Permitting decisions

Bespoke permit

We have decided to grant the permit for Seamer Mill operated by Noble Foods Co.

The permit number is EPR/CP3137RR.

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 provides a record of the decision making process. It:

- highlights key issues in the determination
- summarises the decision making process in the decision checklist to show how all relevant factors have been taken into account
- shows how we have considered the consultation responses.

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

Read the permitting decisions in conjunction with the environmental permit. The introductory note summarises what the permit covers.

Key issues of the decision

Risk to Surface Water, Soil and Groundwater

A number of materials are stored at the site that have the potential to cause pollution if allowed to escape into the aquatic environment. These include solid and liquid raw materials and fuels. The site comprises of yard areas and a process building surrounded by landscaped areas. The yard and process building are situated on impermeable surfaces which will prevent emissions of any spillages to groundwater. There are kerbs in place around the landscaped areas to prevent spillages or firewater reaching these areas. Table S1.1 Activities in the permit requires all potentially polluting liquids and solids to only be handled on an impermeable surface. Sewage from site amenities are discharged to soakaway under permit EPR/DB3196EG.

Material storage and containment

As outlined in our guidance we expect bunds to comply with the following:

- be waterproof
- be resistant to any materials stored in them
- have no outlets (e.g. drains or taps)
- drain to a blind (completely enclosed) collection point
- have self-contained pipework that is separate from the container pipework

Bunds must also have a capacity larger than both of the following:

- 110% of the largest tank the bund is protecting
- 25% of the combined volume of all the tanks the bund is protecting

Soya Oil is stored in two tanks of 19 m^3 and 36 m^3 capacity. These tanks are situated within bunds inside the Mill building. The bunds are below the capacity we would expect, at approximately 55% and 40% of the capacity stored in the tanks. The Operator has outlined that to accommodate for the small bund size the tanks are only half filled. These tanks have continuous level probes and unloading of liquid bulk materials are supervised to minimise the risk of spills.

There is a vegetable oil storage tank of 50m^3 capacity in a bund which is 92% of the amount stored in the tank.

There is also bulk storage of an amino acid animal feed supplement (Methionine) within a tank with a combined volume of 30,000 litres. The tank is stored within an integral tank bund with secondary containment of a capacity of 41% of the volume stored. This substance is water soluble so could bypass the interceptor if there was a spill. However the Operator is proposing to install an isolation valve on the drainage system which could isolate the drainage system in the event of a spill. We have incorporated this into the permit as Improvement Condition 3 (see section on accidents below).

During the determination we asked the Operator to review their containment against guidance document CIRIA 736 ‘Containment systems for the prevention of pollution: Secondary, tertiary and other measures for industrial and commercial premises’. They have indicated that the containment on site does not meet this guidance as the infrastructure on site pre-dates the standards. We have included Improvement Condition IC1 which requires the Operator to review their containment and implement improvements to a timescale agreed with us.

The liquid raw materials are loaded into the building via external connection points. Currently there is no drip tray in place. The Operator has proposed to install covered drip trays at all external filling connections and we have included IC2 requesting the Operator to improve their infrastructure around unloading so that all spilt materials can be recovered.

There are intake tipping booths on site to receive solid raw materials such as grain products. These materials are transferred by an enclosed conveyor to bulk storage bins inside the building. The bulk storage bins have high level alarms to prevent overfilling. The product storage bins also have process controls in place to prevent overfilling.

Minerals such as limestone are delivered to bulk storage bins inside the main building by being blown through the delivery vehicle pneumatic system. Medicine supplements for feed are stored within the processing building in a locked container. Packed solid raw materials such as nutrient additives are delivered to the raw materials warehouse.

We consider that the current storage and drainage arrangements for liquid materials do not meet Best Available Technique (BAT) standards. We have included Improvement Conditions to improve the on-site containment and drainage systems (IC1, 2 and 3). We are satisfied that the solid raw material storage and handling is appropriate and will minimise the risk to the environment.

Other materials stored on site

Diesel for site vehicles is stored in a tank which can hold up to 15,000 litres. Gas oil (red diesel) for the boiler is stored in a 12,000 litre tank. Both tanks are integrally bunded to more than 110% of the capacity stored. The operator has stated that these tanks are compliant with The Control of Pollution (Oil Storage) (England) Regulations 2001.

