Our Ref: 5039-PSL1-01

23 July 2026

By email only:

Wrexham County Borough Council
Planning Service
16 Lord Street
Wrexham
LL11 1LG

Dear Planning Service,

PLANNING APPLICATION: PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF AN IN-VESSEL COMPOSTING (IVC) FACILITY AND ASSOCIATED DEVELOPMENT AT FORMER BEFESA SALT SLAGS SITE, FENNS BANK, WREXHAM

Further to the above, and recent correspondence with Mr Robin Wynne Williams (Senior Planning Officer Minerals and Waste Planning Manager - North Wales Minerals and Waste Planning Service, who is the Planning Case Officer [PCO]), I am writing to address various points raised in Consultation Responses to the application, and to provide clarity on certain points.

The following updated documents are attached which (where relevant) replace the versions previously submitted:

Document name	Reference	Revision
Appendix L - Drainage Strategy	16076-Drainage Strategy-06	06
Appendix O - Air Quality Assessment Addendum – for Revised Emission Limit	UF00174-0030-0006SMN	1
Appendix O - AQA - Eco interpretation of AQA - Veolia IVC Fenns Bank - K25-003 – v3	-	3.0
Appendix P - Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment	-	V2
Landscape Design	5039-01-005	B

NRW Consultation response 25/03/2026

NRW raised several matters in their consultation response, which are summarised below and a response provided:

Aerial emissions and Protected Sites

A revised Air Quality Assessment Addendum (AQAA) is attached that addresses the points raised by NRW, in respect of each:

i. ***Classification of receptors E10 & E12-E14*** - whilst we note NRW's comments receptors E10, E12, E13, and E14 overlap with the Fenn's, Whixall, Bettisfield, Wem and Cadney Mosses SSSI, SAC, and Ramsar designations these receptor locations are included to assess the impacts upon features within local nature site designations. However, as these

Axis is the trading name of Axis P.E.D LTD,
Registered in England and Wales, Company No. 3872453
Chester Office: Well House Barns, Bretton, Chester, CH4 0DH (Registered Office)
Manchester Office: 1st Floor, Barfield House, Alderley Road, Wilmslow, SK9 1PL
North East Office: Maling Exchange, Studio 307, Haults Yard, Walker Road, Newcastle Upon Tyne, NE6 2HL

also lie within the SSSI, SAC, and Ramsar designations, the assessment criteria applicable to European and UK designated sites (as detailed in section 5.1.2 of the AQA) have been applied at these receptors. That being the case the approach taken is assumed to be satisfactory.

ii. ***Stack height and scenario assessment*** - Following discussions with NRW the assessment now considers only scenario 1.

iii. Turning to the extent of peat in the Fenn's, Whixall, Bettisfield, Wem and Cadney Mosses protected site, an intermediate receptor location (reference E18) set between E1 and E10 has been added to the assessment. This is based on the peat extent shown in Soilscapes data which does not extend beyond that location and so the area beyond that could not support qualifying habitat based on available data on absence of peat, visible tree cover, the survey detail reported in Kevin Honour's AQA addendum report submitted as part of the planning application, and the size/shape of the Protected Site in this area (which would not be sufficient to create a qualifying habitat).

iv. Adjustments have been made to the emissions from the Proposed Development based on a further review of equipment with the technology provider for the project, and to reflect expected gaps in operation for cleaning, maintenance, and servicing. This demonstrates that the required 1% threshold critical level would not be exceeded for the qualifying habitats within the Protected Sites and would only be exceed for receptor E1 which is not capable of supporting qualifying habitats and thus can be discounted.

v. ***In-combination assessment*** – This has been repeated and no further in-combination impacts were found.

vi. ***Abatement / mitigation*** – This is not required as the required levels have been met.

vii. ***Updates/corrections to addendum wording*** – All required revisions have been made.

Pollution prevention (Construction Phase)

The condition suggested by NRW is acceptable.

Land contamination

NRW are satisfied with the approach to land contamination.

In respect of on-site drainage, this is dealt with below but there is no objection to an environmental permit for discharge and water quality standards if this is justified.

