowest MAC where variable standards are specified based on calcium carbonate concentrations

³ - standard based on bioavailable fraction of pollutant

3.1.7 The potential leachate source term concentrations for the monocell presented in **Table 2** represents the potential worst-case (maximum) concentrations of any individual waste source based on the waste acceptance criteria presented in **Table 1**. However, it should be recognised that the deposits will comprise waste from a variety of sources each consisting of varying leachate source term characteristics. Upon deposit in the cell, the bulk source term concentration generated will be diluted below these maximum leachable threshold values. Of the substances listed the following broad observations are made:-

- The maximum leachable concentrations of arsenic, antimony and selenium are less than the effluent discharge consent limits and the maximum concentrations recorded in the leachate produced by the non-hazardous waste landfill between 2014 and 2019;
- The maximum leachable concentration of chloride is more than 5 times lower than the maximum leachate concentration recorded in the non-hazardous waste landfill between 2014 and 2019. No limit is listed in the effluent discharge consent for this substance;
- The maximum leachable concentrations of cadmium, chromium, lead, molybdenum and nickel are less than the effluent discharge consent limits, but greater than the maximum concentrations recorded in the non-hazardous waste landfill between 2014 and 2019;
- The maximum leachable concentrations of copper, zinc and sulphate are greater than the effluent discharge consent limits and maximum recorded concentrations in leachate recorded in the non-hazardous waste landfill between 2014 and 2019;
- The maximum leachable concentrations for barium, fluoride and mercury are greater than the maximum recorded concentrations in leachate recorded in the non-hazardous waste landfill between 2014 and 2019.

3.1.8 However, in real terms, the leachable concentrations of each substance will vary for each waste source, with the bulk leachate chemistry being significantly less than the limit values.

- 3.1.9 It is also worth noting that prior to 2005 the landfill originally operated as a co-disposal facility in which the source term concentrations of special/hazardous wastes are likely to have been significantly greater than those to be displayed by the non-hazardous wastes proposed for deposit in the monocell. Historic deposits of special/hazardous wastes will therefore still have an influence on the leachate source term currently being managed at the site, however as can be seen from the quality of the leachate managed between 2014 and 2016 the bulk leachate chemistry is not as potent as that of the leachable concentrations from the individual special/hazardous wastes streams that would have been deposited at the site prior to 2004.

Leachate Management in the SNRHW Monocell

- 3.1.10 Whilst a side riser has been installed within the monocell, no basal drainage blanket is installed. However, the inherent nature of the filling sequence within the monocell will result in a significant proportion of low permeable cover materials (e.g. cohesive soils) being deposited and compacted that will restrict the volume of water that infiltrates the waste, with a significant proportion of waters being managed at the surface and only a limited quantity likely to reach the base.
- 3.1.11 For any waters that do infiltrate and reach the base of the monocell, the leachate level will be monitored and maintained at no more than 5m above the base of the riser, which mirrors the current leachate compliance level for Phase 1 (derived by the HRA) and the water level adopted in the quantitative SRA models.

Potential Influence on Existing Leachate Management and Discharge

- 3.1.12 Of the substances in which limits are imposed within the effluent discharge consent only the waste acceptance limits for copper, zinc and sulphate would potentially lead to exceedances. As discussed above, the leachable concentrations presented in **Table 2** are representative of maximum leachable concentrations of the future wastes proposed to be deposited in the monocell. Taking into account the variable chemistry of the wastes to be deposited and the associated reduced bulk chemistry the bulk source term concentrations of waters within the monocell are likely to be significantly less than the equivalent leachate concentrations derived from the waste acceptance limits. Moreover, as the treatment process consists of a batch reactor process, water extracted from the monocell will also be mixed with leachate from the non-hazardous waste deposits for treatment, thus providing further dilution prior to treatment and discharge. On this basis it is not considered that the potential change in water quality within the monocell will significantly influence the leachate treatment and discharge regime at the site.

Hydrogeological Risk

- 3.1.13 The monocell is constructed on a section of the engineered sidewall of the site, the base of which is ~70m above that of the landfill itself, which in turn is at least 30m above that of groundwater within the underlying aquifer. The Hydrogeological Risk Assessment carried out for the landfill to date has quantified through probabilistic modelling that the potential risk of the discernible inputs of hazardous substances and the input of non-hazardous pollutants that could cause pollution is low.
- 3.1.14 The relevance of the current HRA in the context of the proposed variation of wastes for disposal in the monocell is largely based on the selection of cadmium

(formerly a hazardous substance) as a priority, surrogate metal species owing to the associated risk factor of 740 calculated based on the ratio of the maximum concentration recorded in leachate to date of 0.74 mg/l to that of an Environmental Assessment Level of 0.0001mg/l. The model predicted a theoretical peak concentration in groundwater of 1×10^{-40} mg/l (excluding baseline concentrations), which illustrates that there is a significant attenuation provided by the lining system, unsaturated zone and aquifer to limit the risk to groundwater.

3.1.15 Taking into considering the elevation of the monocell relative to basal level of the landfill, the attenuation provided by the lining system and unsaturated zone, and the dilution available in the aquifer the leachable concentrations of the proposed wastes to be deposited in the monocell will not present a significant increased risk to controlled waters.

3.1.16 Moreover, leachate generated within the monocell will be managed within the cell itself, with only limited quantities likely to leak through the separation bund and into the adjacent non-hazardous landfill cells. The potential influence on the water balance of the non-hazardous landfill is therefore considered to be low.

