Little Marlow Sewage Treatment Works Liaison Committee minutes

Minutes of the meeting of the Little Marlow Sewage Treatment Works Liaison Committee held on Friday 10 November 2023 in Via Video Conference, commencing at 11.00 am and concluding at 12.00 pm.

Members present

J Downes, M Overall and D Watson

Others in attendance

P Emmett, C Gray, S Kershaw, J Morley and A Scott

Agenda Item

1 Welcome

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2 Chairman's Update

The Chairman wished to bring to the attention of the committee a library where documents were stored, including correspondence with Thames Water, the Environment Agency, the Leader of the Council as well as the Secretary of State. The link for this library, which is public and can be accessed at any time is below:

https://buckinghamshire.moderngov.co.uk/ecCatDisplay.aspx?sch=doc&cat=13716

3 Apologies for Absence

There were none.

4 Minutes and Actions Arising from the last meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 28 April 2023 were agreed as a correct record. The Chairman asked Andrew Scott of Thames Water to update the committee on their action points during his update.

It was noted that Sam Kershaw had sent some questions to Thames Water one of which, in particular, he was hoping would be responded to at this meetin. It was a question that arose at the last meeting that EDM UM system monitors spillages from the storm tank and his question was how are other types of pollution incidents identified and recording recorded if not through the EDM?

5 Thames Water Update

Andrew Scott explained that they monitor on site for water quality and quantity by online monitoring, which is constant and measured parameters such as flow, compensation flows, outfall solids, outfall authority, ammonia, and storm tank levels. Event duration monitors were also used to detect when they were spilling to the environment. He admitted that they did not measure the volume of storm flows, which was not required by their permit but could have a significant environmental impact. Thames Water would need to implement upstream and downstream monitoring for water quality by 2030 as part of the Environment Bill.

Andrew Scott explained about the monitoring methods and performance of a water treatment site. He showed graphs of suspended solids, biochemical oxygen demand and ammonia, which were the main parameters of their consent. He also explained that they used online and offline tests to measure these parameters and that Thames Water had been complying with the limits. He went on to explain how some events, such as blower trips, could affect the ammonia removal. Andew Scott concluded that the site was operating well and that they would have to meet new requirements in the future.

Andrew Scott went on to explain how Thames Water used ferric to remove phosphorus from the water and monitored the flow and the storm tank spills. He reported that they had achieved very good results in terms of phosphorus and iron levels and that they had not had any spills to the environment in 2022 and 2023. He also showed some examples of false triggers from the EDM monitors, which were caused by various factors such as maintenance, cobwebs or animals. He assured the committee that they had CCTV and storm tank depth monitors to verify that there were no actual spills.

Andrew also explained how quality of the water was monitored and the performance of the treatment process. He showed three graphs that displayed the results for suspended solids, biochemical oxygen demand (BYOD) and ammonia. He stated that the plant met the consent limits for all these parameters, except for one occasion when the blowers that provided air to the aeration lane tripped and caused a spike in ammonia. Andrew concluded that the site was operating well and effectively.

There were no reported pollutions in 2022 and 2023. The EDM going out to storm is not necessarily a pollution but a consented discharge. Andrew also explained that one of the key ways of reporting pollutions is by the local stakeholders or the Environment Agency. Reporting incidents was encouraged as they would be investigated and reported back through the Environment Agency (EA). There was a national incident recording database which was available for viewing.

Andrew explained how Thames Water reported and investigated any pollution incidents that occurred when the water quality exceeded the effluent of concern level, which is higher than the consent limit. He stated that the consent limit was a 95% compliance limit which meant that they could have some variations in the water quality without violating the regulation. He also stated that the effluent of concern level is usually two or three times the consent limit and if they went above

that, even for a short time, they had to notify the authorities and find out the cause.

Sam Kershaw asked Andrew Scott under what circumstances would their regular monitoring system fail to identify a pollution incident which would then have been identified by a member of the public?

Andrew explained that they dealt with the possibility of pollution that was not detected by their online monitoring system. He commented that this was very rare, but it could happen if there was something that affected the water course that they were not measuring. He stated that Little Marlow had a sophisticated online monitoring system that was alarmed and checked by a 24 hour centre and that other sites that did not have this facility relied on daily or weekly visits to check on the outfalls.

