

# Permitting decisions

## Bespoke permit

---

We have decided to grant the permit for New House Farm operated by Meadowland Poultry Ltd

The permit number is EPR/QP3233YH.

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 summarises the decision making process in the decision checklist to show how all relevant factors have been taken into account.

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

### New Intensive Rearing of Poultry or Pigs BAT Conclusions document

The new Best Available Techniques (BAT) Reference Document (BREF) for the Intensive Rearing of poultry or pigs (IRPP) was published on the 21st February 2017. There is now a separate BAT Conclusions document which will set out the standards that permitted farms will have to meet.

The BAT Conclusions document is as per the following link

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32017D0302&from=EN>

Now the BAT Conclusions are published all new installation farming permits issued after the 21<sup>st</sup> February 2017 must be compliant in full from the first day of operation.

There are some new requirements for permit holders. The conclusions include BAT Associated Emission Levels for ammonia emissions which will apply to the majority of permits, as well as BAT associated levels for nitrogen and phosphorous excretion.

For some types of rearing practices stricter standards will apply to farms and housing permitted after the new BAT Conclusions are published.

#### New BAT conclusions review

There are 33 BAT conclusion measures in total within the BAT conclusion document dated 21<sup>st</sup> February 2017.

We have sent out a request for information requiring the Applicant to confirm that the new installation complies in full with all the BAT conclusion measures.

The Applicant has confirmed their compliance with all BAT conditions for the new installation, in an email 'IF BREF BAT' and dated 12/05/17.

The following is a more specific review of the measures the Applicant has applied to ensure compliance with the above key BAT measures.

<b>BAT measure</b>	<b>Applicant compliance measure</b>
BAT 3 - Nutritional management Nitrogen excretion	<p>The Applicant has confirmed it will demonstrate it achieves levels of Nitrogen excretion below the required BAT-AEL of 0.6 kg N/animal place/year by an estimation using manure analysis for total Nitrogen content.</p> <p>This confirmation was in response to the Request for Further Information, received 12/05/17, which has been referenced in Table S1.2 Operating Techniques of the Permit.</p> <p>Table S3.3 of the Permit concerning process monitoring requires the Operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT Conclusions.</p>
BAT 4 Nutritional management Phosphorous excretion	<p>The Applicant has confirmed it will demonstrate it achieves levels of Phosphorous excretion below the required BAT-AEL of 0.25 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> animal place/year by an estimation using manure analysis for total Phosphorous content.</p> <p>This confirmation was in response to the Request for Further Information, received 12/05/17, which has been referenced in Table S1.2 Operating techniques of the Permit.</p> <p>Table S3.3 of the Permit concerning process monitoring requires the Operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT Conclusions.</p>
BAT 24 Monitoring of emissions and process	Table S3.3 Process monitoring requires the operator to undertake relevant

BAT measure	Applicant compliance measure
parameters - Total nitrogen and phosphorous excretion  BAT 25 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Ammonia emissions	monitoring that complies with these BAT conclusions.
BAT 26 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Odour emissions	The approved OMP includes the following details for Farm Monitoring and Continual Improvement:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The staff will perform daily off site monitoring to check the surrounding area for high levels of odour, the checks will be undertaken by the site manager first thing in the morning before going onto the farm.</li> <li>• The staff will perform daily boundary monitoring to check the surrounding area for high levels of odour, the checks will be undertaken by the site manager first thing in the morning after offsite monitoring is completed.</li> </ul>
BAT 27 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters -Dust emissions	The Applicant has confirmed they will report the dust emissions to the Environment Agency annually by multiplying the dust emissions factor for broilers by the number of birds on site.  This confirmation was in response to the Request for Further Information, received 12/05/17, which has been referenced in Table S1.2 Operating techniques of the Permit.  Table S3.3 Process monitoring requires the operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT conclusions.
BAT 32 Ammonia emissions from poultry houses - Broilers	The BAT-AEL to be complied with is 0.08 kg NH3/animal place/year.  The Applicant will meet this as the emission factor for broilers is 0.034 kg NH3/animal place/year.  The Installation does not include an air abatement treatment facility, hence the standard emission factor complies with the BAT AEL.

