

## Application SCR evaluation template

Name of activity, address and NGR	EPR/UP3335WA/S002 Harrys Farm Poultry Unit, Twyford Road, Stenson, Derby, Derbyshire, DE73 7GB. SK 32453 29478.
-----------------------------------	--

Document reference of application SCR	EPR/UP3335WA/A001 EPR/UP3335WA/S002
---------------------------------------	--

Date and version of application SCR	6 <sup>th</sup> December 2014 2 <sup>nd</sup> March 2017
-------------------------------------	---

### 1.0 Site details

#### Has the applicant provided the following information as required by the application SCR template?

Site plans showing site layout, drainage, surfacing, receptors, sources of emissions/releases and monitoring points

The Operator provided a Site Condition Report (SCR) at the time the original application was made. Drawings have been provided by the Operator and reviewed and accepted by the Environment Agency at the application stage (2014).

### 2.0 Condition of the land at permit issue

#### Has the applicant provided the following information as required by the application SCR template?

- a) Environmental setting including geology, hydrogeology and surface waters
- b) Pollution history including:
  - pollution incidents that may have affected land
  - historical land-uses and associated contaminants
  - visual/olfactory evidence of existing contamination
  - evidence of damage to existing pollution prevention measures
- c) Evidence of historic contamination (i.e. historical site investigation, assessment, remediation and verification reports (where available))
- d) Has the applicant chosen to collect baseline reference data?

a) The poultry unit lies on fairly level ground, 4.2 miles south west of Derby and 2.1 miles North east of Repton. Predominant land use is arable farming and grazing. Nearest receptor is situated approximately 160 metres to the south. Woodland is located 45 metres to the south and 200 metres to the northeast of the site.

The poultry houses are between 40 and 45 metres above sea level. Tree planting around the unit together with existing mature hedges and woodland helps to minimise the visual intrusion normally associated with poultry units. Site clean water drainage is all directed to soakaways.

According to the British Geological Society, The site is underlain with Triassic Mudstone.

The site is not located within a source protection zone, but is located within a nitrate vulnerable zone. The groundwater vulnerability zones classification for the area is minor aquifer high, the superficial deposits classification is secondary A and the bedrock designation is secondary B. Clean water drainage from the site flows into soakaways. The nearest water course is Twyford Brook, 200m to the South West of the site. Average rainfall in the area is 925mm.

b) No pollution incidents are known to have affected the land at the site. Previous use prior to 2014 – general agricultural use, grass and grazing. All clean site drainage routed to soakaways.

c) No evidence of historic contamination has been noted.

d) No baseline data has been recorded.

<b>3.0 Permitted activities</b>	
<b>Has the applicant provided the following information as required by the application SCR template?</b>	<b>Response (Specify what information is needed from the applicant, if any)</b>
a) Permitted activities b) Non-permitted activities undertaken at the site	
a) Section 6.9 A(1)(a)(i) Rearing of poultry intensively in an installation with more than 40,000 places. The rearing of poultry in a facility with a capacity for 80,000 broiler places. b) Operation of 2 biomass boilers with an aggregated thermal rated input not exceeding 0.429 MWth, for site heating requirements, burning biomass fuel not comprising waste or animal carcasses.	

<b>3.0(a) Environmental Risk Assessment</b>
The H1 environmental risk assessment should identify elements that could impact on land and waters, cross- referenced back to documents and plans provided as part of the wider permit application.
The Environment Agency reviewed the Operator's environmental risk assessment including the potential for environmental impact from emissions to air and water and was accepted as satisfactory. The documents provided by the operator demonstrate an awareness of the environmental risks.
The site has changed from rearing broilers to rearing turkeys but below the threshold. The site had been constructed to the original permit application with all of the pollution prevention measures in place. All wash water and yard washings were directed to dirty water tanks, clean drainage systems were not contaminated. Fuel storage on site for the generator was in a bunded tank. Associated food was stored on the installation in sealed food bins. Mortalities were collected daily and stored in a secure container on site for removal under the National Fallen Stock Scheme. Noise and odour management plans were in place. A pest control contract was in place using a specialist contractor.

<b>3.0(b) Will the pollution prevention measures protect land and groundwater?</b>	
Are the activities likely to result in pollution of land?	
It was concluded that there was little likelihood of pollution arising from the operation of the installation provided that it was operated and maintained correctly. There were no direct discharges of hazardous substances or non-hazardous pollutants to groundwater from the site.	
For dangerous and/or hazardous substances only, are the pollution prevention measures for the relevant activities to a standard that is likely to prevent pollution of land?	Raw materials inventory comprised: Biocides 250ltrs, Pesticides 5ltrs, Veterinary medicines 80,000 doses, Gas 12,000ltrs, and Diesel 1,000ltrs. The fuel oil storage tank for the generator was bunded. The bund met the requirements of the Water Resources (Control of Pollution) (Silage, Slurry and Agricultural Fuel Oil) Regulations 2010 (SSAFO Regulations) and met the requirements outlined in SGN EPR6.09 'How to comply with your environmental permit for intensive farming'. The tank was regularly inspected. Pesticides and veterinary medicines were kept in a store capable of retaining spillage, resistant to fire, dry, frost free and secure.

