

## Application SCR evaluation template

Name of activity, address and NGR	Faccenda Foods Limited  Lyneham Farm Poultry Unit Hillmarton Caine Wiltshire SN11 9JB  Centre NGR: SU 02004 77411
-----------------------------------	---

Document reference of application SCR	Doc A1 - Site Condition Report Template V2.0 04/08/2008.
---------------------------------------	---

Date and version of application SCR	Doc A1 - Site Condition Report Template V2.0 04/08/2008 (This has been updated and submitted with application S005 along with supporting documents dated October 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

See original SCR dated 04/08/2008.  
Also see 'Doc A5' submitted with application S005.

### 2.0 Condition of the land at permit issue

To be completed by GWCL officers  
(Receptor)

**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?

See 'Doc A1 - Site Condition Report Template V2.0 04/08/2008'. Also see document 'Application Site Report – Site Condition Report (prepared 30.06.06)' referenced as Doc A3 submitted with application S005.

### 3.0 Permitted activities

(Source)

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

**Response  
(Specify what information is needed from the applicant, if any)**

- a) Permitted activities
- b) Non-permitted activities undertaken at the site

See 'Doc A1 - Site Condition Report Template V2.0 04/08/2008'. Also see permit.

**3.0(a) Environmental Risk Assessment**

(Source)

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.

See 'Doc A1 ' / Site Condition Report Template V2.0 04/08/2008'

Also see doc "Site Operations and pollution prevention measures' submitted with application S005.

**3.0(b) Will the pollution prevention measures protect land and groundwater?**

(Conceptual model)

Are the activities likely to result in pollution of land?

No, see above.

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?

Yes, see 3.0(a)

<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	See SCR
Information is missing- the following information must be obtained from the applicant. (Advise the permitting team on what additional information is needed)	
Pollution of land and water is unlikely; or	
Pollution of land and water is likely (Advise the permitting team on what additional controls/checks may be necessary)	
Historical contamination is present- advise operator that collection of background data may be appropriate	
Date and name of reviewer:	

## 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> (Source)	
<b>Have there been any changes to the following during the operation of the site?</b>	<b>Response</b> (Specify what information is needed from the applicant, if any)
a) Activity boundaries b) Permitted activities c) "Dangerous substances" used or produced	
Permitted activities - V003 permitted the increase in broiler places from 157,500 to 197,499.	
There have been no changes to the activity boundaries or 'Dangerous substances' used or produced.	

<b>5.0 Measures taken to protect land</b> To be completed by EM/PPC officers (Pathway)
<p>Has the applicant provided evidence from records collated during the lifetime of the permit, to show that the pollution prevention measures have worked?</p>
<p>The operator has confirmed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During the lifetime of the permit, there have been no pollution incidents on site. The farm manager would check the condition of the farm on a daily basis to ensure that no pollution had occurred.</li> <li>• Before, during and after cleanout checks were made to ensure that dirty water and litter was contained within the site and collected and disposed of correctly.</li> </ul> <p>Supporting document 'Doc A3 Application Site Report –Site condition Report -prepared 30.06.06' (and updated October 2017) states that "No pollution incidents are known to have occurred at the site since the construction of the current poultry installation in 1971". The report also states that the site was inspected to establish whether pollution had occurred through any of the pathways identified (earlier in the report). Leakage from hard standing areas was assessed by visually examining vegetation and soil around the hard standing and searching for run-off channels or other evidence of leakage. Vegetation and bare ground did not show any obvious signs of pollution.</p> <p>A similar procedure was used to assess run-off from the apron area, there was no evidence of wet land as a result of rainwater runoff and no evidence of any contamination from, for example, dust or feed.</p> <p>The area around the septic tank showed no signs of leakage and evidence of previous leaks such as build-up of algae were not obvious.</p> <p>There was no evidence of diesel spillage around the storage tank areas.</p> <p>The Report concludes that the area of the site comprising the poultry sheds is considered to be in a condition commensurate with agricultural land that has been developed for the intensive poultry production. It is unlikely that contamination is present, and, the land surrounding the poultry sheds is still used for agricultural production.</p> <p>The Report also notes that bi-monthly inspections were undertaken by the Farm staff and findings were recorded and defects noted and corrective action taken. Weekly checks were also made as part of monitoring the production process.</p> <p>The supporting document 'Doc A4 Site Condition Report – Closure' also states that there was no known pollution incidents since the site has been permitted, or before that since the early 1970's. The report repeats what has been noted above and also states that the boundary of the farm was checked with no signs of pollution evident.</p>

**6.0 Pollution incidents that may have impacted on land and their remediation**

To be completed by EM/PPC officers  
(Sources)

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)?