A fuel additive is stored within a 2,500 litre storage system with an integrated bund which is 110% of the volume stored. The storage system has a telemetric gauging system to control levels to prevent overfilling and detect leaks.

Boiler water treatment chemicals and other liquid chemicals such as lubricants and cleaning chemicals are also used on site. These are stored within their primary packaging on the impermeable surface in the processing building.

We consider that the fuel and chemical storage arrangements are unlikely to pose a risk to surface water, land or groundwater.

Accidents

Raw materials are transported around the site using conveyors and pipework to reduce the risk of accidents associated with manual handling. Any spillages that do occur will be cleared up using strategically placed spill kits. Portable bunds are stored on site to contain liquid spillages. All offloading of materials will be supervised to minimise the risk of accidents.

The Operator has detailed that chemicals or oils are stored at least 10m away from the mill pit sumps and are stored within secondary containment. If there was a significant enough spill to reach the sumps, then the sumps would be cleaned as part of the spill response procedure.

The application details that the site is potentially at risk of groundwater flooding. The Operator has detailed that in the event of a flood, storage chemicals will be moved to the highest point of the site (which is situated on the crest of a hill).

The site drains via interceptors which are designed to prevent oil escaping from the site. However this will not prevent all potentially polluting materials used on site, such as the water soluble amino acid or any physical contaminants. If detergents enter the interceptor they will reduce its working efficiency. Detergents will be used for periodic cleaning however the Operator has confirmed that these will not be discharged to the surface water drainage system.

There are areas on site which do not drain via the interceptor. Under the current arrangements any spill that occurred in these areas could potentially escape the site if not contained by spill kits.

There is no mechanism on site for isolating the drainage system and preventing pollutants escaping off site. There is a risk pollutants could escape off site via the surface water drainage system in the event of a fire or

large spillage, especially considering the risk of the interceptor being bypassed as discussed above. We have included an Improvement Condition (IC3) which requires the operator to consider improvements to their surface water drainage system to isolate this, and agree a timescale for implementation with us. The Operator has indicated that when the isolation valve is installed S2 will no longer be used.

There are manholes for the site foul water system to the south of the mill building which drain to septic tanks. The site drains towards the north, so it is unlikely that in the event of a fire the foul water system will be accessed. However there are drain covers in place which could be used if needed and the Operator has confirmed that in the event of a fire they can access the septic tanks to empty these.

Once the drainage system can be isolated we consider that the methods used on site to prevent and manage accidents are appropriate.

Emission to surface water

As discussed above, the yard and process building drains to the adjacent farm's surface water drainage system. The point of discharge off site has been added to the permit as emission points S1 and S2. The Operator proposes to disconnect emission point S2 so that in the future all surface water drainage will pass through an isolation valve before being discharged via emission point S1.

Boiler blowdown passes through a quench tank to reduce the temperature and dilute the liquid before being discharged to the surface water drainage system.

There are mill pit sumps underneath the mill building. The sumps are emptied into Intermediate Bulk Containers (IBC) which are visually checked for contamination, before being discharged to the surface water system. Due to a high water table these can fill with groundwater.

The Best Available Techniques guidance document titled 'Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control Reference Document on Best Available Techniques in the Food, Drink and Milk Industries' dated August 2006 indicates that effluent should be treated before discharge to surface water, either on site or off site.

As part of the application the Operator has outlined that the following are discharged to surface water as part of the operation of the installation:

- Boiler blow down
- Compressor condensate (following oil/water separation)
- The contents of the Mill Sumps after inspection for contamination

Although boiler blow down and compressor condensate have been discharged to surface water for some time, we consider that the discharge could potentially have an impact on receiving waters. Therefore the risk of discharging to surface water needs to be assessed in more detail. We have included Improvement Condition 4 (IC4) in the permit to require the operator list the options for disposal, justifying the proposed route, and undertake a quantitative risk assessment of the proposed route. It also requires them to agree a timetable for implementation with us if improvement works are identified.

Vehicle washing is currently undertaken off site, but the application details that a vehicle wash may be installed on site in the future. The Operator has detailed that this would have a vehicle wash recycler so detergents would not be discharged to any associated interceptor. We have included Improvement Condition 8 which requires the Operator to submit a report to us identifying how detergents will be prevented from entering the interceptors. We have included this as a Directly Associated Activity in the permit.