Monitoring

3.1.17 The monitoring of leachate generated within the SNRHW monocell will be monitored from the riser and within the waters managed at the surface each quarter. The parameters monitored will include the substances listed in **Table 2**, together with asbestos fibres. Leachate levels within the monocell riser will be measured on a monthly frequency.

3.1.18 Due to the limited risk posed to controlled waters, there are no changes required to current monitoring schedule for groundwater or surface water as a result of this variation.

Compliance with the Landfill Directive

3.1.19 Paragraph 5.7 to the EA guidance LFD1 (Understanding the Landfill Directive) stipulates that for SNRHW *"the engineering requirements of the landfill cells must comply with the requirements of the Directive. However, it is recognised that the design and specification requirements may be different for the differing waste types and should be determined on the basis of a risk assessment"*.

3.1.20 The LFD requires that separation be provided to ensure that there is no direct contact between the biodegradable wastes and SNRHW, or their products. The position of the SNRHW cell on the sidewall of the landfill means that it is located ~65m above the leachate compliance limit for the non-hazardous landfill. Combined with the presence of a 2m thick (minimum) bund between the two wastes types the waste separation principles of the LFD have been achieved. There is also no direct pathway for any leachates formed in the SNRHW monocell to enter the non-hazardous landfill. Similarly, landfill gas from the non-hazardous waste will continue to be prevented from entering the monocell by means of the installation of a network of gas extraction wells located ~10m from the outer edge of the separation bund. Based on the engineered separation and management design principles currently adopted the engineering requirements of the LFD relating to the co-disposal of SNRHW wastes at the biodegradable non-hazardous landfills are achieved.

3.2 Landfill Gas Risk Assessment Review

- 3.2.1 The additional wastes to be deposited in the monocell will be non-degradable in nature, as are the current wastes permitted for deposit in the monocell. This change will not therefore alter the gas generation potential of the landfill or impact upon the management of landfill gas at the site.

3.3 Stability Risk Assessment Review

- 3.3.1 A review of the Stability Risk Assessment (SRA) for the SNRHW monocell has been carried following a request from Natural Resource Wales (NRW) (**Appendix 5**). The SRA:-

- reviews the 2014 SRA in light of the proposed permit variation to widen the permitted waste codes for the SNRHW cell; and
- calibrates the infill model in light of the inclinometer readings to date;

- 3.3.2 Using a wider range of material values (in terms of bulk density, permeability, stiffness, and shear strength) for the SNRHW waste (to reflect the additional waste codes proposed as part of the permit variation), the factors of safety for stability of the waste mass, and integrity of the waste containment system, are still satisfactory.

- 3.3.3 By incorporating a volume reduction function into the MSW waste model (to more accurately simulate biodegradation and creep settlement in MSW) it was possible to very closely match the bund movement witnessed to date in Inclinometer 2 (the tallest surviving inclinometer).

- 3.3.4 Using this improvement to the model, it was possible to determine that variations in the SNRHW waste parameters don't impact significantly on the predicted movement of the separation bund between the two waste types. Additionally, it was determined that settlement of the MSW has the most significant impact in controlling movement of the bund.

- 3.3.5 Also, using the results of the calibration exercise, and an examination of the impact of potential variations in predicted MSW waste settlement and creep, it was possible to determine the maximum potential separation in the corners (at all bund heights). Following this assessment, it was possible to confirm that the additional cover material being placed in the corners is still sufficiently wide to ensure that a 2m wide separation zone (between the two waste types) would be maintained during the remaining in-filling period, and after in-filling is completed.

4.0 OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

4.1 Financial Provision

- 4.1.1 The scope of this application to vary the permit does not alter the existing plans for closing the site.
- 4.1.2 Given that the SNRHW will be capped to the same specification as non-hazardous waste filled areas, the leachate balance for the site does not need to be revised. On this basis no further provision needs to be included for in the financial provision currently agreed for the treatment or disposal of leachate from the site.
- 4.1.3 Moreover, due to the presence of asbestos wastes in the monocell, drilling into the waste mass is not permitted. No further provision is therefore required for replacement leachate or gas management infrastructure at the site.
- 4.1.4 As discussed in section it should be noted that although the monocell has only accepted asbestos wastes to date, prior to issue of the PPC permit in March 2005, the site had operated under a Waste Management Licence, as a hazardous waste landfill, co-disposing a range of non-hazardous and full hazardous wastes together. Therefore, waste deposits within the existing landfill have already comprised non-hazardous, stable non-reactive hazardous wastes including asbestos and full hazardous wastes. The leachate source term within existing areas of the landfill, outside of the monocell, is therefore representative of that from a former co-disposal site and as noted in Section 3.1, leachate concentrations within the monocell will be less than within the main areas of the landfill.
- 4.1.5 It should also be noted that financial provision for the landfill already took account of former waste deposits and was therefore never reduced when the PPC permit was issued, or when the monocell was later removed from the permit. Increasing the range of wastes to include further stable non-reactive hazardous wastes, in keeping with the permit when originally issued, will not therefore increase the requirement for financial provision, which has already been put in place based on historical waste deposits of non-hazardous, stable non-reactive hazardous wastes, and hazardous wastes within the landfill.

4.2 Amenity Risk Assessment

- 4.2.1 The additional waste types are not considered to pose any significant increased risk to local amenity through the potential emissions of dust, odour, noise, mud or debris (including litter), nor will it increase the potential risks from pests or scavengers.

4.3 Closure Plan

- 4.3.1 The scope of this application to vary the permit does not alter the existing plans for closing the site.