

# Environment Agency permitting decisions

## Bespoke permit

We have decided to grant the permit for **Hayes Barton Pig Unit** operated by **Mr Roy Gilbert Down, Mr Chris Down and Mrs Katie Jane Down**

The permit number is **EPR/MP3834VW**

We consider in reaching that decision we have taken into account all relevant considerations and legal requirements and that the permit will ensure that the appropriate level of environmental protection is provided.

## Purpose of this document

This decision document:

- explains how the application has been determined
- provides a record of the decision-making process
- shows how all relevant factors have been taken into account

Unless the decision document specifies otherwise we have accepted the applicant's proposals.

## Structure of this document

- Key issues
- Annex 1 the decision checklist
- Annex 2 the consultation and web publicising responses

# Key issues of the decision

## Introduction

### Industrial Emissions Directive (IED)

The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) (Amendment) Regulations 2013 were made on the 20 February and came into force on 27 February. These Regulations transpose the requirements of the Industrial Emissions Directive (IED).

This permit implements the requirements of the EU Directive on Industrial Emissions.

## Environmental Impacts

### Ammonia Emissions

There are multiple European statutory sites within the relevant screening distances of the installation boundary; these include Dawlish Warren and Sidmouth to West Bay both SAC's, East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA and Exe Estuary SPA/Ramsar Site.

There are four Sites of Special Scientific Interest within 5 km screening criteria.

There are eight Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) / Ancient Woodland / Local Nature Reserves within 2 km of this installation ; seven LWS's and an Ancient Woodland.

### Ammonia Assessment – SAC / SPA / Ramsar sites

The following trigger thresholds have been designated for assessment of European sites including Ramsar sites.

- If the Process Contribution (PC) is below 4% of the relevant critical level (Cle) or critical load (CLo) then the farm can be permitted with no further assessment.
- Where this threshold is exceeded an assessment alone and in combination is required.
- An overlapping in combination assessment will be completed where existing farms are identified within 10km of the application.

Screening using the detailed modelling has determined that the Process Contribution (PC) on the SAC/SPA/Ramsar sites for ammonia, acid and N deposition from the application site are under the 4% significance threshold and can be screened out as having no likely significant effect.

The data is based on our Ammonia Screening Tool AST v.4.4 (report dated 05/06/15) with pig numbers confirmed as 1092 sows and 208 farrowers plus final manure storage volume of 100 m<sup>3</sup> and slurry storage surface area of 787.6 m<sup>2</sup>.

See results below:

A precautionary level of 1µg/m<sup>3</sup> for Critical Level for ammonia has been used during the screen

Screening indicates that beyond **4863 m** distance, the Process Contribution at conservation sites is less than 4 % of the 1µg/m<sup>3</sup> critical level for ammonia. In this case the habitat sites below in Table 1 are beyond this distance.

**Table 1– Distance from source**

Site	Distance (m)
Dawlish Warren SAC	7,680
Exe Estuary SPA/Ramsar site	6052
Sidmouth to West Bay/SAC	8075

**The PCs for ammonia at these sites has been screened as insignificant.** It is therefore possible to conclude that no significant pollution will occur at these sites and no further assessment is required. Where a CLe of  $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  is used, and the process contribution is assessed to be less than the 4 % insignificance threshold in this circumstance it is not necessary to further consider Nitrogen Deposition or Acidification Critical Load values.

#### Other European Sites

The designated area for the SPA and SAC in tables 2, 3 and 4 are identical. Both cover same area of 1119.94 Hectares.

**Table 2 – Ammonia Emissions**

Site	Critical Level Ammonia $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	Predicted Process Contribution $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	% of Critical Level
East Devon Heaths SPA/SAC	3 (1)	2.173	72.4

(1) The Critical Level of  $3\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  has been used after advice from Natural England as listed on our audited critical levels spreadsheet. Lower plants are not in general considered an important part of the conservation objectives for this site

**The process contribution for this SPA/SAC is greater than 4 % of relevant critical loads and as such assessed as requiring an in-combination assessment**

**Table 3 – Nitrogen deposition**

Site	Critical Load kg N/ha/yr	PC Kg N/ha/yr	PC % Critical Load
East Devon Heaths SPA/SAC	10	11.285	112.9