**More detailed assessment of specific BAT measures**

Ammonia emission controls – BAT conclusion 32.

The new BAT conclusions include a set of BAT-AEL’s for ammonia emissions to air from animal housing for broilers.

**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 New House Farm (dated 12/05/17) 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.**

## Odour

Under section 3.3 of the guidance an Odour Management Plan (OMP) is required to be approved as part of the permitting process, if as is the case here, sensitive receptors (sensitive receptors in this instance excludes properties associated with the farm) are within 400m of the Installation boundary. It is appropriate to require an OMP when such sensitive receptors have been identified within 400m of the installation to prevent, or where that is not practicable, to minimise the risk of pollution from odour emissions.

The OMP sets out the preventative measures that will be taken on the installation as part of the daily management of odour risk at the site. Preventative measures have been specified for all of the potential odour sources from the installation. A contingency plan has been included in the event that any of the preventative measures fail, which would be indicated through receipt of an odour complaint. A list of primary and secondary remedial measures are included in the contingency plan. For each remedial measure, the number of hours within which each remedial measure would be put in place is specified. It is anticipated that these measures should be sufficient to address the risk of odour from the installation. However, if odour becomes a reoccurring issue then two long term solutions have been put forward which are use of a shorter crop cycle and reducing stocking density during summer months. The exact details of how these two options would be put in place would be discussed and agreed with the Environment Agency's local Area Officer.

We, the Environment Agency, have reviewed and approved the Odour Management Plan (OMP) and consider it complies with the requirements of our H4 Odour management guidance note. We agree with the scope and suitability of key measures, but this should not be taken as confirmation that the details of equipment specification design, operation and maintenance are suitable and sufficient. That remains the responsibility of the operator.

The OMP should be reviewed on a regular basis to ensure that it reflects the most up to date management practices and infrastructure.

## Ammonia emissions

There are two Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) and two Ramsar sites located within 10 kilometres of the installation. The air dispersion modelling provided with the application also includes one Special Protection Area (SPA), which is greater than 10km away. We have included the modelling results for this site in the Decision Document. There are three Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) located within 5 km of the installation. And two Local Wildlife Sites located within 2km.

Where the ammonia screening tool predicts that emissions of ammonia or ammonia deposition (nutrient nitrogen or acid) will be <Y% (see Table 1 below) of the relevant Critical Level or Critical Load, the proposal screens out of the requirement for an ammonia assessment.

Further modelling is required where:

- emissions of ammonia or ammonia deposition (nutrient nitrogen or acid) are in excess of Z% of the relevant Critical Level (ammonia) or Critical Load (nutrient nitrogen or acid) at any particular designated site;
- there is the potential for an in-combination effect with existing farms at a SAC, SPA, Ramsar and/or SSSI if emissions are > Y% of the critical level or critical load;
- the original permit for the installation required an Improvement Condition to reduce ammonia emissions;
- the proposal is within 250m of a nature conservation site.

Table 1 - Screening thresholds

Designation	Y%	Z%
SAC, SPA, Ramsar	4	20
SSSI	20	50
NNR, LNR, LWS, AW	50	100

## Air Dispersion Modelling Report

The Operator undertook detailed Air Dispersion Modelling to assess the potential significance of ammonia emission to air and nitrogen deposition rates, to demonstrate any potential impact. We agree with the outcomes of the report (New House Farm, dated 15th November 2016).

### Ammonia modelling assessment outcome - SAC / SPA / RAMSAR

Table 2 - Ammonia emission - Predicted maximum annual mean ammonia concentration at the discrete receptors

Site	Critical level ammonia $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	Predicted PC $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	PC % of Critical level
West Midland Mosses (SAC)	1*	0.011	1.1
Fenn's, Whixall, Bettisfield, Wem & Cadney Mosses (SAC)	1*	0.016	1.6
Fenn's, Whixall, Bettisfield, Wem & Cadney Mosses (SPA)	1*	0.016	1.6
Midland Meres And Mosses Phases 1 (Ramsar)	1*	0.019	1.9
Midland Meres And Mosses Phases 2 (Ramsar)	1*	0.022	2.2

\* Audited critical level agreed and verified with AQMAU - email 15/05/17

Table 3 - Nitrogen deposition - Predicted maximum annual mean nitrogen deposition rate at the discrete receptors