We consider that the above Improvement Condition will ensure that only appropriate emissions are discharged to surface water.

Conclusion

We are satisfied that the current systems in place on site and the improvement conditions included in the permit will minimise pollution risk from the site to soil, surface water and groundwater.

Emissions to Air

There are eight point source emissions to air at the installation. Emission points A1 and A2 are linked to the process and fitted with abatement to minimise the release of particulates. Emission point A3 is the exhaust

from the boiler. Emission points A4-A8 are vents on the tanks used for the storage of raw materials and fuels. We have listed emission points A4-A8 in the permit but we have not set emission limit values for these points as we do not consider emissions from storage of these materials are likely to have an impact on local air quality.

A key environmental risk from the installation is the potential to create particulate emissions. Particulate emissions are controlled using Local Exhaust Ventilation (LEV), cyclones and bag filters at different stages throughout the process.

The hoppers receiving raw materials and conveying system to bulk storage are both fitted with LEV systems which feed to a bag filter to abate particulate emissions. Particulates collected are recycled into the feed processing as a raw material to minimise waste. Reverse jet bag filters are attached to an LEV system associated with the mineral storage bins. Raw materials which are delivered in bags are added to the process in an area which has an LEV system. Bag filters are also in place on product storage bins and the outloading bay. These bag filters vent within the process building. The operator minimises the release of fugitive particulate emissions keeping doors and windows closed where possible during normal operations. Spills are cleaned up immediately, using dry cleaning methods such as vacuuming where possible to maximise product recovery. Loading of finished product takes place within the main building and all vehicles are covered to minimise particulate release.

We are satisfied that these control measures represent Best Available Techniques (BAT) for the sector.

Coolers

The cooling system involves passing ambient air over the hot pellets to cool them. This air is then ducted into a cyclone which removes particulates before being vented to atmosphere as emission point A2. Dust recovered from the cyclone is added back into to the process.

Grinders

One of the components of the process which has the potential to create particulate emissions is the grinder, which reduces the particle size of the raw materials. The air from the grinder is vented to a reverse jet bag filter to control particulate emissions. This vents to atmosphere as emission point A1.

Screening

The Operator has undertaken screening of the particulate matter emitted to air from the cooler stack using our H1 assessment tool to assess if the emissions can be screened out as insignificant. The H1 screening was carried out using results from previous emissions monitoring and assessed emissions against PM10 Environmental Quality Standards (EQS). PM_{10} is particulate matter with a diameter of less than 10µm. The assessment concluded that short term particulate emissions could not be considered insignificant using our H1 tool. However, where an emission cannot be screened out as insignificant, it does not necessarily mean it will be significant. In these circumstances, we may require the Operator to carry out further assessment using detailed air dispersion modelling of the emissions.

No screening was completed for the grinder emissions as the Operator considered these to be minimal and no monitoring data was available to input into the screening. The Operator has provided the data from a similar site which indicates that grinder emissions are likely to be lower than the cooler emissions. The grinder emissions at the other site were approximately 11% of the emissions from the cooler at this site. However we need site specific data of the emission characteristics to be able to screen for this site.

We did not request detailed air dispersion modelling during the determination of this permit. In making this decision we considered the following factors:

- The Installation has been operating for at least 40 years and therefore emissions from the Installation are reflected in the background.
- Our H1 screening tool is precautionary in nature.
- The screening results used reflected Total Particulates rather than PM_{10} specifically, but were assessed against the PM_{10} EQS.
- The Operator has provided the results of an industry survey which indicates that PM_{10} makes up approximately 20% of Total Particulate Emissions. This indicates that the screening may over-estimate the amount of PM_{10} released.

Considering these factors, we have included improvement conditions in the new permit (IC5-IC7). These will ensure that the Operator undertakes emission monitoring of particulates and uses this to perform a site specific risk assessment of particulate emissions. This should specifically look at PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ (particulates with a diameter of less than 10µm and 2.5µm respectively). If the risk assessment indicates further mitigation of particulate emissions is required we have included an improvement condition to agree an action plan with us for further improvements. This approach will allow us to understand the actual pollution risk of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions from both the grinder and cooler rather than requiring the Operator to undertake dispersion modelling based on total particulates which will may be an overestimate of PM_{10}.