Pollution of Controlled Waters - Surface water drainage

A revised Drainage Strategy is attached which:

i. Demonstrates that ingress of contaminated water into the drainage system will be prevented by fully sealing the below ground drainage system.

ii. Confirms for the deep drains that the attenuation storage calculations include for inflow from the existing access road (gullies) east of the main site. The drainage area plan (Appendix H) shows the contributing drainage areas to the drainage system.

iii. Proposes underground tanks in place of the previously proposed drainage pond. The tanks would be sealed and so not be vulnerable to ingress of contaminated ground water.

iv. Confirms that the existing pollutants listed by NRW will not be mobilised into the sealed drainage system, and that pollutants will be limited to suspended solids, metals, and hydrocarbons which will be addressed by the measures incorporated into the SUDS design.

v. Confirms that the lagoon will be decommissioned, removed, and the Site infilled. The ecology pond commitment would instead be met in the northern part of the Site thus avoiding landfill gas.

Natural England Consultation response 21/05/2026

NE raised several matters in their consultation response, which are summarised below and a response provided:

Water Quality and Quantity

A detailed Drainage Statement has been submitted, with a revision attached, that demonstrates how surface water will be addressed. Due to the landform of the area the only Protected Site reached by flows from the Site would be the River Dee and Bala Lake Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Phosphorous loading is the key issue for that designation and this has been addressed in the submission.

As the Site is wholly in Wales matters relating to flooding are outside NE's remit and instead are for NRW and the LLFA to assess, neither of whom have raised concerns.

In-combination Assessment

This has been provided as part of the application submission.

European / International Sites

This matter is addressed above in response to NRW's comments, and it is demonstrated that impacts from aerial emissions would be below thresholds where there would be harm to the parts of the Protected Sites within Wales. As these are closer than the areas in England there would be no harm to the areas for which NE has responsibility.

Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment (SHRA)

NE express concerns as to the rigorousness and robustness of the sHRA but do not state what these are. The sHRA is rigorous and robust providing a thorough assessment of the Proposed Development and detailed assessments provided to support it. Without detail of NE's concern no further response can be provided. Should NE maintain their concerns then these must be set out in detail to allow the Applicant to respond.

Consultation responses

Various matters have been raised by members of the public in responses to the application, as well as by Hanmer Community Council, and Andrew Ranger the MP for Wrexham. To assist the PCO with consideration of the application responses to the matters raised are provided in the table below. Due to the number of responses they have been reviewed and grouped into themes and topics:

Table 1 – Response to comments from members of the public

Summary of comments	Response
Integrity of Protected Sites	
Deposition of ammonia and nitrogen and impact upon protected sites	This matter has been addressed above; the claimed harms would not occur.
Hydrological impact upon Protected Sites	This matter has been addressed above; the claimed harms would not occur.
HRA	This matter has been addressed above; a robust and through sHRA has been submitted.
In-combination effects	This matter has been addressed above; and no in-combination effects have been identified.

Summary of comments	Response
Impact upon restoration of the Protected Sites	Per the above and the submission, there would be no materially harmful impacts to the Protected Sites and thus also none upon their restoration.
Impact upon carbon sink and flood function role of peatland	Per the above and the submission, no there would be no materially harmful impacts upon the peatland and thus also none upon these functions.
Risk of spread of invasive non-native species, pathogens, and seeds/spores that could harm Protected Sites.	For INNS, such impacts would not occur as material containing INNS will not be accepted at the Site, and any material included in error would be segregated immediately and reloaded as a rejected load and returned. Turning to the other matters, all material will be delivered in suitably contained vehicles, contained within the Site, and treated by the process. The treated material would not pose a risk and would also be removed from the Site in suitably contained vehicles.
Drainage, water contamination, and hydrology	
Concern that further contaminated water will reach watercourses	This matter has been addressed above; the claimed harms would not occur.
Concern that contamination will be disturbed/mobilised and reach watercourses	This matter has been assessed by NRW and the approach proposed was confirmed as acceptable. This confirms that no such impacts would occur.
Concern leachate from the process will escape the Site	'Process' water (i.e. water that is contaminated due to having been either used to supress airborne PM / dust particles, or that which has been in contact on the external 'yard' areas / maturation pad) would be fed via a separate drainage system which would then feed to a water tank located adjacent to the biofilters. The water would be re-circulated into the dust suppression control or exported off-site via tankers for wastewater treatment. Leachate from the process would not escape the system, but should it do so it would be within the contained drainage system area and so would not escape the Site.
Concerns that additional surface water flows will be created with impacts upon locality	The Proposed Development will not result in an increase in surface water flows from the Site as no extension to hard surfaced areas are proposed. The new drainage system will meet SAB requirements and will provide attenuation storage which will reduce peak flows and so reduce their impact upon the locality.
Odour and health	
Risk of odour impacts and efficacy of measures to control these	Odour impacts are dependent on several factors; however, a Dispersion Modelling Assessment (DMA) was undertaken using the most stringent assessment criterion, which concluded that there would be no offensive odour beyond the permitted installation boundary. In addition, there is the potential for odour emissions from waste reception and handling, and from the maturation pads which would utilise a forced aeration system to avoid the need to turn the piles. Waste reception and handling procedures would be developed as part of the Odour Management Plan (OMP) for the Facility, while the forced aeration used in the maturation process would ensure aerobic conditions are maintained thereby preventing the formation of highly odorous compounds. As such, no significant odour impacts

