

Permitting decisions

Bespoke permit

We have decided to grant the permit for Finmere Mill operated by Noble Foods Co.

The permit number is EA/EPR/FP3237RP/A001.

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.

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

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

Key issues of the decision

Risk to Surface Water, Soil and Groundwater

A number of materials are stored at the site that have the potential to cause pollution if allowed to escape into the aquatic environment. These include solid and liquid raw materials and fuels. The site comprises of yard areas and a process building surrounded by landscaped areas. The yard and process building are situated on impermeable surfaces which will prevent emissions of any spillages to groundwater. However, any spillages could cause pollution of soil and groundwater if allowed to come into contact with the landscaped areas. Table S1.1 Activities in the permit requires all potentially polluting liquids and solids to only be handled on an impermeable surface. Foul drainage from the site amenities drains to a sewage treatment plant before being discharged under an existing environmental permit, EPR/RB3235AF.

Material storage and containment

Gas Oil which is the backup fuel for the site boiler is stored on site in a 22,000 litre tank. The tank is stored within a bund, and is raised from the ground as shown by the photos in the site condition report. The bund capacity is over 110% of the capacity stored. We visited the site as part of the determination and found that the bund for this tank is penetrated by pipework. This is not in line with our guidance on bunding.

We expect bunds to comply with the following:

- be waterproof
- be resistant to any materials stored in them
- have no outlets (e.g. drains or taps)
- drain to a blind (completely enclosed) collection point
- have self-contained pipework that is separate from the container pipework

Bunds must also have a capacity larger than both of the following:

- 110% of the largest tank the bund is protecting
- 25% of the combined volume of all the tanks the bund is protecting

It is not appropriate for pipework to pass through bund walls. We assess if bunds have been designed appropriately by referring to CIRIA 736 'Containment systems for the prevention of pollution: Secondary, tertiary and other measures for industrial and commercial premises'. During the determination we asked the Operator to review their containment against guidance document CIRIA 736 'Containment systems for the prevention of pollution: Secondary, tertiary and other measures for industrial and commercial premises'. They have indicated that the containment on site does not meet this guidance as it pre-dates the guidance. We have included Improvement Condition 1 (IC1) which requires the Operator to review their containment and implement improvements to a timescale agreed with us.

There are two other tanks on site that store diesel. One stores 34,000 litres of white diesel and a smaller 2,500 litre tank also storing white diesel. These tanks are stored within integrated bunds.

During a site visit we identified a diesel pump in the south east corner of the site which is not banded and exhibited signs of diesel spillage onto the surrounding site surface. This is not acceptable so we have included an Improvement Condition (IC2) to replace this pump and associated infrastructure and clean up any spillages.

There are two bulk storage tanks for liquid raw materials. Soya Oil is stored within a 35m³ tank. Vegetable Oil is stored within a 49m³ tank. These are cylindrical tanks within a bund. The bund capacity for each tank exceeds 110% of the tank capacity. These tanks have continuous level probes and unloading of liquid bulk materials are supervised to minimise the risk of spills.

As with the gas oil tank, when we visited the site we found that there was pipework penetrating the bund wall. This is not appropriate, and we have included (IC1) to ensure the containment on site is reviewed and improvements are implemented to a timetable agreed by the Environment Agency.

The raw liquid materials are loaded external to the building via connection points on the outside of the bunds, with a drip tray in place but this isn't covered. The Operator has proposed to install covered drip trays at all external filling connections. We have included IC3 requesting the Operator to improve their infrastructure around unloading so that all spilt materials can be recovered.

There is also bulk storage of an amino acid animal feed supplement (Methionine) within a 12m³ capacity tank which is stored within a bund. The bund capacity is over 110% of the tank capacity. This substance is water soluble so could bypass the interceptor if there was a spill, however the Operator is proposing to install an isolation valve on the drainage system which could isolate the drainage system in the event of a spill (see section on accidents below).

There are two intake tipping booths on site to receive solid raw materials such as grain products. These materials are transferred by an enclosed conveyor to bulk storage bins inside the building. The bulk storage bins have high level alarms to prevent overfilling. The product storage bins also have process controls in place to prevent overfilling.

