

From: Yorkshire Enquiries, Environment Agency

Subject: Request for information - Ref: EIR2026/44236

Date: 29 September 2026 at 17:11:30 BST

Our ref: EIR2026/44236

Dear [Redacted],

I am writing in response to your request for information, received 15 September 2026, regarding EIR.

We respond to requests for information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOI) and Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR).

1. Please provide any recorded information comparing AWRP's actual emissions since commissioning with the emission source terms and operating assumptions used in the original Air Quality dispersion modelling and Human Health Risk Assessment.

This request includes both:

- (a) pollutants assessed within the HHRA, including PCDD/Fs, PAHs and metals; and
- (b) pollutants assessed through the Air Quality/dispersion assessment, including CO, NO_x, SO₂ and particulate matter.

Please include any assessment of whether the frequency, magnitude and duration of subsequent permit exceedances and OTNOC emissions remain within the emission scenarios modelled in the original application.

The sites original Air Quality and HHRA submissions were undertaken with the plant operating at the permitted limits on a continuous basis. Many of these emission limit values have subsequently been tightened as reflected in permit variation EPR/KP3808PN/V003. Annual emissions data illustrates that the permitted limits are complied with for the overwhelming majority of the time. Individual exceedances are assessed against the Air Quality Standard or Environmental Assessment Level for the particular pollutant and scored in-line with the Environment Agency Compliance Classification Scheme. As such, the original model remains valid and no further assessment has been undertaken.

2. Any recorded information showing that the original dispersion/deposition modelling has subsequently been rerun, updated or validated using actual AWRP emissions, including any reassessment of annual-average concentrations, deposition or indirect exposure pathways.

If no such reassessment has been undertaken, please provide any other recorded quantitative evidence relied upon in concluding that the original modelling remains valid.

See response to question 1.

3. Following the September 2024 Line 1 PCDD/F result of 0.6295 ng/m³, please provide any recorded assessment of whether the previous conclusion that AWRP's PCDD/F emissions were sufficiently 'stable' to justify periodic rather than continuous long-term sampling remained valid, and any consideration of requiring continuous/long-term PCDD/F sampling thereafter.

Only a single high dioxin result has been recorded during compliance monitoring. A subsequent retest was below the permitted limit. As this was a single high level result no HHRA was requested. This is only considered should there be numerous high levels over a significant period.

4. The complete information supplied by the EA to UKHSA concerning the September 2024 Line 1 and Line 2 PCDD/F exceedances, UKHSA's complete response, and any subsequent correspondence concerning the investigation, retesting or need for an updated HHRA.

Information attached

Some of the reports have been partially redacted; this is because we are unable to provide you with any information defined as personal data. As a public body we are required under the Freedom of Information Act/Environmental Information Regulations to give reasons for this refusal. **You can find the details in the appendix below.**

...

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted]

YOR Area Customers and Engagement Team

Environment Agency