Emission Limits and Monitoring

We have set an emission limit value (ELV) for particulates of 20mg/m^3, which is lower than the DEFRA guidance note 6/26(13) for the emission from the product cooler (A2). Previous emissions monitoring mentioned in the application was 7.9mg/Nm^3.

We have set an ELV of 20mg/m^3 for emissions from the grinders (A1). This is in line with the DEFRA guidance note 6/26(13). We have set monitoring requirements to ensure these ELVs are met. If appropriate, these ELVs may be revised in line with improvement condition IC6.

The cooler cyclone is subject to continuous indicative monitoring which links to the main operating system. This is alarmed and the process is interlocked so if there is a problem with the cyclone the process will stop until the problem is rectified. This is in line with the requirements of DEFRA guidance note 6/26(13) and we consider this BAT. There is a pressure gauge in the bag filter associated with the grinder which is checked daily. As the grinder exhaust airflow is less than 100m^3 per minute, continuous monitoring of the bag filter is not required, in line with DEFRA guidance note 6/26(13). We consider the site abatement and monitoring to represent BAT.

We are setting emission limit values which are more stringent than those in the current permit. We therefore consider that this represents an environmental improvement when compared to the current Local Authority regulated permit.

Boiler

The boiler on site has a thermal input of 1.5MW and is fuelled by liquid petroleum gas (LPG). Gas oil (red diesel) will be used as a backup if there is an issue with LPG supply. We have not requested an assessment of air emissions from this emission point as we consider it unlikely that boilers of this size will have a negative impact on air quality. This mirrors the approach in our guidance 'AQTAG014: Guidance on identifying 'relevance' for assessment under the Habitats Regulations for installations with combustion processes'. In the event of boiler malfunction a temporary standby boiler would be brought on site which is likely to be powered by gas oil.

There is a small domestic boiler installed in the site amenities block shown on the site plan as an emission point. As this is purely used for central heating one building and is only 24.64kW thermal input capacity we have not listed this in the permit.

Conclusion

We consider the site is using BAT to abate and monitor their emissions to air. We cannot screen out the site particulate emissions as insignificant. Therefore we have set improvement conditions requiring the monitoring of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ so we can assess the site specific emissions and undertake a more representative screening. If the site screening shows improvements are required we have included an improvement condition which requires the site to develop an action plan to reduce emissions and implement these to a timetable agreed by us. We have set lower ELVs than those in the current permit, therefore we consider this represents an environmental improvement for the installation.

Site Condition Report

A Site Condition Report (SCR) was submitted with the application. The SCR describes the site setting as an agricultural area with an adjacent poultry farm, and residential and commercial receptors nearby. The site is located south of the village of Seamer. The nearest residential receptor is located adjacent to the site's western boundary, approximately 35m from the Mill building. The Yorkshire Moor Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Special Protection Area (SPA) is located approximately 6.5km to the south east. An electrical substation is located at the eastern boundary. The site is not within 500m of a Source Protection Zone and there are no recorded abstractions within 2km. The maps indicate that two wells are in the vicinity, one approximately 540m west and another approximately 790m to the southwest. There are field drains in the vicinity of the site, including a culvert along the northern boundary. Two rivers are within 1km of the site, the Carr Stell 930m to the west and River Tame 1km to the south east.

The underlying geology comprises of sand and gravel glaciofluvial deposits. The bedrock geology is mudstone. Both the superficial and bedrock geology are also secondary aquifers. The SCR describes the site as in an area susceptible to groundwater flooding.

There is evidence that surface mining of sand took place historically approximately 20m to the south-east. A sheep dip was recorded approximately 30m south east. Historical maps indicate the site was in its current layout by 1975. Due to the age of the buildings on site, it is possible asbestos is present.

As discussed in the Key Issues section above, the site stores and uses a number of materials that could pose a risk to groundwater and soil. The risk to groundwater and soil from these materials have been addressed above. These materials include gas oil and diesel.

No baseline samples have been taken. As baseline samples have not been provided we will need to assume that the existing level of contamination at the site is zero and the operator will be responsible for any necessary remediation when the site is surrendered. We advised the Operator of this in an email dated 27 November 2017.

