

Environment Agency permitting decisions

Surrender

We have decided to accept the surrender of the permit for Wretton Farm Poultry Unit operated by Noble Foods Limited.

The permit number is YP3332MX

We are satisfied that the necessary measures have been taken to avoid any pollution risk and to return the site to a satisfactory state.

We consider in reaching that decision we have taken into account all relevant considerations and legal requirements.

Purpose of this document

This decision document:

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

Structure of this document

- Key issues
- Annex 1 the decision checklist

Key issues of the decision

The original permit was issued to Dean Foods Limited on 21/09/07 for the housing of 60,000 pullets. The Operator changed its name to Noble Foods in 2011. The registered number of the company remained unchanged.

Pollution risk

The site operated as a replacement layer pullet rearing installation with an original maximum stocking density of 60,000 birds. Birds were brought in at a day old and left the site at 16 weeks of age. The stocking densities increased to 66,000 in January 2010 and 80,000 in July 2012.

The buildings were insulated and mechanically ventilated with air being drawn in from both ends of the houses and leaving through fans on the sides of the houses. All fans were fitted with cowls to minimise dust dispersion. Nipple drinkers were used from 14 days old, prior to this little bell drinkers were used. Water consumption was monitored daily.

The chicks were housed on fully littered floors and provided with heating up to six weeks of age using Propane gas heaters. Feed was delivered pre-mixed and milled from a mill located elsewhere. Mortalities were removed daily and stored in a freezer until collected by a licensed contractor. On average, this was once or twice a flock.

Once the birds had left the houses, litter was removed by a contractor and exported from the site to a local power station. The houses were washed down and disinfected before the next flock arrived. Wash water was collected in an underground tank prior to collection for disposal off-site. Site drainage was improved in 2012.

Production at the site ceased in November 2013, when the last birds on the rearing site were depleted at 16 weeks of age. This was followed by the cleaning down of the poultry sheds with the removal of wash waters and manure.

The site was decommissioned in accordance with the site closure plan, which is included in the application.

Satisfactory state

The SCR and other site records identify no evidence of pollution throughout the life of the Permit.

The site was sold by the Operator on the 18th February 2014. Demolition at the site started in 24th February 2014 and was completed on the 10th of March 2014. The construction of a new poultry facility started soon after the demolition work had been completed. However, because the new poultry facility will not have a capacity of more than 40,000 birds, no transfer of the permit was required.

The site was inspected on 27/08/2014. Significant redevelopment had taken place. All raw materials and wastes relating to the previous operation had been removed from site and there was no evidence of pollution or damage to vegetation within or surrounding the site.

We are satisfied that the necessary measures have been taken to avoid a pollution risk resulting from the operation of the regulated facility and to return the site of the regulated facility to a satisfactory state, having regard to the state of the site before the facility was put into operation.

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
The site		
Extent of the surrender application	The operator has provided a plan showing the extent of the site of the facility that is to be surrendered. We consider this plan to be satisfactory.	✓
Pollution risk	We are satisfied that the necessary measures have been taken to avoid a pollution risk resulting from the operation of the regulated facility.	✓
Satisfactory state	We are satisfied that the necessary measures have been taken to return the site of the regulated facility to a satisfactory state. In coming to this decision we have had regard to the state of the site before the facility was put into operation.	✓