Site	Critical load kg N/ha/yr [1]	Predicted PC kg N/ha/yr	PC % of critical load
------	------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------

West Midland Mosses (SAC)	3	0.089	3
Fenn's, Whixall, Bettisfield, Wem & Cadney Mosses (SAC)	5	0.122	2.4
Fenn's, Whixall, Bettisfield, Wem & Cadney Mosses (SPA)	5	0.122	2.4
Midland Meres And Mosses Phases 1 (Ramsar)	5	0.145	2.9
Midland Meres And Mosses Phases 2 (Ramsar)	5	0.168	3.4

Note [1] \* Audited critical loads agreed and verified with AQMAU (APIS) - email 15/05/17

Modelling results above (Table 2 and 3) show that the predicted process contribution to ammonia and nutrient nitrogen deposition at receptors are below 4% of the critical level / load, therefore no further assessment required.

### Ammonia modelling assessment outcome - SSSI

Table 4 - Ammonia emissions - Predicted maximum annual mean ammonia concentration at the discrete receptors

Site	Critical level ammonia $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	Predicted PC $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	PC % of Critical level
Grinshill Quarries (SSSI)	1*	0.035	3.5
Brownheath Moss (SSSI)	1*	0.026	2.6
Ruewood Pastures (SSSI)	1*	0.194	19.4

\* Audited critical levels agreed and verified with AQMAU - email 15/05/17

Table 5 - Nitrogen deposition - Predicted maximum annual mean nitrogen deposition rate at the discrete receptors

Site	Critical load kg N/ha/yr [1]	Predicted PC kg N/ha/yr	PC % of critical load
Grinshill Quarries (SSSI)	15*	1.508	10.1
Brownheath Moss (SSSI)	15*	1.395	9.3
Ruewood Pastures (SSSI)	15*	1.344	9

Note [1] \* Audited critical loads agreed and verified with AQMAU (APIS) - email 15/05/17

Modelling results above (Table 4 and 5) show that the predicted process contribution to ammonia and nutrient nitrogen deposition at receptors are below 20% of the critical level / load, therefore no further assessment required.

### Ammonia modelling assessment outcome - LWS

Table 6 - Ammonia emissions - Predicted maximum annual mean ammonia concentration at the discrete receptors

Site	Critical level ammonia $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	Predicted PC $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	PC % of Critical level
Ruewood Pools (LWS)	3*	1.996	66.5
Ruewood Pastures (LWS)	3*	0.194	19.4

\* Audited critical levels agreed and verified with AQMAU - email 15/05/17

Modelling results above (Table 6) show that the predicted process contribution to ammonia at receptors are below 100% of the critical level, therefore no further assessment required.

Table 7 - Nitrogen deposition - Predicted maximum annual mean nitrogen deposition rate at the discrete receptors

Site	Critical load kg N/ha/yr [1]	Predicted PC kg N/ha/yr	PC % of critical load
Ruewood Pools (LWS)	10*	10.370	103.7
Ruewood Pastures (LWS)	15*	8.297	83

Note [1] \* Audited critical loads agreed and verified with AQMAU (APIS)- email 15/05/17

Exceedance shown in table 7 for nitrogen deposition at Ruewood Pools (LWS), triggered the next stage in the modelling assessment (see table 8).

Table 8 - Nitrogen deposition - Annual nitrogen deposition rates at the discrete receptors in the restricted modelling domain

Site	Critical load kg N/ha/yr [1]	Predicted PC kg N/ha/yr	PC % of critical load
Ruewood Pools (LWS)	10*	8.94	89.4

Note [1] \* Audited critical loads agreed and verified with AQMAU (APIS) - email 15/05/17

Modelling results above (Table 8) show that the predicted process contribution to nutrient nitrogen deposition at receptors are below 100% of the critical load, therefore no further assessment required.

### Acid deposition

The consultant took the approach that the PC's screen out for nitrogen deposition (table 3), therefore will also screen out for acid deposition. In most cases nitrogen deposition is the limiting factor and where there is no exceedance of the nitrogen deposition critical load there is no exceedance of the acid deposition critical load.