Critical load values taken from APIS website ([www.apis.ac.uk](http://www.apis.ac.uk)) – June 2015

**The process contribution for this SPA/SAC is greater than 4 % of relevant critical loads and as such requiring an in-combination assessment**

**Table 4 – Acid Deposition**

Site	Critical Load keq /ha/yr	PC Keq/ha/yr	PC % Critical Load
East Devon Heaths SPA/SAC	1.205	0.806	66.7

Critical load values taken from APIS website ([www.apis.ac.uk](http://www.apis.ac.uk)) – June 2015

**The process contribution for this SPA/SAC is greater than 4 % of relevant critical loads and as such assessed requiring an in-combination assessment**

#### **Overall conclusion**

In line with our guidelines the total PC's for ammonia emissions, nitrogen and acid deposition are > 20 % of the relevant critical levels and loads which means the in-combination assessment automatically requires detailed modelling for all three assessments.

#### **Sites screen out using detailed modelling supplied by operator**

For the following site this farm has been screened out, as set out above, using results of the detailed modelling supplied by the applicant as part of the application

The operator has submitted detailed modelling with their application. Modelling has been completed with ADMS Version 5. We have reviewed their modelling and accepted the report conclusions as accurate. The operator has utilised five years of meteorological data. The critical levels and loads have been selected based on our pre-application report and precautionary values based on ecology of the wildlife sites (details provided below).

The modelling report is dated June 17<sup>th</sup> 2015.

#### **Bespoke ammonia emission factors**

The applicant has utilised ammonia emission factors from 2012 Inventory of Ammonia Emissions from UK Agriculture.

The ammonia emission factors are 20.7 g-NH<sub>3</sub>/livestock unit/day for fully slatted floor and 15.7 g-NH<sub>3</sub>/livestock unit/day for straw solid floor buildings

A livestock unit is 500 kg.

These emission factors are based on the type of pig building and weight of the animals. The applicant has provided a justification for the usage of average pig weight 183.7 kg; we have reviewed this and concluded this is an acceptable basis for this assessment.

**Detailed modelling results are summarised below:**

**Table 5 - Ammonia Emissions**

Site	Critical Level (Cle ) Ammonia $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	PC $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	PC % Critical Level
East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA	3*	0.20	6.6

\* Cle 's applied from advice from Natural England as listed on our audited critical levels spreadsheet. Lower plants are not in general considered an important part of the conservation objectives for this site

\* Process contributions listed above are the maximum figures for all of the final modelling runs.

**The process contribution for this SPA/SAC is greater than 4 % of relevant critical levels and as such requiring an in-combination assessment**

**Table 6 – Nitrogen deposition**

Site	Critical Load kg N/ha/yr	PC Kg N/ha/yr	PC % Critical Load
East Devon Heaths SPA/SAC	10	1.55	15.5

\*Critical load values taken from APIS website ([www.apis.ac.uk](http://www.apis.ac.uk)) – June 2015

**The process contribution for this SPA/SAC is greater than 4 % of relevant critical loads and as such requiring an in-combination assessment**

**Table 7 – Acid Deposition**

Site	Critical Load keq /ha/yr	PC Keq/ha/yr	PC % Critical Load
East Devon Heaths SPA/SAC	1.205	0.11	9.2

Critical load values taken from APIS website ([www.apis.ac.uk](http://www.apis.ac.uk)) – June 2015

**The process contribution for this SPA/SAC is greater than 4 % of relevant critical loads and as such assessed requiring an in-combination assessment**

**In-combination assessment site between Y% and Z% for in combination assessments and other farms acting in combination**

Screening using the detailed modelling dated June 17<sup>th</sup> 2015 has determined that the process contributions of ammonia, acid and nitrogen deposition from the application site are over the 4 % threshold, and therefore may cause damage to features of the SPA/SAC. An in combination assessment has therefore been carried out. There are other farms acting in combination with this application. A detailed assessment has been carried out as shown below.

A search of all existing active intensive agriculture installations permitted by the Environment Agency has identified one farm within 10 km of the maximum concentration point for the SAC/SPA which has the potential to act in-combination.

