

# Environment Agency permitting decisions

## Variation

We have decided to issue the variation for the installation comprising of **Oakland Farm, Scagglethorpe Farm, Brecks Farm, Killingbeck Farm and Redhouse Farm** operated by **Oakland Farms Limited**.

The variation number is **EPR/FP3030UT/V004**

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

## Key Issues

The applicant has applied for a substantial variation, as the application increases numbers of poultry broilers from 570,000 to 615,000 and this increase is above the scheduled activity section 6.9 A (1) (a) (i) threshold of 40,000 in line with our guidance (RGN No 8) it is considered and determined as a substantial variation.

The application also includes the addition and operation of heat exchanger units, one for each poultry house (20). The applicant has provided a plan to show the location of the heat exchangers and emission points. All condensates from the units are collected in the dirty water tanks. The units are washed and cleaned following each production cycle.

As there is a sensitive receptor (residential property) within 100 m of the installation, the applicant has provided a dust/bioaerosol risk assessment to support the application.

The rest of the installation remains unchanged, there are no changes to the poultry houses and we have corrected an error to the installation boundary to include the adjacent biomass boilers.

**Noise and Odour:**

The applicant has provided a satisfactory noise and odour management plan to support the application.

**Ammonia assessment:**

The operator has installed and is operating heat exchange units fitted to each of the poultry houses. We have been provided with evidence (a verification report) from the operator that a precautionary reduction in ammonia emissions of 35% can be achieved. We agree with this reduction, which results in an ammonia emission factor of 0.022 kg NH<sub>3</sub>/year (previously 0.034 NH<sub>3</sub>/year). The applicant has confirmed use of the units on all houses for minimum ventilation during the first 14 day and the units are supported by 4 recirculation fans per house.

The ammonia emissions from this proposal are less than the ammonia emissions assessed during the last variation to increase the poultry broiler numbers (EPR/FP3030UT/V002). This is a result of the broiler emission factor being reduced to 0.022 kg NH<sub>3</sub>/animal place/year to take into consideration of the improvements on the site – see mass balance calculations below.

**Variation EPR/FP3030UT/V002 for 570,000 broiler places**

Ammonia Assessment:  $0.034 \times 570,000 = \underline{19,380}$  kg NH<sub>3</sub>/year

**Proposal for 615,000 broiler places and heat exchanger units**

Proposal assessment:  $0.022 \times 615,000 = \underline{13,530}$  kg NH<sub>3</sub>/year

The applicant submitted detailed ammonia modelling to support the application ( A Report on the Modelling of the Dispersion and Deposition of Ammonia from the Broiler Rearing Units at Oakland ( Moor Monkton) Farm, Scagglethorpe Farm, Brecks Farm, Killingbeck Farm and Redhouse Farm, Redhouse Lane, Monkton in North Yorkshire – 16 th January 2015). We have reviewed the modelling and can conclude it supports our mass balance calculations which shows a reduction in ammonia emissions.

## Annex 1: decision checklist

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met
		Yes
Receipt of submission		
Confidential information	A claim for commercial or industrial confidentiality has not been made.	✓
Consultation		
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 following were consulted:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Local Authority – Environmental Health</li><li>- Health and Safety Executive</li><li>- Public Health England – consulted on the bioaerosol/dust risk assesment as there is sensitive receptor within 100 metres of the Scagglethorpe Farm.</li><li>- Director of Public Health - consulted on the bioaerosol/dust risk assesment as there is sensitive receptor within 100 metres of the Scagglethorpe Farm.</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>The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance.</p>	✓
European Directives		
Applicable directives	All applicable European directives have been considered in the determination of the application.	✓
The Site		
Biodiversity, Heritage, Landscape and Nature Conservation	<p>The application is within the relevant distance criteria of a site of heritage, landscape or nature conservation, and/or protected species or habitat .</p> <p>A full assessment of the application and its potential to affect the sites, species and habitat has been carried out as part of the permitting process. We consider that the application will not affect the features of the site, species and habitat</p> <p>We have not formally consulted on the application. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance.</p>	✓

EPR/FP3030UT/V004

Installation comprising of Oakland Farm,  
Scagglethorpe Farm, Brecks Farm,  
Killingbeck Farm and Redhouse Farm

Issued 14/09/2015

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met
		Yes
	See key issues.	
<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.</p> <p>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> <p>See key issues section above.</p>	✓
Operating techniques	<p>We have reviewed the techniques used by the operator and compared these with the relevant guidance notes.</p> <p>The operating techniques are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heat exchanger units are connected to foul water drains and tanks. The condensate is collected in a tank.</li> <li>• The operation and maintenance of the units is carried out in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.</li> <li>• The units are used for minimum ventilation for the first 14 days</li> <li>• The units are supported by 4 recirculation fans per poultry house.</li> <li>• The units are washed and cleaned thoroughly on each cycle turnaround, and washwater collected in dirty water tanks.</li> </ul> <p>The proposed techniques for priorities for control are in line with the benchmark levels contained in the Sector Guidance Note EPR6.09 and we consider them to represent appropriate techniques for the facility. The permit conditions ensure compliance with relevant BREFs.</p>	✓
<b>The permit conditions</b>		
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.	✓

Aspect considered	Justification / Detail	Criteria met
		Yes
	These descriptions are specified in the Operating Techniques table S1.2 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.	✓

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

No responses to consultation and web publications were received.