We checked the PC's in this case and calculated the acid deposition based on the applicant's nitrogen deposition PC's. Based on a CLmaxN of 1.28 keq/ha/yr (APIS value for grasslands) the applicant's prediction would not result in an exceedance.

We checked and are confident that the process would not result in an exceedance of 100% of the CLo for acid deposition at the worst case receptor. The detailed modelling provided by the applicant has been audited by AQMAU and we have confidence that we can agree with the applicant's report conclusions.

### **Biomass boilers**

The applicant is installing 3 biomass boilers with a net rated thermal input of 1.665MWth.

The Environment Agency has assessed the pollution risks and has concluded that air emissions from small biomass boilers are not likely to pose a significant risk to the environment or human health providing certain conditions are met. Therefore a quantitative assessment of air emissions will not be required for poultry sites where:

- the fuel will be derived from virgin timber, miscanthus or straw, and;
- the biomass boiler appliance and installation meets the technical criteria to be eligible for the Renewable Heat Incentive, and;
- the aggregate boiler net rated thermal input is less than or equal to 4 MWth, and no individual boiler has a net thermal input greater than 1 MWth, and;
- the stack height must be a minimum of 5 metres above the ground (where there are buildings within 25 metres the stack height must be greater than 1 metre above the roof level of buildings within 25 metres) and;
- there are no sensitive receptors within 50 metres of the emission point(s).

This is in line with the Environment Agency's document "Air Quality and Modelling Unit C1127a Biomass firing boilers for intensive poultry rearing", an assessment has been undertaken to consider the proposed addition of the biomass boilers.

Our risk assessment has shown that the biomass boilers should meet the requirements of the criteria above, and are, therefore, considered not likely to pose a significant risk to the environment or human health and no further assessment is required. The biomass boilers for this application meet all the above criteria.



## Decision checklist

Aspect considered	Decision
<b>Receipt of application</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 confidentiality.
<b>Consultation</b>	
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"> <li>• Public Health England</li> <li>• The Director of Public Health</li> <li>• The Health and Safety Executive</li> <li>• Environment Protection / Planning - Shropshire Council</li> </ul> <p>The comments and our responses are summarised in the consultation section.</p> <p>Comments were received from a Bryn Melyn Care on 03/10/17 outside of the consultation period. These are summarised in the consultation section and an explanation provided as to how they have been addressed.</p>
<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 our guidance on legal operator for environmental permits.
<b>The facility</b>	
The regulated facility	<p>We considered the extent and nature of the facility at the site in accordance with RGN2 'Understanding the meaning of regulated facility', Appendix 2 of RGN 2 'Defining the scope of the installation', Appendix 1 of RGN 2 'Interpretation of Schedule 1', guidance on waste recovery plans and permits.</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>
<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. The 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

Aspect considered	Decision
	Directive.
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>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>We consider that the application will not affect any sites of nature conservation, landscape and heritage, and/or protected species or habitats identified.</p> <p>An Appendix 11 was completed and sent to Natural England on 05/05/17 'For Information Only'.</p> <p>In accordance with the Environment Agency's Air Quality Technical Advisory Guidance 14: "for combustion plants under 5MW, no habitats assessment is required due to the size of combustion plant". Therefore this proposal is considered acceptable and no further assessment is required.</p>
<b>Environmental risk assessment</b>	
Environmental risk	We have reviewed the operator's assessment of the environmental risk from the facility. The operator's risk assessment is satisfactory.
<b>Operating techniques</b>	
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. The applicant has also confirmed their compliance with all BAT conditions for the new installations.</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 are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the fuel is derived from virgin timber,</li> <li>• the biomass boiler appliance and its installation meets the technical criteria to be eligible for the Renewable Heat Incentive; and</li> <li>• the stacks are 1m or more higher than the apex of the adjacent buildings.</li> <li>• The houses are ventilated by roof fans with emission points higher than 5.5 metres above ground level with an efflux speed greater than 7 metres per second, with side inlets, and gable end fans. The houses are well insulated and equipped with nipple and cup drinking systems.</li> <li>• Drainage from animal housing and water from cleaning out is collected in underground storage tanks. Clean drainage systems are not contaminated;</li> <li>• Housing design and management is in accordance with SGN EPR6.09 'How to comply with your environmental permit for intensive farming';</li> </ul> <p>The proposed techniques for priorities for control are in line with the benchmark levels contained in the SGN EPR6.09 'How to comply with your environmental permit for intensive farming (version 2)' and we consider them to represent appropriate techniques for the facility. The permit conditions ensure compliance</p>