<b>Application SCR decision summary</b>	<b>Tick relevant decision</b>
Sufficient information has been supplied to describe the condition of the site at permit issue	✓
Information is missing- the following information must be obtained from the applicant.	
Pollution of land and water is unlikely; or	✓
Pollution of land and water is likely	

Historical contamination is present- advise operator that collection of background data may be appropriate	
Date and name of reviewer: L.Mellor (NPS) – 12/03/2017  GWCL – Consultation sent 13/03/2017, No response received 05/04/2017.	

## Operational phase SCR evaluation template

Sections 4.0 to 7.0 may be completed annually in line with normal record checks.

<b>4.0 Changes to the activities</b>	
<b>Have there been any changes to the following during the operation of the site?</b>	<b>Response (Specify what information is needed from the applicant, if any)</b>
a) Activity boundaries b) Permitted activities c) "Dangerous substances" used or produced	
b) The permitted Section 6.9 A(1)(a)(i) activity did not commence. Instead of the permitted 80,000 broiler chicken places, during the construction stage the operator decided to rear male turkeys with 15,000 places, well below the permitting threshold. The site has been constructed to the original permit application, apart from the internal equipment which has been changed to accommodate turkeys. All of the pollution prevention measures are in place from the original permit application. The site still has one DAA for biomass boilers operating at the site. The operation of 2 biomass boilers with an aggregated thermal rated input not exceeding 0.429 MWth, for site heating requirements, burning biomass fuel not comprising waste or animal carcasses.	

<b>5.0 Measures taken to protect land</b>
Has the applicant provided evidence from records collated during the lifetime of the permit, to show that the pollution prevention measures have worked?
Site is operated in compliance with "how to comply" routine maintenance schedules are followed and recorded and with any abnormal operations recorded. All of the pollution prevention measures are in place from the original permit application.

<b>6.0 Pollution incidents that may have impacted on land and their remediation</b>
Has the applicant provided evidence to show that any pollution incidents which have taken place during the life of the permit and which may have impacted on land or water have been investigated and remediated (where necessary)?
None noted.

<b>7.0 Soil gas and water quality monitoring (where relevant)</b>
Where soil gas and/or water quality monitoring has been undertaken, does this demonstrate that there has been no change in the condition of the land? Has any change that has occurred been investigated and remediated?
No monitoring will be undertaken at the installation.

## Surrender SCR Evaluation Template

If you haven't already completed previous sections 4.0 to 7.0, do so now before assessing the surrender.

8.0 Decommissioning and removal of pollution risk
Has the applicant demonstrated that decommissioning works have been undertaken and that all pollution risks associated with the site have been removed? Has any contamination of land that has occurred during these activities been investigated and remediated?
The site has not been decommissioned as it is being operated to rear male turkeys with numbers well below 40,000 permitting threshold (15,000 maximum).No pollution has been noted.

9.0 Reference data and remediation (where relevant)
Has the applicant provided details of any surrender reference data that they have collected and any remediation that they have undertaken? (Reference data for soils must meet the requirements of policy 307_03 Chemical test data on contaminated soils – quantification requirements). If the surrender reference data shows that the condition of the land has changed as a result of the permitted activities, the applicant will need to undertake remediation to return the condition of the land back to that at permit issue. You should not require remediation of historic contamination or contamination arising from non-permitted activities as part of the permit surrender.
No Land or Groundwater data has been collected. No remediation has been undertaken. The site condition is satisfactory and is operating to BAT and has been inspected by Area Officer.

10.0a Statement of site condition
Has the applicant provided a statement, backed up with evidence, confirming that the permitted activities have ceased, decommissioning works are complete and that pollution risk has been removed and that the land and waters at the site are in a satisfactory state?
Harrys Farm obtained a permit for 80,000 broilers, during the construction phase the operator decided to rear turkeys instead of broilers. The two houses would rear a maximum of 7,500 turkeys in each house, giving a maximum placement of 15,000 places, well below permitting threshold. The site has been constructed to the original permit application with all of the pollution prevention measures in place. The only change is the internal equipment which has been changed to accommodate the rearing of turkeys, it should be noted that it would not be possible to rear broilers on the turkey equipment. The turkey poults are placed at approximately 5 weeks of age and are depleted at 19 weeks of age, this will give just over 3 cycles per annum. At the end of each cycle the litter is removed off site for use on owners land, the site is then washed and disinfected ready for the next crop. All wash water and yard washings are directed to dirty water tanks, clean drainage systems are not contaminated. Fuel storage on site for the generator is in a bunded tank. The site has been visited by the Area Officer.

10.0b Statement of site condition
Has the applicant provided a statement, backed up with evidence, confirming that the permitted activities have ceased, decommissioning works are complete and that pollution risk has been removed and that the land and waters at the site are in a satisfactory state?
Refer to Sections 8.0, 9.0 and 10.0a above.

Surrender SCR decision summary	Tick relevant decision

Sufficient information has been supplied to show that pollution risk has been removed and that the site is in a satisfactory state – accept the application to surrender the permit; or	✓
Insufficient information has been supplied to show that pollution risk has been removed or that the site is in a satisfactory state – do not accept the application to surrender the permit. The following information must to be obtained from the applicant before the permit is determined:	
Date and name of reviewers:  Laura Mellor (NPS) - 12/03/2017  Liz Ebbs (NPS) - 05/04/2017	