We are satisfied that the site condition report provides a representative description of the site baseline condition.

Odour

The site uses raw materials that have the potential to be odorous. The main odour control measures employed are storing and transferring raw materials in enclosed systems or their original packaging and ensuring good house-keeping practices are adhered to. The application states that the site has never had an odour complaint. The risk assessment states that 'there is no noticeable off-site odour impact'. The application identifies that the site cleaning regime will also minimise odour release.

The application outlines that odour may be released as part of the cooling process. The application described that the cooler stack is 18m high which will aid dispersion. The cooler stack is located approximately 60m from the boundary of the nearest residential receptor. Raw material storage tanks are located within approximately 20m of the boundary of the nearest residential receptor.

The application does not include an odour management plan and we have taken the decision not to request one as part of the application as we consider the odour risk to be low from this site, taking account of the fact it has already been operating without any odour issues and that we consider the site activities and raw materials used to be low risk in terms of odour. The site uses a Nuisance Management Plan which includes responses to odour issues. These include periodic walkover surveys of the site to monitor odour and a complaints response procedure which involves investigating odour sources and ceasing activities that might be causing odour issues. We have also included our standard odour condition which allows us to request an odour management plan if odour issues arise.

Based upon the information in the application, we are satisfied that the appropriate measures will be in place to prevent or where that is not practicable to minimise pollution from odour. We are satisfied that the standard conditions, relating to odour pollution prevention and control, in the permit are sufficient and no additional measures are necessary at this time.

Noise

The majority of plant used on site is located within the production building. The building will likely provide a measure of attenuation from noise. The risk assessment identifies that the noisiest activities will be undertaken inside the process building or within acoustic enclosures. The application identifies that the site grinder is the noisiest item of plant used. However the site set up is designed to provide acoustic attenuation to minimise the impact on site staff, which will also reduce the potential for noise to be heard off site. The grinder is located within a separate room designed to provide attenuation. The grinder is located approximately 70m from the nearest residential receptor, on the opposite side of the mill building. There is external plant which has the potential to be noisy. This includes the bulk grain intake, product despatch bay, pumps and ventilation fans. The operator indicates that these are not audible at the site boundary.

Another potential source of noise is vehicle movements. The site operates 24 hours a day. The application indicates that the impact of vehicle movements on site is minimised by scheduling deliveries and product despatch for daylight hours where possible. Drivers are also trained to ensure speeds are reduced and excessive revving is avoided. The application states that the site has never had a noise complaint.

The operator has not provided a noise management plan and we have taken the decision not to request one as part of the application as we consider the noise risk to be low from this site, taking account of the fact it has already been operating without any noise issues. However the site uses a Nuisance Management Plan which includes responses and consideration of noise issues. The Plan states that a weekly inspection of all equipment is undertaken. If any maintenance is considered to be needed repairs will be made by a qualified engineer as soon as possible. The application also details how the operator will undertake investigation of any noise complaints and ensure remedial action is carried out promptly. A preventative maintenance programme is in place which will minimise the risk of noise from equipment malfunction.

We have included our standard noise condition which allows us to request a noise management plan if noise issues arise.

Based upon the information in the application, we are satisfied that the appropriate measures will be in place to prevent or where that is not practicable to minimise pollution from noise. We are satisfied that the standard conditions, relating to noise pollution prevention and control, in the permit are sufficient and no additional measures are necessary at this time.

Best Available Techniques (BAT) Assessment

We have assessed if the operator is using Best Available Techniques by referring to the following guidance:

- Process Guidance Note 6/26(13) Statutory guidance for animal feed compounding December 2013
- How to comply with your environmental permit, Additional guidance for: The Food and Drink Sector (EPR 6.10)
- ‘Control and monitor emissions for your environmental permit’ webpage

As detailed in the preceding Key Issues sections, we consider the operator is using BAT, with the exception of the site drainage and containment arrangements, we have included Improvement Conditions to ensure the infrastructure is improved so this meets BAT.