Aspect considered	Decision
	with relevant BREFs and BAT Conclusions.
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. See Key Issues.</p>
Noise management	<p>We have reviewed the noise management plan in accordance with our guidance on noise assessment and control. We consider that the noise management plan is satisfactory.</p>
<b>Permit conditions</b>	
Use of conditions other than those from the template	<p>Based on the information in the application, we consider that we do not need to impose conditions other than those in our permit template.</p>
Raw materials	<p>We have specified limits and controls on the use of raw materials and fuels. We have specified that only virgin timber (including wood chips and pellets), straw, miscanthus or a combination of these, are acceptable. These materials are never to be mixed with or replaced by, waste.</p>
Emission limits	<p>ELVs and/or equivalent parameters or technical measures based on BAT have been set for the following substances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• kg N excreted/animal place/year</li> <li>• kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> excreted/animal place/year</li> <li>• Kg NH<sub>3</sub>/animal place/year</li> </ul> <p>See Key Issues.</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 meet the requirements of BAT Conclusions 24, 25 and 27 of the IRPP BAT Conclusions.</p> <p>We made these decisions in accordance with the IRPP BAT Conclusions.</p> <p>See Key Issues.</p>
Reporting	<p>We have specified reporting in the permit. This is in line with BAT Conclusions 24, 25 and 27 of the IRPP BAT Conclusions.</p> <p>We made these decisions in accordance with the IRPP BAT Conclusions.</p> <p>See Key Issues.</p>
<b>Operator competence</b>	
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 been checked to ensure that all relevant convictions have been declared. No relevant convictions were found. The operator satisfies the criteria in our guidance on operator competence.</p>

Aspect considered	Decision
Financial competence	There is no known reason to consider that the operator will not be financially able to comply with the permit conditions.
<b>Growth Duty</b>	
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 vary 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 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, 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

<b>Response received from</b>
Bryn Melyn Care 02/10/17
<b>Brief summary of issues raised</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Noise during the construction and operation of the poultry sheds.</li><li>2. Concerns regarding odour from the installation. Suggested that winds blow in a southerly direction. Meteorological data provided from the airfield.</li><li>3. Concerns regarding potential harmful impacts on a brook that is adjacent to the site. Specifically mention loss of indigenous plants adjacent to the watercourse.</li><li>4. Concerns regarding increased traffic along the roads adjacent to the site and that this could lead to detrimental effects on hedgerows and local wildlife.</li></ol>
<b>Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered</b>
<p>These comments were provided based on the previous location of the poultry sheds. They are now located 160 metres away, which should help towards addressing issues raised around odour and noise.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The Noise Management Plan has been reviewed and updated. It is considered that appropriate measures are in place to minimise the risk of noise from the installation.</li><li>2. Having reviewed the metrological data provided, the predominant wind direction is south westerly. This is confirmed in the meteorological data used in the ammonia modelling report provided with the application. Therefore, any potential odours should be taken away from the receptor for the majority of the time. The gable end fans from the poultry sheds are not facing the receptor. We have also reviewed the Odour Management Plan (OMP). It is considered that appropriate measures are in place to minimise the risk of odour arising from the installation. Contingency measures have also been included in the OMP should an odour issue arise. There are also long term measures included that could be put in place should the contingency measures fail.</li><li>3. The site has been moved so that it is no longer near the brook. All water generated during the cleaning out of the sheds is tankered off the site. The only water that will be entering the watercourse is surface water from roofs and the yards; these surfaces are required by the permit to be kept clean. This water is thus not expected to impact the brook.</li><li>4. The permit only covers issues arising within the site boundary. Surrounding roads are not subject to the requirements of the permit.</li></ol>

The following organisations were consulted, however no responses were received:

- Environmental Protection / Planning - Shropshire Council
- The Health and Safety Executive
- The Director of Public Health
- Public Health England

This proposal was also publicised on the Environment Agency's website between 23/05/17 and 21/06/17, but no representations were received during this period.