Andrew also reported on some of the upgrade work that was taking place on site to improve the water quality and prevent pollution. One of the upgrades, the effluent blending mitigation system, was a backup system that could blend the settled sewage with the treated sewage in case of a failure in the biological plant. He stated that this system was used in 2021 when they had a problem with the biological plant, but it caused some concerns from the Environment Agency who expected a higher level of treatment. He explained that this system was a worst case scenario and only protected the river to some extent. The cost of the upgrade work had increased from £5 million to £20 million. The increase was due to engineers had assessed the site which increased the figure which had previously been an estimate.

Thames Water was replacing obsolete sludge presses with a new sludge system that includes chemical dosing. This will help with sludge management within the site and reduce the risk of suspended solids and BYOD spilling from the site. The new system will also enable the production of a better cake product to take off site. The work has been funded, designed, and is in progress. The preliminary work is expected to start in the New Year and will take about a year to complete. Andrew Scott has also introduced a monitoring system called “UMON4” which includes 1/3 and U-14 measures to indicate when anything is going into the storm tanks. The system includes monitors for storm tank levels and when the water goes out to the environment. Additionally, the UMON 4 measures the forward flow to treatment, which is important for demonstrating that the permitted flow treatment is being met. This is a complex project that is still being designed and is expected to be completed by April 2025. The project aims to ensure that the flow of stormwater is accurately monitored and maintained at 1500 leads per second. The project is challenging due to the presence of interstage pumping and the inlet works that do not lend themselves to accurate monitoring of flow. Andrew Scott extended an invitation to anyone interested to take a look around the site.

In response to a question about EDMs on CSOs which was an action for Andrew in the minutes from the previous meeting. He explained that some CSOs not on online map, and then confirmed that all in Bucks were now on the map but that unpermitted CSOs, ones that had been found but that had not been given permits and that TW was not previously aware of, were being investigated and TW had been given until the end of the year to place EDM monitors at those sites, most of which are in the London catchment.

In response to a question about an odour survey, Andrew explained that one would be undertaken sometime after April 2024. Surveys are normally carried out within a 5 year detail and Andrew agreed to respond to the Chairman.

Philip Emmett and Andrew Scott discussed maintenance and repair. Previously, there was no facility to maintain the system, which led to a serious problem. Andrew Scott confirmed that the situation is still the same and if there was a catastrophic failure, they would have to use blending pumps. However, they now have a better understanding of the failure and have implemented a more rigorous condition-based monitoring on their rotating equipment. All M&E site teams, especially at Little Marlow, have the necessary equipment to perform vibration and heat testing which is now done as a routine. There were some repair jobs that could not be maintained due to the size of the equipment. If it was a gearbox issue, then they can be replaced quite easily as they sat above the ground. The previous failure was because the equipment was bespoke and parts had to be made.

It was agreed that some members of the Liaison Committee would visit the site to gain a better understanding of what takes place.

Action: Andrew Scott, David Watson, Liz Hornby

In response to a question on whether E-Coli was measured within their process, Andrew Scott confirmed that TW was doing testing around bathing waters which were the second only inland bathing waters at Port Meadows in Oxford. There was a whole series of sewage treatment works upstream of that which included Cassington as well as Evenlode and Windrush, so sampling for E-Coli was taking place as there was a lack of knowledge in the water industry regarding the fate of viruses and bacteria in sewage treatment and freshwater. Bacteria and viruses are killed or treated at the back end of sewage treatment, but it is unclear how long they survive in fresh water. It was noted that this testing was taking place in conjunction with the EA due to farming run-off. This testing would give a greater understanding of what was going on. It was also noted that there were some community groups, Henley being one of them, who were part-funded by the TW, who were taking samples from the river and sending them to TW's laboratories for analysis. It should be noted that there were many other things that could cause harm but they were unknown.

Andrew explained that he is part of a round table working group with Professor Sir Chris Whitty and the CMO team, along with other people from water companies, virologists and the science community. They are trying to understand where they are in lieu of a potential waterborne pandemic and what they would do in that situation. If they discharged into a coastal bathing water, they would need disinfection of some sort which would either be chemical disinfection or UV disinfection. Currently that was costly and time-consuming to set up, but was something that would be considered when considering an inland bathing water. A UV treatment was to be installed at Cassington, which is the nearest discharging site to Port Meadows.