**Table 8 – In combination Assessment Ammonia Assessment**

Name of Farm	PC $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	Critical Level $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	PC as % of Critical level
Hayes Barton Pig Unit	0.20	3	6.6
Farm 1 Hogsbrook Farm EPR/NP3037MQ/V003	0.14	3	4.7
<b>Total PC</b>	<b>0.34</b>		<b>11.3</b>

**NOTE** – The predicted process contributions for Hogsbrook Farm listed above is estimated using the Environment Agency’s ammonia screening tool (version 4.4). The values are pre-cautionary in their estimate of process contribution and thus greater than would be the case if detailed modelling was undertaken for each farm.

In line with Environment Agency guidelines, where the total PC is <20% of the critical level, in combination impacts can be considered as not being likely to damage the features of the SAC/SPA for which it has been designated. The total PC for East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA from all farms is 11.3 %, **and therefore we have concluded no likely significant effect from in combination impacts at the SAC/SPA.**

**Table 9 – In combination Nitrogen Deposition Assessment**

Name of Farm	PC µg/m <sup>3</sup>	Critical Load µg/m <sup>3</sup>	PC as % of Critical level
<b>Hayes Barton Pig Unit</b>	<b>1.55</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15.5</b>
Farm 1 Hogsbrook Farm EPR/NP3037MQ/V003	0.726	10	7.3
<b>Total PC</b>	<b>2.276</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>22.8</b>

**NOTE** – The predicted process contributions for Hogsbrook farms listed above are calculated using the Environment Agency’s ammonia screening tool (version 4.4). The values are pre-cautionary in their estimate of process contribution and thus greater than would be the case if detailed modelling was undertaken for each farm.

In line with Environment Agency guidelines, where the total PC is >20% of the critical level, in combination impacts can be assessed as having potential for likely significant effect

**More detailed assessment**

In order to provide a more detailed assessment we have reviewed the Hogsbrook Farm detailed modelling report dated April 2015.

The final detailed modelling run concludes that at sensitive receptor NGR 304558, 88281 the nitrogen deposition process contribution from Hogsbrook Farm is < 4 % of the relevant critical load. This point is 2.3 km from the installation boundary. All modelled sensitive receptors further away from this farm distance are consequently < 4 %.

The NGR for the maximum impact from the new installation Hayes Barton Pig Unit is 304607, 84985. This is based on data from June 17<sup>th</sup> 2015 detailed modelling report for this installation. This is a distance 4.7 km from the other in-combination farm Hogsbrook Farm.

**Conclusion**

On the basis of the data from April 2015 Hogsbrook Farm modelling report we conclude that the nitrogen deposition impact from this farm at the NGR 304558,88281 is < 4 % of the relevant critical load

Therefore the aggregated total in-combination impact at this NGR from this new installation and Hogsbrook Farm is < 19.5 % and hence beyond the 20 % threshold of the relevant critical load

In line with Environment Agency guidelines, where the total PC is <20% of the critical level, in combination impacts can be considered as not being likely to damage the features of the SAC/SPA for which it has been designated.

**No further assessment is required.**

**Table 10 – In combination Acid Deposition Assessment**

Name of Farm	PC µg/m <sup>3</sup>	Critical Load µg/m <sup>3</sup>	PC as % of Critical level
<b>Hayes Barton Pig Unit</b>	<b>0.11</b>	<b>1.205</b>	<b>9.2</b>
Farm 1 Hogsbrook Farm EPR/NP3037MQ/V003	0.052	1.205	4.3
<b>Total PC</b>	<b>0.162</b>	<b>1.205</b>	<b>13.5</b>

**NOTE** – The predicted process contributions for Hogsbrook farms listed above are calculated using the Environment Agency’s ammonia screening tool (version 4.4). The values are pre-cautionary in their estimate of process contribution and thus greater than would be the case if detailed modelling was undertaken for each farm.

In line with Environment Agency guidelines, where the total PC is <20% of the critical level, in combination impacts can be considered as not being likely to damage the features of the SAC/SPA for which it has been designated. The total PC for East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA from all farms is 13.5 %, **and therefore we have concluded no likely significant effect from in combination impacts at the SAC/SPA.**

## **Ammonia Assessment – SSSIs**

The following trigger thresholds have been applied for assessment of SSSIs. If the Process Contribution (PC) is below 20% of the relevant critical level (CLE) or critical load (CLo) then the farm can be permitted with no further assessment. Where this threshold is exceeded an in-combination assessment and/or detailed modelling may be required.