Minerals such as limestone are delivered to bulk storage bins inside the main building by being blown through the delivery vehicle pneumatic system. Medicine supplements for feed are stored within the processing building in a locked container. Packed solid raw materials such as nutrient additives are delivered to the raw materials warehouse.

We consider that the current storage and drainage arrangements for liquid materials do not meet Best Available Technique (BAT) standards. We have included Improvement Conditions to improve the on-site containment and drainage systems. We are satisfied that the solid raw material storage and handling is appropriate and will minimise the risk to the environment.

Other materials stored on site

A fuel additive is stored within a 2,500 litre storage system with an integrated bund. The storage system has a telemetric gauging system to control levels to prevent overfilling and detect leaks.

Boiler water treatment chemicals and other liquid chemicals such as lubricants and cleaning chemicals are also used on site. These are stored within their primary packaging on the impermeable surface in the processing building.

We consider that the fuel and chemical storage arrangements are unlikely to pose a risk to surface water, land or groundwater.

Accidents

Raw materials are transported around the site using conveyors and pipework to reduce the risk of accidents associated with manual handling. Any spillages that do occur will be cleared up using strategically placed spill kits. Portable bunds are stored on site to contain liquid spillages. All offloading of materials will be supervised to minimise the risk of accidents.

The bulk liquid storage tanks are fitted with high level alarms to prevent overfilling. These are located on flat areas of ground adjacent to grassed areas, so in the event of a spill it is possible for liquids to reach the landscaped areas. In the event of a fire, water used to fight the fire could potentially leave the mill building via the north and south doors and access grassed areas. As part of IC4 we have requested the Operator identifies improvements to their drainage infrastructure to prevent spills and firewater entering landscaped areas.

There are areas on site which do not drain via the interceptor. Under the current arrangements any spills that occurred in these areas could potentially escape the site if not contained by spill kits. A new interceptor is proposed which will process drainage from the southern side of the site.

The site interceptors are designed to prevent oil escape from the site. However, this will not prevent all potentially polluting materials used on site, such as the water soluble amino acid or any physical contaminants. We have included wording in IC4 which requires the Operator to look at improving their drainage infrastructure to prevent suspended solids being discharged off site.

If detergents enter the interceptor they will reduce its working efficiency. Detergents will be used in the site vehicle wash. We have previously advised the Operator that they will need to amend this system to prevent detergents from the vehicle wash entering the interceptor. The Operator has detailed that they propose to install a vehicle wash recycler so detergents would not be discharged to any associated interceptor. This would link with the drainage system and would involve drainage from the area being diverted to a storage sump during washing, and to the interceptor the rest of the time. The washings will be pumped back to the water recycling unit. We have included Improvement Condition 5 (IC5) which requires the operator to look at options for preventing detergents entering the drainage system. The Operator is to install these measures within an agreed timescale. We have included the vehicle washing as a Directly Associated Activity in the permit.

There is no mechanism on site for isolating the drainage system and preventing pollutants escaping off site. There is a risk pollutants could escape off site in the event of a fire or large spillage via the surface water drainage system, especially considering the risk of the interceptor being bypassed as discussed above. We have previously advised the operator to fit an isolation valve to isolate the site surface water drainage system in the event of a significant spill or need to contain firewater on site. IC4 requires the Operator to consider improvements to their drainage system including a way to isolate the drainage system, and agree a timescale for implementation with us.

Once the drainage system can be isolated and measures are installed to protect landscaped areas we consider that the methods used on site to prevent and manage accidents are appropriate

Emission to surface water

There is an existing environmental permit in place at the site which allows the Operator to discharge to surface water. The permit reference number is EPR/RB3235AF. The permit limits the discharge to effluent of a domestic nature only from offices and showers on site following treatment in a sewage treatment plant.

As discussed above, the yard and process building drains to two interceptors before being discharged to surface water via a drainage ditch. This has been added to the permit as emission point S1.

The Best Available Techniques guidance document titled 'Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control Reference Document on Best Available Techniques in the Food, Drink and Milk Industries' dated August 2006 indicates that effluent should be treated before discharge to surface water, either on site or off site.