Summary of comments	Response
	are anticipated due to odour emissions from either the biofilter or any other sources. Whilst some respondents express doubt as to the efficacy of door closing systems and positive pressure to prevent odour impacts these are widely and successfully used for facilities of this type.
Concern about maturation pads and odour/health impacts	Following completion of treatment and sanitisation of material in the In Vessel Composter it would be moved to the maturation pads. These would utilise a forced aeration system to avoid the need to turn the piles and would ensure aerobic conditions are maintained thereby preventing the formation of highly odorous compounds. Thus, there would be no materially harmful odour impacts from the maturation pads.
Health impact from stack emissions	Per the Air Quality Assessment, during operation of the IVC, the biofilters would be subject to an emission limit for ammonia, and the maximum impact of ammonia emissions anywhere outside the installation boundary is sufficient low that all impacts on human health can be screened out as negligible and not significant. The Bioaerosol Risk Assessment examines emissions of this type and confirms that the probability of risk to human health are low or very low for the receptors within screening distance. Turning to VOCs, whilst composting does release VOCs, these are most commonly alcohols, terpenes, acetic acid, formic acid, and sulphur containing compounds such as dimethyl sulphide and dimethyl disulphide[1]. For the Proposed Development, these emissions are channelled from the vessels for treatment in biofilters, which are effective at abating concentrations of these substances, before release to atmosphere. Sulphur-containing VOCs in particular are a concern for odour emissions, which have been addressed in the Air Quality Assessment. The VOCs listed above are not harmful to human health in the way that other VOCs are, such as those associated with solvents e.g. benzene and toluene. Because of the low potential for harm from these VOCs and the effective abatement in the biofilters, there is no risk to human health.
Concern about dust and other pollutants	During operation dust generation will be minimal and would not be sufficient to be harmful to amenity, health, or safety. During the construction & demolition works the AQA concludes that there are no significant effects. Earthworks and construction activities are assessed as a negligible risk on human health, and the application of standard best-practice measures should be sufficient to ensure that there would be no significant effects. Emissions from HGV and other vehicle movements are modest and would not be sufficient to be materially harmful to health or amenity.

[1] https://rex.libraries.wsu.edu/esploro/outputs/doctoral/MEASUREMENT-OF-VOLATILE-ORGANIC-COMPOUND-AND/99900898735001842