Decision checklist

Aspect considered	Decision
Receipt of application	
Confidential information	A claim for commercial or industrial confidentiality has not been made.
Identifying confidential information	We have not identified information provided as part of the application that we consider to be confidential.
Consultation	
Consultation	The consultation requirements were identified in accordance with the Environmental Permitting Regulations and our public participation statement. The application was publicised on the GOV.UK website We consulted the following organisations: • Local authority environmental protection department • Health and Safety Executive • Director of Public Health and Public Health England The comments and our responses are summarised in the consultation section.
Operator	
Control of the facility	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 our guidance on legal operator for environmental permits.
The facility	
The regulated facility	We considered the extent and nature of the facility at the site in accordance with Regulatory Guidance Note (RGN) 2 'Understanding the meaning of regulated facility' The extent of the facility is defined in the site plan and in the permit. The activities are defined in table S1.1 of the permit.
The site	
Extent of the site of the facility	The operator has provided a plan which we consider is satisfactory, showing the extent of the site of the facility. The plan is included in the permit.
Site condition report	The operator has provided a description of the condition of the site, which we consider is satisfactory. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on site condition reports and baseline reporting under the Industrial Emissions Directive. As discussed in the Key Issues section, we have previously advised the

Aspect considered	Decision
	Operator by email on 27 November 2017 that they should consider taking baseline samples of soil and groundwater. As these have not been provided we will need to assume the baseline level of contamination is zero and the operator will be responsible for any necessary remediation when the site is surrendered.
Biodiversity, heritage, landscape and nature conservation	The application is within the relevant distance criteria of a site of heritage, landscape or nature conservation, and/or protected species or habitat. The site is within the relevant screening distance of the following sites: • A Special Protection Area (SPA) • A Special Area of Conservation (SAC) We have assessed the application and its potential to affect all known sites of nature conservation, landscape and heritage and/or protected species or habitats identified in the nature conservation screening report as part of the permitting process. The combustion process at the installation is not considered 'relevant' for assessment under the Agency's procedures which cover The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 2017 (Habitats Regulations). This was determined by referring to the Agency's guidance 'AQTAG014: Guidance on identifying 'relevance' for assessment under the Habitats Regulations for installations with combustion processes'. Thus no detailed assessment of the effect of the releases from the installation's combustion processes on SACs, SPAs and Ramsar sites is required. We consider that the application will not affect any sites of nature conservation, landscape and heritage, and/or protected species or habitats identified. We don't consider that there is an effective pathway for impact between the mill and the designated sites. We have not consulted Natural England on the application. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance. An appendix 11 has been completed and sent for information only.
Environmental risk assessment	
Environmental risk	We have reviewed the operator's assessment of the environmental risk from the facility. The operator's risk assessment is satisfactory, with the exception of particulate emissions. The assessment shows that, applying the conservative criteria in our guidance on environmental risk assessment, all emissions may be categorised as environmentally insignificant with the exception of particulate matter. See Key Issues for details.
Operating techniques	
General operating techniques	We have reviewed the techniques used by the operator and compared these with the relevant guidance notes and we consider them to represent appropriate techniques for the facility. See Key Issues for more details.

Aspect considered	Decision
	The operating techniques that the applicant must use are specified in table S1.2 in the environmental permit.
Operating techniques for emissions that do not screen out as insignificant	Emissions of particulate matter cannot be screened out as insignificant. We have assessed whether the proposed techniques are BAT. Conditions are being imposed for which the appropriate emission limits are more stringent than those associated with the best available techniques as described in BAT conclusions (see also emission limits). We have included a stricter ELV for emission point A2. We have also included Improvement conditions which requires the Operator to undertake monitoring and further screening. See Key Issues for more details. We consider the site containment and drainage infrastructure does not represent BAT so we have included Improvement Conditions to ensure the infrastructure is improved. See Key Issues for more details. As discussed in the key issues, we have included an improvement condition for the Operator to analyse their discharges to surface water and assess their environmental impact, proposing alternatives if necessary.
Permit conditions	
Improvement programme	Based on the information on the application, we consider that we need to impose an improvement programme. We have imposed an improvement programme to ensure that the Operator has the correct infrastructure and processes in place to manage the risk to air, soil, surface water and groundwater. See Key Issues for more details.
Emission limits	Emission Limit Values (ELVs) and equivalent parameters or technical measures based on BAT have been set for the following substances: particulate matter. We have imposed a stricter ELV than that required by the guidance document 'Process Guidance Note 6/26(13) Statutory guidance for animal feed compounding December 2013' in respect of particulate matter from the cooler (emission point A2). See Key Issues section on Emissions to Air for more details.
Monitoring	We have decided that monitoring should be carried out for the parameters listed in the permit, using the methods detailed and to the frequencies specified. These monitoring requirements have been imposed in order to ensure particulate emissions are controlled. We made these decisions in accordance with 'Process Guidance Note 6/26(13) Statutory guidance for animal feed compounding' December 2013. Based on the information in the application we are satisfied that the operator's techniques, personnel and equipment have either MCERTS certification or MCERTS accreditation as appropriate.
Reporting	We have specified reporting in the permit. The specified reporting will allow us to monitor environmental compliance at