As part of the application the Operator has outlined that in addition to the discharge from the sewage treatment plant the following are discharged to surface water as part of the operation of the installation:

- Boiler blow down
- Compressor condensate (following oil/water separation)
- Liquids from the onsite vehicle wash

Although the discharge of these liquids have previously been carried out on site for some time, we consider that they could potentially have a negative impact on receiving waters and therefore the risk of discharging to surface water needs to be assessed in more detail. We have previously identified that the discharge of liquids from the vehicle wash via the interceptor is unsuitable as discussed above and have included an improvement condition in the permit to address this. We have included Improvement Condition 6 (IC6) in the permit to require the operator list the options for disposal, justifying the proposed route, and undertake a quantitative risk assessment of the proposed route. It also requires them to agree a timetable for implementation with us if improvement works are identified.

We consider that the above Improvement Condition will ensure that only appropriate emissions are discharged to surface water.

Consolidation

Where an Installation has an existing environmental permit to discharge to surface water we would normally seek to consolidate this discharge within the Installation permit. We have not consolidated the permit reference number EPR/RB3235AF into the Installation permit because this permit only relates to the sewage from the site, not the Installation process. This permit is also held by a different legal entity, although this forms part of the company holding the Installation permit.

Conclusion

We are satisfied that the current systems in place on site and the improvement conditions included in the permit will minimise pollution risk from the site to soil, surface water and groundwater.

Emissions to Air

There are nine point source emissions to air at the installation. Emission point A2 is linked to the process and fitted with abatement to minimise the release of particulates. Emission point A3 is the exhaust from the boiler. Emission points A4-A10 are vents on the tanks used for the storage of raw materials and fuels. We have listed emission points A4-A10 in the permit but we have not set emission limit values for these points as we don't consider emissions from storage of these materials are likely to have an impact on local air quality.

A key environmental risk from the installation is the potential to create particulate emissions. Particulate emissions are controlled using local exhaust ventilation, cyclones and bag filters at different stages throughout the process.

The hoppers receiving raw materials and conveying system to bulk storage are both fitted with local exhaust ventilation (LEV) systems which feed to a bag filter to abate particulate emissions. Particulates collected are recycled into the feed processing as a raw material to minimise waste. Reverse jet bag filters are attached to a LEV system associated with the mineral storage bins. If raw materials which are delivered to the installation in bags are added to the process this is done in an area which has a LEV system. Bag filters are also in place on product storage bins and the outloading bay. These bag filters vent within the process building. The operator minimises the release of fugitive particulate emissions keeping doors and windows closed where possible during normal operations. Spills are also cleaned up immediately, using dry cleaning methods such as vacuuming where possible to maximise product recovery. Loading of finished product takes place within the main building and all vehicles are covered to minimise particulate release.

Coolers

The cooling system involves passing ambient air over the hot pellets to cool them. This air is then ducted into a cyclone which removes particulates before being vented to atmosphere as emission point A2. Dust recovered from the cyclone is added back into to the process.

Grinders

One of the components of the process which has the potential to create dust is the grinder, which reduces the particle size of the raw materials. The air from the grinder is vented to a reverse jet bag filter to control particulate emissions. Originally the application indicated that this vented to atmosphere, and it was described as emission point A1. However the Operator has clarified in a Schedule 5 response that the grinder does not vent to atmosphere, so we have not included this as an emission point to air in the permit. The bag filter is fitted with a pressure gauge which is checked daily to ensure the bag filter is operating effectively.

Abatement methods

We consider that the use of a bag filter to abate the emissions from the grinder to represent BAT. We consider the use of a cyclone to abate the emissions from the cooler also represents BAT when combined with monitoring to warn if the cyclone malfunctions. DEFRA guidance note 6/26(13) indicates that cyclones should be fitted with monitors that provide alarms on malfunction and are interlocked to shut down the process when the alarm activates. The Operator has indicated that this is not currently in place. We have included Improvement Condition 7 which requires the Operator to propose improvements to the cyclone monitoring and install these improvements to a timetable agreed with us.

Screening

The Operator has undertaken a screening of the particulate matter emitted to air from the cooler stack using our H1 assessment tool to assess if the emissions can be screened out as insignificant. The H1 screening was carried out using results from previous emissions monitoring and assessed emissions against Environmental Quality Standards (EQS). PM₁₀ is Particulate Matter with a diameter of less than 10µm. The assessment concluded that short term emissions could not be considered insignificant using our H1 tool. However, where an emission cannot be screened out as insignificant, it does not necessarily mean it will be significant. In these circumstances, we may require the Operator to carry out further assessment using detailed air dispersion modelling of the emissions.