Summary of comments	Response
Risk of pests, with impacts upon neighbours and upon protected & priority species	The Site would be suitably cleaned and maintained to avoid the risk of pests being attracted to it.
Ecology, biodiversity, and protected species	
Ecology survey insufficient	A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Green Infrastructure Statement has been submitted which demonstrates that suitable survey effort has taken place. It is noted the NRW are satisfied with the report, and no concerns have been raised by the LPA/WCBC.
Claimed harm to protected and priority species	The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Green Infrastructure Statement proposes reasonable avoidance measures are provided for amphibians, reptiles and mammals in order to ensure that the Proposed Development can proceed without having adverse impacts on the identified species; along with several enhancement / mitigation measures to help deliver biodiversity net gain. Thus, there would be no harm to protected or priority species from the Proposed Development. The Proposed development would not cause direct harm to species on the nearby Protected Sites due to the level of separation, and impacts from emissions have been addressed elsewhere in this letter and submission and shown not be materially harmful.
Traffic	
Increase in HGV movements and impact upon safety and operation of the highway, and residential amenity	The Transport Assessment confirms that the Proposed Development is forecast to generate 73 two-way total vehicle trips per day (including 55 two-way HGV delivery trips and 18 two-way staff trips). These could be accommodated by the highway network without harm to its operation of safety. When compared against the trip generating potential of the existing Site, the Proposed Development would result in a net reduction of 248 two-way trips per day. The level of movements would not materially harm residential amenity.
Suitability of local highway network	The highway network serving the Site is of suitable standard for the Proposed Development and can accommodate it without harm to its safety or operation. Again, the substantial reduction in movements from the extant use is relevant.
Condition of highway	Whilst the condition of the highway is a matter for the Local Highway Authority, it is entirely suitable to serve the Proposed Development.
Conflict with school routes and non-car modes of transport in the area	The level of movements generated by the Proposed Development and their routing along the northern stretch of Fenn's Bank Lane and the A495 would not result in any material harm to the safety of school routes or to users of non-car modes of transport. Again, the substantial reduction in movements from the extant use is relevant.
Visibility at Site junction and of Fenn's Bank Lane / A495 junction	The Transport Statement demonstrates that suitable visibility is achievable at the junction of the private road serving the Site with Fenn's Bank Lane. The Fenn's Bank Lane / A495 junction also has suitable visibility with the A495 being relatively straight and level either side of the junction.

Summary of comments	Response
Concern that Site could be accessed from rural lanes from the south	All access would be from the A495 and along the northern section of Fenn's Bank Lane.
Noise, light, and operational disturbance	
Noise impacts from Proposed Development	The Noise Impact Assessment considers potential impacts of noise from the Proposed Development and demonstrates that maximum site operating noise levels (when allowing for a +3dB noise character penalty) at noise sensitive receptors subject to the proposed mitigation measures would be no higher than the established representative background sound level +4dB during daytime operating periods, resulting in a low to below adverse impact according to BS4142: 2014+A1:2019. During evening and night-time operating periods when pre-treatment and processing activity have stopped there would be no exceedance of established representative background sound levels, so there would be a low impact against the same standard.
Vibration concerns	The nature of the proposed use means that there would be no risk of materially harmful impacts from vibration from operations/activity at the Site.
Concern about extent of proposed operating hours	The proposed operating hours are set out in table 2.1 of the Planning Statement, these are suitable and would not result in harm to local residents amenity. The planning permission for the extant use allows 24-hour working, so the Proposed Development would be an improvement as processing activity would be restricted to daytime hours.
Light pollution potential	A detailed lighting scheme has been provided which demonstrates that the site can be suitably lit without causing material harm to amenity or ecology.
Need and site selection	
What is need for the Site in Wales and criticism of Alternative Site Assessment	The proximity principle requires that waste is managed at the nearest appropriate location, which is the approach that been applied here. The Alternative Site Assessment assesses sites in Shropshire and Wrexham based on policy in their Development Plans, both of which favour allocated sites for uses of this type and thereafter allow consideration of non-allocated sites. No allocated sites were suitable, so a non-allocated site can then be considered with no further alternative site assessment required for such Sites. This Site well located to serve the identified need, is previously developed, and meet the other key requirements to be suitable for the Proposed Development.
Suitability of other facilities to take up need / Not sufficient need for facility	Whilst there are some facilities within Shropshire that could process waste of this type, they do not have the capacity to accommodate the volume of waste required. Indeed, this is why the need for a new Site was identified. The Proposed Development has been designed to accommodate 50,000tpa of green and kitchen waste, of which circa 30,000tpa would be delivered to the Site under the Shropshire Waste PFI Contract. This provides 'head room' of circa 20,000tpa to help manage the surplus commercial and industrial green and food waste arising from operations near the site. Section 3.7 of the Planning Statement sets out the quantitative need for the

