

## Response ID ANON-77AS-6MYH-6

Submitted to **Standard rules consultation no. 19: revision of standard rule sets for medium combustion plant and specified generators**  
Submitted on **2019-06-10 18:48:42**

### About the consultation

#### About you

**1 Please tell us if you are responding as an individual or on behalf of an organisation or group.**

Responding on behalf of an organisation or group

**2 What is your email address?**

**Your email address:**

andy.limbrick@energy-uk.org.uk

**4 Can we publish your response? We will not publish any personal information or parts of your response that will reveal your identity.**

Yes

**If you do not want us to publish your response, you need to tell us why.:**

**3 Please tell us how you found out about this consultation:**

From the Environment Agency

**Other:**

### Responding as an organisation or group

**5 Please state the name of the organisation or group you are responding on behalf.**

**Name of organisation or group:**

Energy UK

**6 Please tell us which sector you are from.**

**Sector:**

Energy/Combustion

### Proposed revision to rules

**1 Do you agree with our approach to revise the standard rules sets?**

Agree

**Please provide further information to support your answer.:**

In particular, we support the extension of SRPs to explicitly include new medium combustion plant and the clarity and extensions provided regarding the range of plant falling within the scope of SRP No.7.

**2 Are there any barriers to using the rules?**

Yes

**Please explain your answer.:**

We think that there are barriers to being able to use the standard rule permits due to the strict locational applicability criteria. For example, in the case of SRP1, having minimum distances of 150m from the nearest human sensitive receptors and 600m from habitat receptors, and the requirement to be outside an Air Quality Management Area, means that very few sites are able to make use of these. It is unclear whether such a conservative approach is justified in terms of environmental benefits, and this clearly leads to more work for both site operators and the Environment Agency in terms of bespoke permit applications/determinations/regulation.

Given the range of different plant covered under the specified generator and MCP regulations, the most efficient way to determine which additional plant could be brought under SRP rules would be for the Environment Agency to review the outcomes of simple bespoke and complex bespoke permit determinations after a period of implementation, say 18 months, to see where these more detailed assessments consistently indicate low impacts. Such a review could also determine which SRP criteria (e.g. minimum distances to receptors) could be relaxed. This would be particularly useful in the case of back-up generators operating for less than 50 hours per year which are located within the minimum habitats screening distances in SRP No.7 and hence currently would not qualify for standard rules permits.

### 3 Please tell us about any financial impact on your business of making this proposed change.

#### Details of any financial impact:

We note that there is currently a backlog in terms of permit determination for Tranche B generators and that there may be plant which have applied under the bespoke permit process which would be eligible for standard rules permitting under the proposed revisions. We therefore recommend that the Environment Agency screen all submitted bespoke permit applications which have yet to be determined, for eligibility under the additional SRP categories as part of the determination process.

Similarly, where permits have already been issued for Tranche B generators which would now be eligible for a standard rules permit under the additional categories, then those operators should be entitled to request a replacement SRP, or have their permit conditions amended to match those applicable under the equivalent SRP. This would ensure a level playing field and avoid penalising early applicants.

#### Proposed charges

#### Further comments

### 4 Please tell us if you have any further comments that have not been covered by the previous questions and provide as much information as possible to support your answer.

#### Any further comments:

- Table 3.1 in SRPs 1,2,3,6 and 9 states "N/A" in relation to monitoring frequency for a CHP boiler, but includes an ELV and monitoring standard. It is not clear what the implication of this requirement is, particularly in the light of rules 3.2, 3.2.1 and 3.2.2. Does this mean no monitoring is required, in which case, why is an ELV specified? Or is there simply a requirement to demonstrate compliance with a one-off single measurement? Clarification should be provided on what the compliance and monitoring requirements are for CHPs covered by these SRPs where these are not new MCPs. A similar comment applies to Table 3.1 in SRP No.5 for gas engines with no abatement.

- The purpose of the new rule 3.2.2 is not clear. Rule 3.2.1 sets the default position that monitoring will be required for the parameters in Tables 3.1 and 3.2 unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Environment Agency. The new rule 3.2.2 appears to state the opposite position, that the operator shall undertake monitoring if notified in writing by the Environment Agency. These rules could be read as conflicting or it could be that 3.2.2 is to allow the Environment Agency to reserve the right to request additional monitoring. If the intention is that 3.2.2 is applied in cases where an agreement has been obtained from the Environment Agency negating the requirements of 3.2.1, or if there is a different intention behind 3.2.2, then this should be stated more clearly.

- SRP No.6 is not compliant with the requirements of the MCP Directive (MCPD). Table 3.2 sets a limit of 190mg/Nm<sup>3</sup> (15%O<sub>2</sub>) for a new MCP gas engine ≥ 1MWth firing natural gas. The MCPD requires compliance with 95mg/Nm<sup>3</sup> for such plants. This should be amended.

- We have noticed that the distance criteria in SRP No.7 now relate to the minimum distance from any SAC, SPA, Ramsar or SSSI bringing it into line with the other SRPs. The current version of SRP No.7 only relates to distances from any SAC or SPA. The revision therefore represents a significant increase in stringency. It would be helpful to understand whether this was simply correcting a drafting error or whether this reflects an intentional increase in stringency associated with the additional MCP categories now included and to understand the environmental justification for the latter, if that is the case.

In SRP No.7, Rule 2.2.2 clarifies that both the stack height and minimum screening distance criteria must be met to qualify for a SRP. In this context, the wording in 2.2.3 is superfluous and confusing, as it could be interpreted that a unit could qualify for an SRP by meeting the stack height criterion alone. We therefore suggest that Rule 2.2.3 is omitted.

- SRP No.7 requires some additional specificity in the category definitions where these overlap as follows:

- o SRP No.7 treats biogas as a distinct fuel category. In order to provide clarity that it does not also fall under the heading 'gaseous fuels other than natural gas' (as it does in the MCPD, albeit subject to specific footnotes) the latter category should be stated as 'gaseous fuels other than natural gas or biogas' within SRP No.7.

- o The final row in Table 2.2 is already covered by row 4 and can be removed.

- We note that MCPApp\_releaseVO1\_31 (Electronic SRP application form) will need to be updated to reflect the revised SRP criteria, including the extension to include MCPs under SRPs other than SRP No.7.

- We have also identified the following issues related to MCPApp\_releaseVO1\_31 in relation to the original set of SRPs, which should be addressed when the form is updated.

- o SRP No.4 and SRP No.5 are only applicable to engines, but allow boilers as a valid technology selection when verifying the plant

- o When SRP No.7 is selected for 'a single specified generator' it allows individual plant of > 20 MWth as a valid thermal input selection when verifying the plant, despite the individual limit of 20 MWth

- o When SRP No.7 is selected it does not allow Boilers burning natural gas or Boilers burning other gaseous fuels as a valid combination, despite these combinations falling within the scope of SRP No.7.

#### Your feedback on this online tool

### 9 How satisfied were you with the tool?

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

**Please tell us if you have any suggestions on how we could improve the tool.:**

Make it easier to edit text in the free text boxes. e.g. I could not find a way to add bullet points other than copying and pasting text from Word.