We have taken into consideration that our H1 assessment tool is precautionary in nature and as the Installation has already been operating for at least 40 years emissions from the Installation are reflected in the background. The screening assumed all particulates were comprised of PM₁₀, however the Operator has provided the results of an industry survey which indicates that PM₁₀ makes up approximately 20% of total particulate emissions. This indicates that the screening may over-estimate the amount of PM₁₀ released.

We have developed additional screening criteria which indicates when dispersion modelling is necessary for feed mills entering regulation as a result of the Industrial Emissions Directive. This indicates that dispersion modelling is not necessary for sites with less than two coolers, where there are no sensitive receptors within 300m and where emissions are via a capped stack. At this site the nearest sensitive receptor is approximately 275m away from the single cooler stack. The screening position assumes a higher background than at this site, 20 µg/m³ rather than 14.6 µg/m³. As the site was close to the screening criteria we undertook additional screening using our AQMAU screening tool, Version 5.2. This indicated that emissions from the Installation are unlikely to cause an exceedance of the long or short term EQS. On this basis we have not requested detailed air dispersion monitoring and consider emissions from the Installation unlikely to have a significant negative effect on local air quality.

Emission Limits and Monitoring

The cyclone at emission point A2 was fitted in 2015, as such we consider that it should be able to achieve the lower emission limit value (ELV) for particulates of 20mg/m³ in line with the DEFRA guidance note 6/26(13). This reflects that new plant should be capable of better performance than older existing plant.

We are setting emission limit values which are more stringent than those in the current permit. We therefore consider that this represents an environmental improvement when compared to the current Local Authority regulated permit.

Boiler

The boiler on site has a thermal input of 1.6MW. The boiler was previously run on gas oil but now will be fuelled by liquid petroleum gas (LPG) but with the option to run on gas oil if the LPG supply is disrupted. We haven't requested an assessment of air emissions from this emission point as we consider it unlikely that boilers of this size will have a negative impact on air quality. This mirrors the approach in our guidance 'AQTAG014: Guidance on identifying 'relevance' for assessment under the Habitats Regulations for installations with combustion processes'. In the event of boiler malfunction a temporary standby boiler would be brought on site which would likely run on gas oil.

Conclusion

Whilst the results of the H1 assessment concluded that the particulate emissions to air could not be deemed as insignificant, we have undertaken further screening steps to identify if dispersion modelling is required. We have taken this approach in this instance as the installation is already in operation and the requirement for a permit is a result of the implementation of Industrial Emissions Directive (IED). We can conclude that emissions of particulates from the process would not result in significant impacts at nearby receptor locations with respect to the long term and short term air quality objectives for PM₁₀. As such, we are satisfied that no further assessment needs to be undertaken by the applicant. We have included IC7 to ensure the Operator installs monitoring and alarms on the cyclone which we consider BAT.

Site Condition Report

A Site Condition Report (SCR) was submitted with the application. The SCR describes the site setting as an agricultural area with adjacent Ancient Woodland. The site is located south of the village of Tingewick near Buckingham. The nearest residential receptor is approximately 225m to the North West of the site.

The underlying geology comprises of superficial glacial till over limestone bedrock in the north of the site and sandstone, siltstone and mudstone in the southern third of the site. The superficial deposits are designated unproductive for groundwater but the bedrock formations are secondary aquifers. The SCR indicates that the superficial deposits are of low permeability and extend for 9m, which would offer a measure of protection to prevent liquid pollutants entering groundwater.

The site was historically used as an airfield, an ammunitions store and subsequently as a depot. A fuel store borders the site. Due to the age of the buildings on site, it is possible asbestos is present. Historical contaminants of concern include petroleum hydrocarbons, heavy metals, volatile organic compounds and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons.