The operator has confirmed that no pollution incidents have taken place during the lifetime of the permit (see section 5.0 above)

**7.0 Soil gas and water quality monitoring (where relevant)**

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?

See section 7.0 of SCR – N/A.

## 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**

To be completed by EM/PPC officers

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?

See section 8 of SCR.

Supporting document 'Doc A2 – Decommissioning' sets out the activities taken during decommissioning:

- At depletion, sheds were mucked out with spent litter being incinerated at a local power station or distributed to local farmers.
- Sheds and the yards was washed down and disinfected.
- Sheds were washed down externally.
- All salvageable equipment such as feeders, drinkers, ventilation systems, heaters, etc were removed from sheds.
- Fans, exhausts and ventilation shafts were closed or covered to keep out pests.
- Leftover feed was removed from site by a sucker/blower lorry and taken to an operational farm.
- Feed silos were washed down and disinfected before being sealed off.
- The supplier removed excess fuel and necessary arrangements were made to render the empty tanks safe.
- Chemicals such as disinfectants or detergent was taken to other operational sites where a need still exists.
- Expired chemicals were disposed of as per manufacturer's recommendations.
- A licensed contractor collected inorganic waste and the receptacle it was stored in. in short, anything considered a potential environmental risk was removed from site before closing the farm.
- Storage tanks for dirty water were emptied, as well as the tank used to collect the foot dip solution.
- The dirty water storage tanks were closed once they were emptied.
- The water and electric companies were notified in order that a course of action could be taken in shutting off supplies.
- All houses and storerooms were locked to discourage vandalism.

Also see supporting document 'Doc A4 Site Condition Report – Closure'.

The document confirms that:

- Post closure, a full site check was carried out to ensure that the decommissioning plan (see above) was followed.
- There is no evidence of pollution incidents at the site since the early 1970's when the farm was built.
- Leakage from the hard standing areas was assessed by visually examining vegetation and soil around the hard standing and searching for run-off channels or other evidence of leakage. Vegetation and bare ground did not show any obvious signs of pollution.
- A similar procedure was used to assess run-off from the apron area, there was no evidence of wet land as a result of rainwater runoff and no evidence of any contamination from, for example dust or feed.
- The area around the septic tank showed no signs of leakage and evidence of previous leaks such as build-up of algae were not obvious.
- There was no evidence of diesel spillage around the storage tank areas.
- Vegetation around the sheds was green and lush, probably as a result of ammonia deposition, but there was no evidence of damage or scorching of vegetation, shrubs or trees.
- The boundary of the farm was checked with no signs of pollution were evident.

The operator concludes that the area of the site comprising the existing poultry sheds is considered to be in a condition commensurate with a poultry unit which has produced poultry for many years. All processes outlined in the decommissioning plan were followed and they consider the site to be in a condition that in any way cannot pollute the environment.

Additionally, the operator submitted an updated SCR on 30/01/2018 which included 'Table 1'. Table 1 lists all decommissioning jobs that have been completed. Photos of the empty fuel tanks were also submitted on 24/01/2018.

## 9.0 Reference data and remediation (where relevant)

To be completed by GWCL officers

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.

A number of minor non compliances have previously been noted by the site inspection officer. However, the most recent CAR form (dated 30/10/17) confirms that the site has been sold to another company which is believed to be operating under threshold. The operator addressed non-compliances from previous visits by ceasing stocking of poultry. The last batch was approximately 12 months ago. The local site inspector requires the site surrender plan is followed and that any remaining oil in oil tanks is removed from site by a suitable contractor.

- The operator has confirmed that the supplier removed excess fuel and necessary arrangements were made to render the empty tanks safe.
- Additionally, the operator submitted an updated SCR on 30/01/2018 which included 'Table 1'. Table 1 lists all decommissioning jobs that have been completed. Photos of the empty fuel tanks were also submitted on 24/01/2018.

## 10.0a Statement of site condition

To be completed by EM/PPC officers

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?

See section 10 of SCR. This confirms that the permitted activities have ceased, decommissioning is complete, pollution risks have been removed and the land is in a satisfactory condition.

## 10.0b Statement of site condition

To be completed by GWCL officers

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?

See section 10.0a of this document, above.

## Surrender SCR decision summary

To be completed by GWCL officers and returned to NPS

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 reviewer

Christine  
Sellers,  
Permitting  
Officer