### **Where sites screen out as <20%**

Screening using our screening assessment dated 05/06/15 indicated that the PCs for the following SSSIs are predicted to be less than 20% Critical Level for ammonia, acid and N deposition therefore it is possible to conclude no damage. The results of the ammonia screening tool v4.4 are given in the tables below.

A precautionary level of  $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  for Critical Level for ammonia has been used during the screen.

Screening indicates that beyond **2,201m** distance, the Process Contribution at conservation sites is less than 20 % of the  $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  critical level for ammonia. In this case the SSSI below in Table 1 is beyond this distance.

**TABLE 11 – Distance from source**

Site	Distance (m)
Otter Estuary	2,707
Budleigh Salterton Cliffs	3,579
Ladram Bay to Sidmouth	4,403

**The PCs for ammonia at these sites has been screened as insignificant.** It is therefore possible to conclude that no significant pollution will occur at these sites and no further assessment is required.

Where a CLe of  $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  is used, and the process contribution is assessed to be less than the 20% insignificance threshold in this circumstance it is not necessary to further consider Nitrogen Deposition or Acidification Critical Load values. In these cases the  $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  level used has not been confirmed, but it is precautionary.

### **Other SSSI – East Devon Pebblebed Heaths.**

**Table 12 – Ammonia Emissions**

Site	Critical Level Ammonia $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	Predicted Process Contribution $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	% of Critical Level
East Devon Heaths SSSI	3 (1)	2.173	72.4

(1) The Critical Level of  $3\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  has been used, taken from advice from Natural England as listed on our audited critical levels spreadsheet. Lower plants are not in general considered an important part of the conservation objectives for this site.

**The process contribution for this SSSI is greater than 20 % of relevant critical levels and as such assessed as requiring detailed modelling.**

**Table 13 – Nitrogen deposition**

Site	Critical Load kg N/ha/yr	PC Kg N/ha/yr	PC % Critical Load
East Devon Heaths SSSI	10	11.285	112.9

Critical load values taken from APIS website ([www.apis.ac.uk](http://www.apis.ac.uk)) – June 2015

**The process contribution for this SSSI is greater than 20 % of relevant critical loads and as is assessed as requiring detailed modelling.**

**Table 14 – Acid Deposition**

Site	Critical Load keq /ha/yr	PC Keq/ha/yr	PC % Critical Load
East Devon Heaths SSSI	1.205	0.806	66.7

Critical load values taken from APIS website ([www.apis.ac.uk](http://www.apis.ac.uk)) – June 2015

**The process contribution for this SSSI is greater than 20 % of relevant critical loads and as such assessed as requiring modelling needed.**

## Detailed Modelling

The June 2015 detailed modelling report data for the East Devon Heaths SSSI are as follows

**Table 15 – Ammonia Emissions**

Site	Critical Level Ammonia $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	Predicted Process Contribution $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	% of Critical Level
East Devon Heaths SSSI	3 (1)	0.20	6.6

(1) The Critical Level of  $3\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  has been used, taken from advice from Natural England as listed on our audited critical levels spreadsheet. Lower plants are not in general considered an important part of the conservation objectives for this site.

**The process contribution for this SSSI is < 20 % of relevant critical levels and as such assessed as no further assessment is needed.**

**Table 16 – Nitrogen deposition**

Site	Critical Load kg N/ha/yr.	PC Kg N/ha/yr.	PC % Critical Load
East Devon Heaths SSSI	10	1.55	15.5

Critical load values taken from APIS website ([www.apis.ac.uk](http://www.apis.ac.uk)) – June 2015

**The process contribution for this SSSI is < 20 % of relevant critical loads and as such no further assessment is needed.**

**Table 17 – Acid Deposition**

Site	Critical Load keq /ha/yr	PC Keq/ha/yr	PC % Critical Load
East Devon Heaths SPA/SAC	1.205	0.11	9.2

Critical load values taken from APIS website ([www.apis.ac.uk](http://www.apis.ac.uk)) – June 2015

**The process contribution for this SPA/SAC is < 20 % of relevant critical loads and as such assessed requiring an in-combination assessment**

### **Ammonia assessment - LWS/AW/LNR.**

There are eight Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) within 2 km of this installation. The following trigger thresholds have been applied for the assessment of these sites.