As discussed in the Key Issues section above, the site stores and uses a number of materials that could pose a risk to groundwater and soil. The risk to groundwater and soil from these materials have been addressed above. These materials include diesel, which may previously have been present on site when it was used as an airfield and fuel distribution centre. We have advised in an email dated 19 July 2016 that baseline samples are taken due to the historic use of the site as an airfield. As baseline samples have not been provided we will need to assume that the existing level of contamination at the site is zero and the operator will be responsible for any necessary remediation when the site is surrendered. The Operator has indicated in an email on 30 November 2017 that they are considering taking baseline sample for this site.

We are satisfied that the site condition report provides a representative description of the site baseline condition.

Odour

The site uses raw materials that have the potential to be odorous. The main odour control measures employed are storing and transferring raw materials in enclosed systems or their original packaging and ensuring good house-keeping practices are adhered to. The application states that the site has never had an odour complaint.

The application does not include an odour management plan, we have taken the decision not to request one as part of the application as we consider the odour risk to be low. We have taken into consideration that the site has been operating without any odour issues and the site activities and raw materials used are low risk. The site has a Nuisance Management Plan in place which includes responses to odour issues. These include periodic walkover surveys of the site to monitor odour and a complaints response procedure which involves investigating odour sources and ceasing activities that might be causing odour issues.

We have also included our standard odour condition which allows us to request an odour management plan should odour issues arise.

Based upon the information in the application, we are satisfied that the appropriate measures will be in place to prevent or where that is not practicable to minimise pollution from odour. We are satisfied that the standard conditions, relating to odour pollution prevention and control, in the permit are sufficient and no additional measures are necessary at this time.

Noise

The majority of plant used on site is located within the production building. The building will likely provide a measure of attenuation from noise. The risk assessment identifies that the noisiest activities will be undertaken inside the process building or within acoustic enclosures. The application identifies that the site grinder is the noisiest item of plant used. However, the site set up is designed to provide acoustic attenuation to minimise the impact on site staff, which will also reduce the potential for noise to be heard off site. The grinder is located approximately 70m from the nearest ecological receptor. There is external plant which has the potential to be noisy. This includes the bulk grain intake, product despatch bay, pumps and ventilation fans. The operator indicates that these are not audible at the site boundary. The site typically operates 18 hours per day but can operate 24 hours per day.

Another potential source of noise is vehicle movements. The application indicates that the impact of vehicle movements on site is minimised by scheduling deliveries and product despatch for daylight hours where possible. Drivers are also trained to ensure speeds are reduced and excessive revving is avoided. The application states that the site has never had a noise complaint.

The operator has not provided a noise management plan and we have taken the decision not to request one as part of the application as we consider the noise risk to be low from this site. We have taken into account the site has already been operating without any noise issues and the distance to the nearest sensitive receptors. However, the site uses a Nuisance Management Plan which includes responses and consideration of noise issues. The Plan states that a weekly inspection of all equipment is undertaken and if any maintenance is considered to be needed repairs will be made by a qualified engineer as soon as possible. The application also details how the operator will undertake investigation of any noise complaints

and ensure remedial action is carried out promptly. A preventative maintenance programme is in place which will minimise the risk of noise from equipment malfunction.

We have also included our standard noise condition which allows us to request a noise management plan if noise issues arise.

Based upon the information in the application, we are satisfied that the appropriate measures will be in place to prevent or where that is not practicable to minimise pollution from noise. We are satisfied that the standard conditions, relating to noise pollution prevention and control, in the permit are sufficient and no additional measures are necessary at this time.

Best Available Techniques (BAT) Assessment

We have assessed if the operator is using Best Available Techniques by referring to the following guidance:

- Process Guidance Note 6/26(13) Statutory guidance for animal feed compounding December 2013
- How to comply with your environmental permit, Additional guidance for: The Food and Drink Sector (EPR 6.10)
- 'Control and monitor emissions for your environmental permit' webpage

As detailed in the preceding Key Issues sections, we consider the operator is using BAT with the exception of the cyclone monitoring system and the site drainage and containment arrangements discussed above. We have included IC7 to ensure appropriate monitoring and interlock infrastructure is installed in line with BAT.