In response to a question about whether monitoring points were being installed in the Thames itself, Andrew stated that the Environment Bill that was passed 18 months ago, which mandates water companies to monitor the receiving water

course, which requires upstream and downstream monitoring. However, this is fraught with problems as some streams and rivers are easily accessible to the public. The parameters to measure and how to make them vandal-proof are still being worked out. The cost of this is very high, which will ultimately be borne by the customer. This is a requirement across the whole of the water industry and would help understand the impact of upstream and downstream activities of a particular site's discharges.

In response to a question about the designated bathing area which is located near a sewage works which, in turn, put constraints on TW in terms of monitoring and treatment of that particular stretch of the river, Andrew Scott explained that where there were bathing waters, monitoring took place every year for faecal indicators as well as E-Coli, Streptococcus etc. The system was complicated due to other factors being involved, such as run off from farms and other river users such as marinas.

If the Little Marlow area were to be designated a bathing area, then this would entail implementing the same measures as at Oxford.

Sam Kershaw enquired about the status of a proactive alerting system that was put on hold. People are expected to check the EDM website to identify instances. Where there are any plans to put in place a more proactive system and if so, what is the progress of that initiative. Jake Morley stated that the online EDM map that monitors the river is currently a fair and good way for river users to check the river and how they want to use it. The map is going through an iterative process and consulting groups from Thames Water are being consulted to improve the map. The text messaging service is not a high concern for the groups. The first iteration of the map only had data on when the river overflowed. The map has been updated to include a link to the website's improvement plans. There is no specific plan to alert immediate users in the area and users are encouraged to go online to check how they want to use their water courses.

Sam Kershaw asked that following a sewage pipe failure that occurred earlier this year in Marlow, which resulted in tankering in of effluent during that time. The compliance assessment report from 2021 stated that tankering should not occur during storm discharge; could TW confirm if during the storm discharge, tankering took place? Jake Morley responded by asking if Sam was referring to the burst rising main and explained that it was simply to get the effluent to the treatment works. Andrew Scott also explained that TW should not be done during storm events is taking in from third party carriers that are going around picking up septic tanks, for instance, and charge them money to tip because it goes straight out to the environment and during storming events, something called a Cess Logger can be cut off which then means that no discharge can be physically released.

In response to a discussion about the Environment Agency not attending this meeting, the Chairman agreed to co-ordinate with the Leader of the Council to try and exert pressure on them to attend future meetings as it was believed they had an important contribution to make.

Action: Cllr D Watson

In response to a question from Nick Rowcliffe in respect of a strip of land along the south side of the railway from Marlow to opposite the treatment works being dug

up by a bulldozer, Jake Morley responded that there was a temporary rising main pipe in situ which was waiting for a more permanent fix.

Nick Rowcliffe also asked about why Marlow was showing green on the EDM map during the recent Storm Kieran compared to all coastal areas which showed red. Andrew Scott responded that there was spillage into the storm tanks and not out of and that the storm tanks have very large capacities.

In response to a question in reference to the impact the new film studios, should they go ahead, would have on the sewage works it was noted that there would be concern at the works due to the additional pressures that would be exerted. The issue was a complex one of measuring the population equivalent of a site which is based on the number of households and estimated number of people living in each household. There is also a trade effluent element to it. The load is measured in kilograms of ammonia per day rather than volume. There are two things that can affect the system: hydraulic restriction and ground water impact. The rising main is used to detect ground water impact. Andrew Scott is unsure about the maximum capacity of the asset management team. The team is responsible for monitoring the development of catchments, which can be unpredictable and vary depending on the design horizon. From an operations perspective, it was noted that the team was often playing 'catch-up' instead of being proactive.

In response to a question of when 7 stroke 8 is in real terms and when a likely upgrade/improvement would be, it was noted that AMP 7 finishes at the end of March 2025 and AMP 8 is then a 5-year period starting in April 2025.

The Chairman thanked Andrew Scott and Jake Morley for their report and responses to questions.

6 Environment Agency Update

The Chairman explained there was no update from the EA and would follow up on his action to liaise with the Leader of the Council to encourage their attendance at future meetings.

*Post meeting note: the EA update is attached.

7 Action Log

The Action Log was noted.

8 Date of next meeting

Friday 22 March 2025 at 11.00am.