1. If PC is < 100% of relevant Critical Level or Load, then the farm can be permitted (H1 or ammonia screening tool)
2. If further modelling shows PC <100%, then the farm can be permitted.

### **Sites that screen out after initial review below**

For the following sites this farm has been screened out at Stage 1, as set out above, using results of the Ammonia Screening Tool version 4.4.

### **Sites that screen out from AST screen**

For the following sites this farm has been screened out, as set out above, using results of the Ammonia Screening Tool version 4.4 dated 05/06/15. The Process Contribution on the LWS/AW/LNR for ammonia, acid and Nitrogen deposition from the application site are under the 100% significance threshold and can be screened out as having no likely significant effect.

A precautionary level of  $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  for Critical Level for ammonia has been used during the screen.

Screening indicates that beyond **841 m** distance, the Process Contribution at conservation sites is less than 100 % of the  $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  critical level for ammonia. In this case the SSSI below in Table 1 is beyond this distance.

**Table 18 – Distance from Source**

Site	Distance (m)
Ladram Bay to Sidmouth	4,404
Hayes Wood Pond	924
Bicton Lake	2,015
Squabmoor Reservoir	1,497
Shortwood Heath	1,114
Black Hill	1,592
Dalditch	1516



The PCs for ammonia at these sites has been screened as insignificant. It is therefore possible to conclude that no significant pollution will occur at these sites and no further assessment is required. Where a CLe of  $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  is used, and the process contribution is assessed to be less than the 100% insignificance threshold in this circumstance it is not necessary to further consider Nitrogen Deposition or Acidification Critical Load values. In these cases the  $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  level used has not been confirmed, but it is precautionary

### **Detailed Modelling**

The operator detailed modelling report dated June 17<sup>th</sup> 2015 provides following results for LWS/AW other conservation site Hayes Wood

Thirteen receptor locations were modelled. The following tables detail the maximum process contribution impact of the installation on this habitat site.

**Table 19 – Ammonia Emissions**

Site	Critical Level Ammonia $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	Predicted Process Contribution $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	% of Critical Level
Hayes Wood	3	0.75	24.9

Critical load values taken from APIS website ([www.apis.ac.uk](http://www.apis.ac.uk)) – June 2015

**Table 20 – Nitrogen deposition**

Site	Critical Load kg N/ha/yr	PC Kg N/ha/yr	PC % Critical Load
Hayes Wood	10	5.81	58.1

Critical load values taken from APIS website ([www.apis.ac.uk](http://www.apis.ac.uk)) – June 2015

**Table 21 – Acid deposition**

Site	Critical Load keq /ha/yr	PC Keq/ha/yr	PC % Critical Load
Hayes Wood	1.09	0.42	52.4

Critical load values taken from APIS website ([www.apis.ac.uk](http://www.apis.ac.uk)) – June 2015

Based on the above assessment the process contributions for ammonia, nitrogen and acid deposition are < 100 % of the critical level and load respectively.

### **Conclusion**

The PCs for this site have been screened as insignificant. It is therefore possible to conclude that no significant pollution will occur at this site and no further assessment is required.

### **Groundwater and soil monitoring**

As a result of the requirements of the Industrial Emissions Directive, all permits are now required to contain condition 3.1.3 relating to groundwater monitoring. However, the Environment Agency's H5 Guidance states that it is only necessary for the operator to take samples of soil or groundwater and measure levels of contamination where the evidence that there is, or could be existing contamination and:

- The environmental risk assessment has identified that the same contaminants are a particular hazard; or
- The environmental risk assessment has identified that the same contaminants are a hazard and your risk assessment has identified a possible pathway to land or groundwater.

H5 Guidance further states that it is **not essential for the operator** to take samples of soil or groundwater and measure levels of contamination where:

- The environmental risk assessment identifies no hazards to land or groundwater; or
- Where the environmental risk assessment identifies only limited hazards to land and groundwater and there is no reason to believe that there could be historic contamination by those substances that present the hazard; or
- Where the environmental risk assessment identifies hazards to land and groundwater but there is evidence that there is no historic contamination by those substances that pose the hazard.