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.
Consultation	
Consultation	<p>The consultation requirements were identified in accordance with the Environmental Permitting Regulations and our public participation statement.</p> <p>The application was publicised on the GOV.UK website.</p> <p>We consulted the following organisations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local authority environmental protection department • Health and Safety Executive • Director of Public Health and Public Health England <p>The comments and our responses are summarised in the consultation section.</p>
Operator	
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 our guidance on legal operator for environmental permits.
The facility	
The regulated facility	<p>We considered the extent and nature of the facility at the site in accordance with Regulatory Guidance Note (RGN) 2 'Understanding the meaning of regulated facility'</p> <p>The extent of the facility is defined in the site plan and in the permit. The activities are defined in table S1.1 of the permit.</p>
The site	
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. The plan is included in the permit.
Site condition report	<p>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.</p> <p>As discussed in the Key Issues section, we have previously advised the</p>

Aspect considered	Decision
	<p>Operator by email on 19 July 2016 that they should consider taking baseline samples of soil and groundwater. As these have not been provided we will need to assume the baseline level of contamination is zero and the operator will be responsible for any necessary remediation when the site is surrendered. The Operator has indicated in an email on 30 November 2017 that they are considering taking baseline sample for this site.</p>
<p>Biodiversity, heritage, landscape and nature conservation</p>	<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>The site is within the relevant screening distance of the following sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) • Five Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) • 15 Ancient Woodlands <p>We have assessed the application and its potential to affect all known sites of nature conservation, landscape and heritage and/or protected species or habitats identified in the nature conservation screening report as part of the permitting process.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to woodland areas which have the potential to be affected by emissions from the Installation, principally noise and particulate emissions.</p> <p>The key control mechanisms employed include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preventing dust escaping the treatment building as discussed in the Emissions to Air Key Issues section. This involves using LEV and abatement mechanisms such as bag filters and cyclones. The particulate emission point to air is abated through a cyclone. • Employing preventative maintenance on site equipment to control noise emissions. • We have set emission limit values for all emission points to air to control particulate release. These are lower than those in the current local authority permit so we consider this represents an environmental improvement. <p>We consider that these are appropriate mitigation methods for this site and will control emissions to prevent an impact on the woodland habitats.</p> <p>The combustion process at the installation is not considered 'relevant' for assessment under the Agency's procedures which cover The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 2017 (Habitats Regulations). This was determined by referring to the Agency's guidance 'AQTAG014: Guidance on identifying 'relevance' for assessment under the Habitats Regulations for installations with combustion processes'. Thus no detailed assessment of the effect of the releases from the installation's combustion processes on Habitats Regulations sites is required. Although this guidance is aimed at sites covered by the Habitats Regulations, we consider this is a reasonable approach to adopt for other sites designated under conservation legislation such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest.</p> <p>We consider that the application will not affect any sites of nature conservation, landscape and heritage, and/or protected species or habitats identified.</p>

Aspect considered	Decision
	<p>We have not consulted Natural England on the application. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance. An appendix 4 has been completed which concludes that the installation is not likely to damage the SSSI. This has been saved for audit.</p>
Environmental risk assessment	
<p>Environmental risk</p>	<p>We have reviewed the operator's assessment of the environmental risk from the facility.</p> <p>The operator's risk assessment is satisfactory, with the exception of particulate emissions.</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 with the exception of particulate matter. See Key Issues for details.</p>
Operating techniques	
<p>General operating techniques</p>	<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. See Key Issues for more details.</p> <p>The operating techniques that the applicant must use are specified in table S1.2 in the environmental permit.</p>
<p>Operating techniques for emissions that do not screen out as insignificant</p>	<p>Emissions of particulate matter cannot be screened out as insignificant. We have assessed whether the proposed techniques are BAT.</p> <p>The proposed techniques/ emission levels for emissions that do not screen out as insignificant are in line with the techniques and benchmark levels contained in the technical guidance and we consider them to represent appropriate techniques for the facility. The permit conditions ensure compliance with relevant BAT Reference documents (BREFS).</p> <p>We consider the operator is using BAT to manage particulate emissions with the exception of the cyclone monitoring system discussed in the Key Issues. We have included Improvement Condition 7 to ensure appropriate monitoring and interlock infrastructure is installed in line with BAT.</p> <p>We consider the site containment and drainage infrastructure does not represent BAT so we have included Improvement Conditions to ensure the infrastructure is improved. See Key Issues for more details.</p> <p>As discussed in the key issues, we have included Improvement Condition 6 for the Operator to analyse their discharges to surface water and assess their environmental impact, proposing alternatives if necessary.</p>
Permit conditions	
<p>Improvement programme</p>	<p>Based on the information on the application, we consider that we need to impose an improvement programme.</p> <p>We have imposed an improvement programme to ensure that the Operator has the correct infrastructure and processes in place to manage the risk to air, soil, surface water and groundwater. See Key Issues section for more</p>