Environment Agency	**EPR Compliance Assessment Report**	Report ID: S/0750428

This form will report compliance with your permit as determined by an Environment Agency officer

Site	LITTLE MARLOW STW (WOOBURNVALLEY), LITTLE MARLOW STW (WOOBURNVALLE, Y), BUCKS, -	Permit Ref	CNTD.0058		
Operator/ Permit holder	THAMES WATER UTILITIES LIMITED.				
Date	19/07/2023	Time in	10:00	Out	13:23
What parts of the permit were assessed	Wastewater Treatment Works / STW settled storm sewage, Wastewater Treatment Works secondary treated sewage effluent				
Assessment Type	Site inspection: Wastewater Treatment Works - Operator Self Monitoring (OSM)	EPR Activity:	Water Discharge		
Recipient's name/position	CAR form Inbox				
Officer's name	Jackie Outhwaite	Date issued	02/08/2023		

Section 1 - Compliance Assessment Summary

This is based on the requirements of the permit under the Environmental Permitting Regulations. A detailed explanation and any action you may need to take are given in the "Detailed Assessment of Compliance" (section 3). This summary details which conditions we have assessed, where we believe any non-compliance with the permit has occurred, the relevant condition and how the non-compliance has been categorised using our Compliance Classification Scheme (CCS). For more details of our CCS scheme, contact your local office.

KEY: **C1, C2, C3, C4** = CCS breach category **A** = Assessed (no evidence of non-compliance

Activities and Permit Conditions Assessed	CCS Category	Condition(s) breached
1 - Wastewater Treatment Works secondary treated sewage effluent		
1.1b. WRA Works operation (c2)	A	
2.2a. The site authorised discharge points (a1)	A	
3.3j. MCERTS Requirements (g1)	A	
3.3k. Accessible sample point (g1)	A	
Oth. Other (a1)	A	
2 - Wastewater Treatment Works / STW settled storm sewage		
2.3c. Overflow to environment PFF/due to rainfall or snowmelt (b5)	A	
2.3e. Storage provided and emptied (b5)	A	

Descriptive Works Fail	N/A	Number of breaches recorded	0

If the total no of breaches is greater than zero, then please see Section 3 for details of our proposed enforcement response

Section 2 – Compliance Assessment Report Detail

This section contains a report of our findings and will usually include information on:

- the part(s) of the permit that were assessed (e.g. maintenance, training etc)
- where the type of assessment was 'Data Review' details of the report/results triggering the assessment
- any non-compliances identified
- any non-compliances with directly applicable legislation
- details of any multiple non-compliances
- details of advice given
- any other areas of concern
- all actions requested
- any examples of good practice.
- a reference to photos taken

This report should be clear, comprehensive, unambiguous and normally completed within 14 days of an assessment.

Little Marlow wastewater treatment works (WwTW**)** is regulated under Environmental Permit number **D 0058**. There is also a permit for the compensation flow to the River Wye numbered 1334. Population equivalent of 177,415. This report relates to an inspection carried out on 18 July 2023.

Please see below for the report sections:
1. Permit Breaches
2. Summary of Processes and Equipment on site
3. Comments and observations from site walk around and **Recommended Actions**

1. **Permit Breaches:** there are no permit breaches recorded for this visit.

2. Summary of Processes and Equipment on site

Site is manned Monday to Friday 07:30 – 15:36 hrs with 1 to 7 people at a time as it is a hub site.

Preliminary Stage

- Sewage is both pumped and gravity fed into the works siphon washout pumping station chamber which has a high high level alarm float which triggers an A1 alarm.
- Cess waste is accepted at Little Marlow WwTW unless the site is storming, when access is denied and texts are sent letting customers know it is closed.
- 3 inlet screens (duty, assist, assist) which were installed 2015/16. The screens are cleaned by wash water system which also helps transport the screened rag to washpactors and skips for disposal. There is also a full flow bypass around the screens in the event of the screens becoming blinded, if this occurs then the flow diverts to the bypass via a weir and an alarm will be generated, there was no sign that this had been used recently.
- Storm separation takes place after the screens via a concrete weir. Flow to treatment (FTT) is set at 1442l/s. Sewage was not overflowing to the storm tanks at the time of the visit.
- Following the storm separation is an inlet flow meter that gives inaccurate instantaneous flow readings due to the grit collecting in the channel.
- There is also a penstock which used to be linked to the interstage pump station (PS) and would close should the interstage PS fail e.g. during a power cut. This was taken out of use because brownouts would cause the penstock to close even though the PS continued to operate. The penstock can still be used to reduce FTT and send incoming sewage to the storm tanks but there is a strict procedure to follow, escalating the issue through the business (Out of Hours Coordinator, Waste EDA and Duty Manager) before it should be operated.
- Grit removal was by 2 grit vortex systems but only 1 needs to be operational at a time.
- Flow to Treatment meter is located after the manual penstock and was reading 119l/s.

