

# Environment Agency permitting decisions

## Variation

We have decided to issue the variation for Cranswick Farm Poultry Unit operated by Faccenda Group Limited.

The permit number is EPR/ZP3037ZP.

The variation number is EPR/ZP3037ZP/V002.

This was applied for and determined as a normal variation.

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
- justifies the specific conditions in the permit other than those in our generic permit template.

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

## Structure of this document

- Key issues
- Annex 1 the decision checklist

## Key issues of the decision

### Ammonia Emissions

There is one Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) located within 5 kilometres of the installation. There are also 5 Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) within 2km of the installation.

### Ammonia Assessment – SSSI

The following trigger thresholds have been applied for assessment of SSSI's. 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.

Screening using the Ammonia Screening Tool (v4.4) has indicated that the Cle for River Hull Headwaters SSSI is not appropriate and as such PC is incalculable. The results of the ammonia screening tool v4.4 are given in the tables below.

**Table 1 Ammonia Emissions**

Name of SSSI	Ammonia Cle ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )	PC ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )	PC as % of Critical level
River Hull Headwaters SSSI	N/A*	N/A	N/A

\* Natural England advises that a critical level for ammonia is not appropriate to be applied to this site at present as it is designated for aquatic features.

No further assessment of wildlife sites is necessary.

### Ammonia assessment – LWS's

There are 5 Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) within 2 km of Cranswick Farm. 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.

For the following sites this farm has been screened out, as set out above, using results of the Ammonia Screening Tool version 4.4. The Process Contribution on the LWS for ammonia, acid and N deposition from the

application site are under the 100% significance threshold and can be screened out as having no likely significant effect.

**Table 2 - Ammonia Emissions LWS's**

Site	Critical Level Ammonia $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	PC $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	PC % Critical Level
Old Fox Covert Plantation LWS	3*	0.857	28.6%
Gawdy Hall Plantation LWS	3*	1.304	43.5%
Hutton Cranswick Meadow LWS	3*	1.666	55.5%
Corpslanding Road LWS	3*	1.153	38.4%
Sheepman Lane LWS	3*	1.256	41.9%

\* Critical level of 3 applied as no protected lichen or bryophytes species were found when checking easimap layer.

**Table 3 - Nutrient enrichment**

Site	Critical Load nutrient enrichment kg N/ha/yr	PC Kg N/ha/yr	PC % Critical Load
Old Fox Covert Plantation LWS	10*	4.452	44.5%
Gawdy Hall Plantation LWS	10*	6.772	67.7%
Hutton Cranswick Meadow LWS	20*	8.656	43.3%
Corpslanding Road LWS	10*	5.989	59.9%
Sheepman Lane LWS	10*	6.525	65.2%

\* Critical load values taken from APIS website ([www.apis.ac.uk](http://www.apis.ac.uk)) – 02/12/13

**Table 4 - Acidification**

Site	Critical Load acidification keq/ha/yr	PC keq/ha/yr	PC % Critical Load
Old Fox Covert Plantation LWS	2.72*	0.318	11.69%
Gawdy Hall Plantation LWS	2.72*	0.484	17.78%
Hutton Cranswick Meadow LWS	4.00*	0.618	15.46%
Corpslanding Road LWS	2.72*	0.428	15.73%
Sheepman Lane LWS	2.72*	0.466	17.13%

\* Critical load values taken from APIS website ([www.apis.ac.uk](http://www.apis.ac.uk)) – 02/12/13

No further assessment is required.

## 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.

## Groundwater and soil monitoring

As a result of the requirements of the Industrial Emissions Directive, all permits are now required to contain condition 3.2.4 relating to groundwater monitoring. However, our H5 Guidance states that it is only necessary for the operator to take samples of soil or groundwater and measure levels of contamination where there is 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 the 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 for Cranswick Farm Poultry Unit (dated 25.11.2013) concludes that the hazards to land or groundwater have been mitigated/minimised such that there is little likelihood of pollution and there is no evidence of historic contamination on site. Therefore, although this condition is included in the permit, no groundwater monitoring will be required at this installation as a result.

## Annex 1: decision checklist

This document should be read in conjunction with the Duly Making checklist, the application and supporting information and permit/ notice.

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met
		Yes
<b>Operator</b>		
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 EPR RGN 1 Understanding the meaning of operator.	✓
<b>European Directives</b>		
Applicable directives	All applicable European directives have been considered in the determination of the application.	✓
<b>The site</b>		
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  A plan is included in the permit and the operator is required to carry on the permitted activities within the site boundary.	✓
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.  A full assessment of the application and its potential to affect the sites has been carried out as part of the permitting process. We consider that the application will not affect the features of the sites.  We have not formally consulted on the application. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance.  <b>See Key issues for details.</b>	✓
<b>Environmental Risk Assessment and operating techniques</b>		
Operating techniques	We have reviewed the techniques used by the operator and compared these with the relevant guidance notes.  The proposed techniques for priorities for control are in line with the techniques contained in the SGN EPR6.09 "How to comply with your Environmental Permit for Intensive Farming, version 2" and we consider them to	✓

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met
		Yes
	represent appropriate techniques for the facility.	
Environmental risk	<p>We have reviewed the operator's assessment of the environmental risk from the facility.</p> <p>The operator's risk assessment is satisfactory.</p>	✓
<b>The permit conditions</b>		
Updating permit conditions during consolidation.	<p>We have updated previous permit conditions to those in the new generic permit template as part of permit consolidation. The new conditions have the same meaning as those in the previous permit.</p> <p>The operator has agreed that the new conditions are acceptable.</p>	✓
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.</p> <p>These descriptions are specified in the Operating Techniques table in the permit.</p>	✓
<b>Operator Competence</b>		
Environment management system	<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 decision was taken in accordance with 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 on Operator Competence.</p>	✓