The site condition report is dated April 2015 within the application supplementary documentation Doc 005.

It includes completion of H5 template plus an installation boundary with locations of farm buildings, drains, diesel tank and dirty water tank.

The surrounding land is predominantly used for arable and grass farming. There are some small villages in the area.

The site itself is relatively flat or gently undulating, positioned the top of a small rise. Historically the land has been used for arable farming production.

The nearest surface water course is 500 meters to River Wissey to the North of the installation.

Our technical review of this specific land usage is as follows.

- There is no record of installation area land contamination.
- No record of any land pollution incidents within 250 metres of installation boundary.
- There is no record of any usage of the installation area except for agricultural usage.

This installation is in a Nitrate Protection Zone and operator has confirmed 6 month slurry storage capacity requirement is complied with.

Therefore the conclusion is there is a low risk of historic groundwater and land contamination due to former activities within installation boundary.

**Therefore, although condition 3.1.3 is included in the permit, no groundwater monitoring will be required at this installation as a result.**

## **Odour**

There are sensitive receptors within 400 metres of the installation and therefore an odour management plan has been prepared.

There is one property within 400 meters south of the installation. This is Hayeswood Cottage which is 380 meters away at NGR easting 305106 northing 84737. The village of Yettington is 585 meters away at NGR easting 305332, and northing 85711.

*There is no history of odour complaints from local residents linked to the existing pig facility.*

An Odour Management Plan has been submitted with this application. The OMP was updated in the duly making response providing more details of locations of sensitive receptors, contingency plans and complaint procedures.

The OMP covers feed selection, feed storage and containment, ventilation design, techniques to manage loading pigs onto wagons to minimise odour, wash down and slurry storage management.

We approve the OMP as provided based on the information in the application.

## **Noise**

There are sensitive receptors within 400 metres of the installation boundary as stated above in the odour review.

There is one property within 400 meters south of the installation. This Hayeswood Cottage which is 380 meters away at easting 305106 northing 84737. The village of Yettington is 585 meters away, easting 305332, and northing 85711.

The operator has provided a Noise Management Plan in their supporting information.

Operations with the most potential to cause noise nuisance have been assessed as those involving pig loading, feeding pigs, moving of pigs, farm building ventilation fans, mucking out, manure loading/transport delivery of supplies and materials plus automated feed lines.

The noise management plan covers control measures for each of these potential noise hazards.

There is no history of noise complaints linked to the existing pig farm activity below the EPR scheduled activity threshold.

Overall there is the potential for noise from the installation beyond the installation boundary. However the risk of noise beyond the installation boundary is considered insignificant.

## Annex 1: decision checklist

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met
		Yes
<b>Consultation</b>		
Scope of consultation	<p>The consultation requirements were identified and implemented. The decision was taken in accordance with RGN 6 High Profile Sites, our Public Participation Statement and our Working Together Agreements.</p> <p>The application was sent for consultation with</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kings Lynn and West Norfolk District Borough Council Environmental Health department</li> <li>• HSE</li> </ul>	✓
Responses to consultation and web publicising	<p>The web publicising and consultation responses (Annex 2) were taken into account in the decision.</p> <p>No consultations comments were received. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance.</p>	✓
<b>Operator</b>		
Control of the facility	<p>We are satisfied that the applicant (now the operator) is the person who will have control over the operation of the facility after the grant of the permit. The decision was taken in accordance with EPR RGN 1 Understanding the meaning of operator.</p>	✓
<b>European Directives</b>		
Applicable directives	<p>All applicable European directives have been considered in the determination of the application. This permit meets IED requirements. This permit implements the requirements of the EU Directive on Industrial Emissions. See key issues section above for further information.</p>	✓
<b>The site</b>		
Extent of the site of the facility	<p>The operator has provided a plan which we consider is satisfactory, showing the extent of the site of the facility. This plan was finalised with the duly making response.</p> <p>A plan is included in the permit and the operator is required to carry on the permitted activities within the site boundary.</p>	✓
Site condition report	<p>The operator has provided a description of the condition of the site. We consider this description is satisfactory. Please refer to key issues, section 'Groundwater and soil monitoring'. As a result of further assessment, baseline data is not required.</p> <p>The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on site condition reports and baseline reporting under IED – guidance and templates (H5).</p>	✓
Biodiversity, Heritage, Landscape and Nature Conservation	<p>The application is within the relevant screening distance criteria of a number of conservation sites.</p> <p>The key issues section provide a list of these sites</p> <p>In addition an ammonia emissions review is included in key issues section of this document.</p> <p>In conclusion installation environmental impacts on the surrounding habitat sites are considered not significant.</p> <p>An appendix 11 for information only and an Appropriate Assessment (Appendix 12) for East Devon Heaths SAC/SPA has been sent to Natural England. The latter was sent for formal consultation.</p> <p>Natural England approved of our assessment; approval confirmed 23/07/15.</p>	✓
<b>Environmental Risk Assessment and operating techniques</b>		
Environmental risk	<p>We have reviewed the operator's assessment of the environmental risk from the facility. The operator's risk assessment is satisfactory.</p> <p>The assessment shows that, applying the conservative criteria in our guidance on Environmental Risk Assessment all emissions may be categorised as environmentally insignificant.</p>	✓