Aspect considered	Decision
	details.
Emission limits	<p>Emission Limit Values (ELVs) and equivalent parameters or technical measures based on BAT have been set for the following substances: particulate matter.</p> <p>See Key Issues section on Emissions to Air for more details.</p>
Monitoring	<p>We have decided that monitoring should be carried out for the parameters listed in the permit, using the methods detailed and to the frequencies specified.</p> <p>These monitoring requirements have been imposed in order to ensure particulate emissions are controlled.</p> <p>We made these decisions in accordance with 'Process Guidance Note 6/26(13) Statutory guidance for animal feed compounding' December 2013.</p> <p>Based on the information in the application we are satisfied that the operator's techniques, personnel and equipment have either MCERTS certification or MCERTS accreditation as appropriate.</p>
Reporting	<p>We have specified reporting in the permit.</p> <p>The specified reporting will allow us to monitor environmental compliance at the site.</p> <p>We made these decisions in accordance with 'Process Guidance Note 6/26(13) Statutory guidance for animal feed compounding' December 2013.</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> <p>The decision was taken in accordance with the guidance on operator competence and how to develop a management system for environmental permits.</p>
Relevant convictions	<p>The Case Management System has been checked to ensure that all relevant convictions have been declared.</p> <p>No relevant convictions were found. The operator satisfies the criteria in our guidance on operator competence.</p>
Financial competence	<p>There is no known reason to consider that the operator will not be financially able to comply with the permit conditions.</p>
Growth Duty	
Section 108 Deregulation Act 2015 – Growth duty	<p>We have considered our duty to have regard to the desirability of promoting economic growth set out in section 108(1) of the Deregulation Act 2015 and the guidance issued under section 110 of that Act in deciding whether to grant this permit.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.3 of the guidance says:</p> <p>"The primary role of regulators, in delivering regulation, is to achieve the</p>

Aspect considered	Decision
	<p>regulatory outcomes for which they are responsible. For a number of regulators, these regulatory outcomes include an explicit reference to development or growth. The growth duty establishes economic growth as a factor that all specified regulators should have regard to, alongside the delivery of the protections set out in the relevant legislation.”</p> <p>We have addressed the legislative requirements and environmental standards to be set for this operation in the body of the decision document above. The guidance is clear at paragraph 1.5 that the growth duty does not legitimise non-compliance and its purpose is not to achieve or pursue economic growth at the expense of necessary protections.</p> <p>We consider the requirements and standards we have set in this permit are reasonable and necessary to avoid a risk of an unacceptable level of pollution. This also promotes growth amongst legitimate operators because the standards applied to the operator are consistent across businesses in this sector and have been set to achieve the required legislative standards.</p>

Consultation

The following summarises the responses to consultation with other organisations and 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
Public Health England
Brief summary of issues raised
<p>They advise that the Environment Agency ensures Best Available Techniques (BAT) to control emissions to air. They consider that the activities have the potential to produce dust or odour issues, but they are reassured by the proposals to store dusty materials in enclosed or covered areas and odorous materials in sealed containers. They recommend that the Environment Agency ensures the proposed control measures are sufficient to keep fugitive air emissions to a minimum.</p> <p>They consider that compliance with the legislation and good management should ensure the site presents a low risk to local human receptors. Based on the application, they consider the development does not present any obvious cause for concern.</p>
Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered
<p>As discussed in the Key Issues, we have assessed the proposed operating techniques and consider these to represent BAT, with the exception of the cyclone monitoring system. We have included an Improvement Condition which requires the Operator to improve their monitoring infrastructure so that this is in line with BAT. We have also included our standard conditions which require the Operator to manage their odour emissions and allow us to request an odour management plan if necessary.</p>