Dosing

- Ferric sulphate dosing takes place in the BNR.

Primary

- Flow is split between 3 primary settlement tanks (PSTs) which were all operational but al contained duck weed on the surface. The settled sewage gravitates from the PSTs to the interstage pumping station
- Retention times are 2+ hours and the site can operate with 2 PSTs so maintenance can be carried out.

Interstage Pumping Stage

- There are three variable speed pumps in the interstage PS (duty, assist and standby) that lift the sewage to the secondary treatment.
- There are 'high' and 'high high' level floats in the wet well linked to alarms.

Secondary

- Secondary treatment is provided by a Biological Nutrient Removal (BNR) plant which accelerates the natural biological processes by starving then feeding micro-organisms so that they remove phosphorus, ammonia and organic compounds.
- Three blowers (one duty and two assist) provide the oxygen for the aerobic stage of the BNR process.
- Effluent from the BNR is then passed through 4 final settlement tanks (FST's) to remove any final solids. They contained a lot of duckweed on their surfaces, but it did not appear to leaving the tanks in any quantity.
- Return Activated Sludge (RAS) pumps return some of the sludge to the BNR and surplus activated sludge (SAS) passes to the sludge treatment area.
- Each FST has an adjustable sludge blanket detector installed and in the event of a FST high sludge blanket level being detected, an alarm for each tank is raised.
- The settled effluent is decanted over the peripheral weirs of the FST's and is split between the River Wye, River Thames and wash water.

Tertiary

- Approximately 320l/s of flow is pumped to the River Wye to compensate for High Wycombe STW closing in 2005. Due to the tighter consent conditions at the High Wycombe outfall approximately two thirds of the compensation flow passes through tertiary treatment provided by disc filters.
- If high level blanket alarms on the FSTs are triggered the compensation flow will stop.

Storm System

- There are 5 storm tanks with a combined capacity of 12,568m3.
- The tanks fill sequentially but only discharge from tank 5 with the EDM monitor and CCTV installed. There was also a level monitor for spills to the storm tanks.
- Return from the storm tanks is carried out manually to Marlow Bottom pumping station (PS) when FFT drops below 1,300l/s. Marlow Bottom PS then feeds into the siphon washout chamber along with sewage from part of the catchment.
- The storm tanks contain an Amajet system for removing any sludge in the bottom of the tanks. There was a small amount of liquid in the bottom of the storm tanks following the recent rainfall and the storm return valve was open and returning 7.5l/s at the time of the visit.

Monitoring

- Phoenix for WQ monitoring in the final effluent (FE) chamber to the River Thames.
- MCERTS flow meters on FE to River Thames read 595l/s and on FE to River Wye read 263.8l/s at the time of visit.
- FE sample point was labelled and was running clear. The outfall on the River Thames for both the FE and the storm is located about 500m from the site. Here the FE was also running clear and there were no signs that the storm outfall had discharged recently.

Sludge

- PST sludge and scum are removed and pumped to the raw sludge buffer tank.
- SAS is pumped to the SAS belt thickeners, then on to the aerated SAS Buffer Tank before being made into cake by 2 presses for the THP at Oxford or Mogden.

Improvement Work Planned

- Complete installation of a new pumping system which will take settled sewage from the interstage PS, bypassing the secondary treatment, and blending with the FE before the River Thames discharge flow meter. This is to provide short term resilience until an extra FST is added to the site. The system has an inbuild MCERTS flow meter within it and a procedure for operating the pumping system will be produced before the system is operational in 3 – 4 months time. Just to be clear, if blended sewage is discharged from the site in this way, it will be a breach of your environmental permit – see letter from D Ophof dated 30 June 2023.
- Outstanding requirement for a feasibility study for an extra FST on site.
- Sludge treatment assessment including bringing the sludge presses down to ground level to improve maintenance access.