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met
		Yes
Operating techniques	<p>We have reviewed the techniques used by the operator and compared these with the relevant guidance notes.</p> <p>The operator has confirmed that all farm facilities and operating techniques will be in compliance with our sector guidance EPR 6.09.</p> <p><b><u>The Operator has proposed the following techniques:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feed selection is carefully selected with reference to pig's growth curve. Phosphorous and protein levels are altered over the growing.</li> <li>• All pig buildings will be well insulated for optimum animal health and the houses will use high velocity extraction fans to optimise odour dispersion. The finishing rooms will be thoroughly washed and disinfected between batches.</li> <li>• General management; fully slatted buildings and straw based solid floor buildings.</li> <li>• Slurry management: slurry is stored within installation for 6 months in compliance with being within a Nitrate Vulnerable Zone.</li> <li>• Fugitive Emission controls include building maintenance, routine building wash downs, use of automatic auger feed transfer to minimise spillages. Feed is stored within enclosed feed bins.</li> <li>• Storage facilities: there is one diesel tank which is bunded.</li> <li>• Roof water and slurry is transferred to discharge to off-site surface water.</li> </ul> <p>The proposed techniques for priorities for control are in line with the benchmark levels contained in the SGN EPR6.09 and we consider them to represent appropriate techniques for the facility.</p> <p>The lagoon itself is covered in compliance with our guidance EPR 6.09.</p> <p>The permit conditions ensure compliance with relevant BREFs and BAT Conclusions, and ELVs deliver compliance with BAT-AELs.</p>	✓
<b>The permit conditions</b>		
Incorporating the application	<p>We have specified that the applicant must operate the permit in accordance with descriptions in the application, including all additional information received as part of the determination process. These descriptions are specified in the Operating Techniques table in the permit.</p>	✓
<b>Operator Competence</b>		
Environment management system (EMS)	<p>There is no known reason to consider that the operator will not have the management systems to enable it to comply with the permit conditions. The applicant has chosen to utilise their own management system without external certification.</p> <p>There is a summary of the EMS in supporting documentation with Appendix 2 covering maintenance and appendix 3 of the supporting information gives the detail of their EMS and abnormal operations, complaints system and accident management</p> <p>The decision was taken in accordance with RGN 5 on Operator Competence.</p>	✓
Relevant convictions	<p>The National Enforcement Database has been checked to ensure that all relevant convictions have been declared.</p> <p>No relevant convictions were found.</p> <p>The operator satisfies the criteria in RGN 5 on Operator Competence.</p>	✓
Financial provision	<p>There is no known reason to consider that the operator will not be financially able to comply with the permit conditions.</p> <p>The decision was taken in accordance with RGN 5 : Operator Competence</p>	✓

## **Annex 2: Consultation and web publicising responses**

**Summary of responses to consultation and web publication and the way in which we have** taken these into account in the determination process.

*No external consultation responses were received.*

This proposal was also publicised on the Environment Agency's website for 4 weeks but no representations were received during this period.