

Permitting decisions

Variation

We have decided to grant the variation for Longfield Grange Farm and New Moor Farm Pig Units operated by Mr Tim Bradshaw and Mrs Jacky Bradshaw.

The variation number is EPR/LP3439UW/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 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](#)

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

Key issues of the decision

Ammonia

The applicant has demonstrated that the new pig housing will meet the relevant NH₃ BAT-AEL.

There are no Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Areas (SPA), or Ramsar sites located within 10 kilometres of the installation. There are no Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) located within 5 km of the installation. There are also no Local Wildlife Sites (LWS), Ancient Woodlands (AW) or Local Nature Reserves (LNR) within 2 km of the installation.

No further assessment is necessary.

Numbers of pigs on the permit

The application was initially to increase pig numbers from 5,665 production pigs to 7,741 and 1,180 sows to 1,536 sows. However a breakdown of the number of pigs in each shed, received on 07/07/17, indicated that there were also 6 boars present, which have been added to the total for production pigs.

Additionally, pigs smaller than 30kg had not previously been included in the permit as a directly associated activity. 2,880 pigs of up to 30kg have now been included as a DAA, comprising 1,520 at Longfield Grange Farm and 1,360 at New Moor Farm.

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. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on confidentiality.
Consultation/Engagement	
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 Health Health and Safety Executive (HSE) Public Health England (PHE) Director of Public Health (DPH) The comments and our responses are summarised in the consultation section .
The site	
Extent of the site of the facility	The operator has provided plans which we consider are satisfactory, showing the extent of the site of the facility. During the determination, we updated the site plan and confirmed with the applicant that it was accurate (email dated 07/07/17). This 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.
Biodiversity, heritage, landscape and nature conservation	The application is not within the relevant distance criteria of a site of heritage, landscape or nature conservation, and/or protected species or habitat.
Environmental risk assessment	
Environmental risk	We have reviewed the operator's assessment of the environmental risk from the facility. A noise management plan, and odour management plan were provided and we deemed them satisfactory in with our guidance. A bioaerosols risk

Aspect considered	Decision
	<p>assessment was also provided and also deemed appropriate to address the risk of bioaerosols from the site.</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>
Operating techniques	
General operating techniques	<p>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.</p> <p>The operating techniques that the applicant must use are specified in table S1.2 in the environmental permit.</p> <p>The operating techniques of the new sheds are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sheds are ventilated using automatically controlled fans, operating at 7m/s • Nutrition is provided to minimise phosphorus, nitrogen and ammonia emissions. • The new finisher house uses a uses a 1-Tek Sluice system to remove manure <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>
Odour management	<p>We have reviewed the odour management plan in accordance with our guidance on odour management.</p> <p>We consider that the odour management plan is satisfactory.</p>
Noise management	<p>We have reviewed the noise management plan in accordance with our guidance on noise assessment and control.</p> <p>We consider that the noise management plan is satisfactory.</p>
Operator competence	
Management system	<p>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.</p>

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
Local Authority – Environmental Health (dated 20/06/17)
Brief summary of issues raised
None
Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered
None required.

Response received from
Public Health England (PHE) (dated 23/06/17)
Brief summary of issues raised
PHE raised the issue of dust and bioaerosols. As there was a receptor within 100m of the permitted site, a bioaerosol risk assessment was expected as a matter of public health.
Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered
A bioaerosols risk assessment was requested and provided by the applicant following existing Environment Agency protocol. The risk assessment was provided on 03/07/17 and deemed appropriate to address the risk of bioaerosols from the site.

The Health and Safety Executive and Director of Public Health were also consulted, but no responses were received.

Representations from individual members of the public.

The application was publicised on gov.uk between 05/06/17 and 03/07/17. No responses were received from members of the public.