Other Issues

During the inspection I noticed the bunded trays of 2 IBCs were filled with what looked like water and a white coloured liquid - see photograph 1. This was highlighted to [redacted] while on site.

ACTION – Please ensure the bunds are emptied and no liquid can escape from the containers or bunding trays.

Photograph 1 - Bund needing emptying

Section 3- Enforcement Response	Only one of the boxes below should be ticked
You must take immediate action to rectify any non-compliance and prevent repetition. Non-compliance with your permit conditions constitutes an offence and can result in criminal prosecutions and/or suspension or revocation of a permit. Please read the detailed assessment in Section 2 and the steps you need to take in Section 4 below.	
Other than the provision of advice and guidance, at present we do not intend to take further enforcement action in respect of the non-compliance identified above. This does not preclude us from taking enforcement action if further relevant information comes to light or advice isn't followed.	X
In respect of the above non-compliance you have been issued with a warning. At present we do not intend to take further enforcement action. This does not preclude us from taking additional enforcement action if further relevant information comes to light or offences continue.	
We will now consider what enforcement action is appropriate and notify you, referencing this form.	

Section 4- Action(s)

Where non-compliance has been detected and an enforcement response has been selected above, this section summarises the steps you need to take to return to compliance and also provides timescales for this to be done.

Where the **CCS Category** is marked **N/A** then the specified action does not relate to a permit condition.

Criteria Ref.	CCS Category	Action Required / Advised	Due Date
See Section 1 above			
OA01	N/A	Please ensure the bunds are emptied and no liquid can escape from the containers or bunding trays.	16/08/2023

Section 5 - Compliance notes for the Operator

To ensure you correct actual or potential non-compliance we may

- advise on corrective actions verbally or in writing
- require you to take specific actions in writing
- issue a notice
- require you to review your procedures or management system
- change some of the conditions of your permit
- decide to undertake a full review of your permit

Any breach of a permit condition is an offence and we may take legal action against you.

- We will normally provide advice and guidance to assist you to come back into compliance either after an offence is committed or where we consider that an offence is likely to be committed. This is without prejudice to any other enforcement response that we consider may be required.
- Enforcement action can include the issue of a formal caution, prosecution, the service of a notice and or suspension or revocation of the permit.
- A civil sanction Enforcement Undertaking (EU) offer may also be available to you as an alternative enforcement response for this/these offence(s).

See our Enforcement and Civil Sanctions guidance for further information

This report does not relieve the site operator of the responsibility to

- ensure you comply with the conditions of the permit at all times and prevent pollution of the environment
- ensure you comply with other legislative provisions which may apply.

Non-compliance categories

CCS category	Description
C1	A non-compliance which could have a **major** environmental effect
C2	A non-compliance which could have a **significant** environmental effect
C3	A non-compliance which could have a **minor** environmental effect
C4	A non-compliance which has **no** potential environmental effect

Section 6 – General Information

Data protection notice

The information on this form will be processed by the Environment Agency to fulfill its regulatory and monitoring functions and to maintain the relevant public register(s). The Environment Agency may also use and/or disclose it in connection with:

- offering/providing you with its literature/services relating to environmental matters
- consulting with the public, public bodies and other organisations (e.g. Health and Safety Executive, local authorities) on environmental issues
- carrying out statistical analysis, research and development on environmental issues
- providing public register information to enquirers
- investigating possible breaches of environmental law and taking any resulting action
- preventing breaches of environmental law
- assessing customer service satisfaction and improving its service
- Freedom of Information Act/Environmental Information Regulations request.

The Environment Agency may pass it on to its agents/representatives to do these things on its behalf. You should ensure that any persons named on this form are informed of the contents of this data protection notice.

Disclosure of information

The Environment Agency will provide a copy of this report to the public register(s). However, if you consider that any information contained in this report should not be released to the public register(s) on the grounds of commercial confidentiality, you must write to your local area office within 28 days of receipt of this form indicating which information it concerns and why it should not be released, giving your reasons in full.

Customer charter

What can I do if I disagree with this compliance assessment report?

A permit holder can challenge any part of the CAR form by writing to the Environment Agency office local to the site within 28 days of receipt. If the issue cannot be resolved by the local office, a permit holder can raise a dispute through our official complaints procedure.

If you are still dissatisfied, you can make a complaint to the Ombudsman. For advice on how to complain to the Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman phone their helpline on 0345 015 4033.