

# **Environment Agency permitting decisions**

## **Variation**

We have decided to issue the variation for Trowbridge Farm Poultry Unit operated by Ridgeway Foods Limited.

The permit number is EPR/GP3439RT

The variation number is EPR/GP3439RT/V002

This was applied for and determined as a substantial 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
- Annex 2 the consultation and web publicising responses

## Description of the changes introduced by the Variation

This substantial variation authorises the following changes: To change the two existing poultry sheds from a deep pit manure system with caged laying birds to a modern manure belt system for rearing caged pullets. This will increase the bird numbers from 144,000 to 500,000 places. This change in bird type and site infrastructure will produce an overall ammonia reduction of 28%.

## Key Issues of the decision

### Ammonia Impacts and mass balance

The permit has been varied to increase the number of bird places from 144,000 laying hens to 500,000 pullets an increase of 356,000 places. An emission factor of 0.29 was originally used when the permit was initially issued in 2007.

Table 1.

Category of livestock	Housing system	Ammonia emission factor (kg/NH3/animal place/year)
Layers	Cages with deep pit manure storage beneath	0.29
Pullets	Naturally ventilated or mechanically ventilated, fully littered floor, non-leaking drinkers (manure belt)	0.06

Table 2.

Permit	Animal/Housing Type	Emission factor	Bird Places	Ammonia Emissions (Kg NH3/year)	Ammonia Emissions (g NH3/s)
<b>Original Permit A001</b>	144,000 laying hens	0.29	144,00	41,760	1.324
			<b>Total</b>	<b>41,760</b>	<b>1.342</b>
<b>Proposed Permit V002</b>	500,000 pullets	0.06	500,000	30,000	0.951
			<b>Total</b>	<b>30,000</b>	<b>0.951</b>
<b>Predicted 2015 emissions as a percentage of original emissions</b>		<b>71.84%</b>			
<b>Percentage Reduction</b>		<b>28.16%</b>			

Based upon the revised bird numbers increasing and stocked type changing from 144,000 laying hens to 500,000 pullets within the two sheds. We can show a mass balance reduction of **28.16%** in ammonia emissions, demonstrating a significant environmental improvement (Table 2).

There will be no changes to the emission characteristics, the location of the sheds and the orientation of the emission points remain the same.

## 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 2013. These Regulations transpose the requirements of the IED.

This permit implements the requirements of the European Union 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 a condition relating to protection of soil, groundwater and 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 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 (SCR) for Trowbridge Farm Poultry Unit (dated 21/09/07) demonstrates that there are no hazards or likely pathway to land or groundwater and no historic contamination on site that may present a hazard from the same contaminants. **Therefore, on the basis of the risk assessment presented in the SCR, we accept that they have not provided base line reference data for the soil and groundwater at the site at this stage.**

## Annex 1: decision checklist

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

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met
		Yes
<b>Receipt of submission</b>		
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. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on commercial confidentiality.	✓
<b>Consultation</b>		
Scope of consultation	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.	✓
Responses to consultation and web publicising	The web publicising and consultation responses (Annex 2) were taken into account in the decision. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance.	✓
<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.	✓
Site condition report	The Operator has provided a description of the condition of the site. We consider this description is satisfactory. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance	✓

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met
		Yes
	on site condition reports and baseline reporting under IED - guidance and templates (H5).	
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 sites. We have not formally consulted on the application The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance.	✓
<b>Environmental Risk Assessment and operating techniques</b>		
Environmental risk	We have carried out a risk assessment on behalf of the Operator. The Operator considers this risk assessment is satisfactory - see Key Issues section for further explanation.	✓
Operating techniques	<p>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 benchmark levels contained in the SGN EPR6.09 and we consider them to represent appropriate techniques for the facility.</p> <p>The operating techniques are as follows::</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing design and management will be in accordance with the sector guidance note (SGN) EPR6.09.</li> <li>• Feed selection and use will be in accordance with the sector guidance note (SGN) EPR6.09.</li> <li>• Nipple drinkers are used to reduce wastage of water and maintain dry litter;</li> <li>• All dirty water is collected in storage tanks and taken off site. the biomass boiler fuel is derived from virgin timber;</li> </ul> <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>		
Updating permit conditions during	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 permits. The Operator	✓

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met
		Yes
consolidation.	has agreed that the new conditions are acceptable.	
Incorporating the application	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.	✓
<b>Operator Competence</b>		
Environment management system	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.	✓
Financial provision	There is no known reason to consider that the Operator will not be financially able to comply with the permit conditions. The decision was taken in accordance with RGN 5 on Operator Competence.	✓

## 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.

Response received from
None
Brief summary of issues raised
None
Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered
No further action. See comment below.

The Health and Safety Executive (HSE), Food Standard Agency (FSA), Director of Public Health, Public Health England (PHE) Public Protection Services and Wiltshire Council (County Hall, Trowbridge) were consulted with. Consultation responses from these parties were not received - (receipt of comments to be received by 15/01/16). No relevant comments received.

The permit application was published on the Environment Agency's website (which finished 15/01/16); no comments / representations were received during the web consultation period.