Summary of comments	Response
	development, demonstrating a clear need for management of waste higher up the wate hierarchy in facility of this type.
Site should be located closer to source of need (i.e. in Shropshire)	The Site is well located to serve the catchment area, and whilst material would have to be transported to the Site from across that area this would also be the case for a Site located in Shropshire due to the rural nature of the County. The Site is not so distant that it would meaningfully increase vehicle miles to a harmful extent.
Assertion that food waste collection will not commence in Shropshire until 2036 or 2039	Weekly food waste collection is required from 31/03/2026, and the Applicant has a PFI Contract to provide this as soon as is feasible.
Residential and general amenity	
Harmful impacts upon residential amenity from nature of use, operations, activity, and vehicle movements	Per the detail elsewhere in this letter and submission, the Proposed Development would not materially harm the locality in respect of noise, odour, aerial emission, traffic movements/generation, activity, or visually. Thus, there would be no material harm to the amenity of residents.
Impacts upon recreation in locality	Per the detail elsewhere in this letter and submission, the Proposed Development would not materially harm the locality in respect of noise, odour, aerial emission, traffic movements/generation, activity, or visually. Thus, there would be no material harm to recreational activity in the locality.
Impacts upon viability of tourism and other businesses in the area	Per the detail elsewhere in this letter and submission, the Proposed Development would not materially harm the locality in respect of noise, odour, aerial emission, traffic movements/generation, activity, or visually. Thus, there would be no material harm to other businesses in the locality.
Visual impact of proposed stack	The Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) assesses the impact of the development and the sensitivity of the local area to the changes proposed. Overall, despite some localised adverse effects, the Proposed Development would be visually contained which would give rise to a relatively limited change to the existing landscape character and visual amenity. The impacts are assessed upon a precautionary basis (e.g. a worst-case theoretical visibility during the winter months) and are consistently assessed as no greater than minor adverse, and in most cases negligible. This confirms that the scale, extent and perceptibility of change would remain well within the capacity of the surrounding landscape and visual environment to accommodate it. In addition, the proposed landscaping would improvement the visual containment of the Site as well as providing other benefits.
Industrial appearance of proposal and proposed cladding suitability	Whilst the Proposed Development is inherently industrial the Site already has an industrial appearance and forms part of a cluster of such development. The Proposed Development is therefore suited to the Site and would not materially harm the locality. The proposed re-cladding of the building is also suitable and would be an improvement from its current somewhat dilapidated state.

Summary of comments	Response
Procedural matters	
The LPA does not have sufficient information to determine the application.	A comprehensive and detailed application has been made which provides sufficient information to allow for assessment of the application.
Insufficient consultation/notification by LPA	This is a matter for the LPA.
Other matters	
Dispute extant use and fallback position	The Site has an extant use which remains in place and could be resumed without the need for Consent. Whilst the previous operator ceased their occupation of the Site the planning permission and permit remain in place, and there remains a need for facilities of this type or for similarly intense metal and other material recycling operations. Thus, the resumption of extant use is more than merely theoretical and is a relevant fallback.
Insufficient grid capacity	The Site benefits from an existing electricity supply for the extant use which has sufficient capacity to accommodate the Proposed Development. No objections have been provided by the DNO which would be expected if there was an issue.
Claimed fire risk	The Proposed Development does not present a high fire risk and suitable measure swill be taken to control the risk that does exist. The Site has a suitable standard of access and can be reached by the Fire Service. Indeed, North Wales Fire & Rescue Service were consulted at PAC stage and raided no concerns, it is assumed that there has been no change in their stance.
Concern as to future expansion	The application must be decided based on the submission not a theoretical future scenario. Any future material changes to tonnage or feedstock would require consent and so would be subject to an application.
Operating hours are not clear	Whilst the operating hours are somewhat complex by their nature they are clearly set out at table 2.1 of the PS.

None planning matters such as property value have not been addressed as they are not relevant to consideration of the application.

I trust that the above is helpful and will be borne in mind when considering the application. However, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned should you have any queries or concerns,

Yours faithfully

[redacted]