Aspect considered	Decision
	the site. We made these decisions in accordance with 'Process Guidance Note 6/26(13) Statutory guidance for animal feed compounding' December 2013.
Operator competence	
Management system	There is no known reason to consider that the operator will not have the management system to enable it to comply with the permit conditions. The decision was taken in accordance with the guidance on operator competence and how to develop a management system for environmental permits.
Relevant convictions	The Case Management System has been checked to ensure that all relevant convictions have been declared. No relevant convictions were found. The operator satisfies the criteria in our guidance on operator competence.
Financial competence	There is no known reason to consider that the operator will not be financially able to comply with the permit conditions.
Growth Duty	
Section 108 Deregulation Act 2015 – Growth duty	We have considered our duty to have regard to the desirability of promoting economic growth set out in section 108(1) of the Deregulation Act 2015 and the guidance issued under section 110 of that Act in deciding whether to grant this permit. Paragraph 1.3 of the guidance says: "The primary role of regulators, in delivering regulation, is to achieve the regulatory outcomes for which they are responsible. For a number of regulators, these regulatory outcomes include an explicit reference to development or growth. The growth duty establishes economic growth as a factor that all specified regulators should have regard to, alongside the delivery of the protections set out in the relevant legislation." We have addressed the legislative requirements and environmental standards to be set for this operation in the body of the decision document above. The guidance is clear at paragraph 1.5 that the growth duty does not legitimise non-compliance and its purpose is not to achieve or pursue economic growth at the expense of necessary protections. We consider the requirements and standards we have set in this permit are reasonable and necessary to avoid a risk of an unacceptable level of pollution. This also promotes growth amongst legitimate operators because the standards applied to the operator are consistent across businesses in this sector and have been set to achieve the required legislative standards.

Consultation

The following summarises the responses to consultation with other organisations, our notice on GOV.UK for the public and the way in which we have considered these in the determination process.

Responses from organisations listed in the consultation section

Response received from
Hambleton District Council, Environmental Health Services
Brief summary of issues raised
Based on the information provided they believe there will be no significant impact on local amenity.
Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered
None applicable

Response received from
Public Health England (PHE)
Brief summary of issues raised
PHE consider the screening of emissions to air carried out in the application is flawed and has not considered background concentrations when looking at short term process contributions. PHE consider that the emissions appear to meet the requirement for detailed modelling. PHE note that no detailed assessment of the potential effects of noise, odour or pests has been undertaken which may affect residential receptors on the boundary of the site. PHE request the Environment Agency ensure the Installation has sufficient measures in place to prevent nuisance at nearby residences. PHE consider that there is insufficient information in the application to be able to fully assess the impact of the Installation on public health. They request any information relating to their response should be sent to PHE for consideration when it becomes available and that this may affect the comments in the response. The consultation response is based on the assumption that the Operator will take all appropriate measures to prevent or control pollution on accordance with relevant sector guidance and industry best practice.
Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered
We have discussed the emissions to air in detail in the Key Issues section above. We consider that the assessment included in the application does not reflect that fact that the site is already operating and emissions from the site will be reflected in the background. We have included improvement conditions which requires the Operator to undertake further monitoring and undertake an assessment based on site specific PM_{10} emissions. If the assessment shows improvements to site infrastructure are needed the improvement conditions require these to be agreed by us and implemented to a timetable we have agreed. As discussed in the key issues sections, we consider the site is taking appropriate measures to minimise odour and noise emissions but we have included our standard conditions which allow us to request management plans if needed. The application details that the Operator undertakes pest control measures and regular cleaning. We have also included our standard permit condition which allows us to request a pest management plan if necessary.