Permitting decisions

Variation

We have decided to grant the variation for The Vinnals Poultry Farm operated by Vinnals Poultry Limited.

The variation number is EPR/MP3034YM/V002.

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 and the variation notice. The introductory note summarises what the variation 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 housing within variation applications** issued after the 21st 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.

This variation determination includes a review only of BAT compliance for new housing introduced with this variation. A BAT review of existing housing compliance with BAT conclusions document is to be

the subject of a sector permit review and is beyond the scope of this variation application permit determination. E**xisting housing will have to meet the BAT requirements by 21/02/21.**

New BAT conclusions review

There are 34 BAT conclusion measures in total within the BAT conclusion document dated 21st February 2017.

We have sent out a not duly made (NDM) request for further information (RFI) 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 housing, in their NDM RFI response dated 15/05/2018.

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

BAT measure	**Applicant compliance measure**
BAT 3 - Nutritional management Nitrogen excretion	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. This confirmation was in response to the Not Duly Made Request for Further Information received 15/05/2018, which has been referenced in Table S1.2 Operating Techniques of the Permit. Table S3.3 of the Permit concerning process monitoring requires the Operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT Conclusions.
BAT 4 Nutritional management Phosphorus excretion	The Applicant has confirmed it will demonstrate it achieves levels of Phosphorus excretion below the required BAT-AEL of 0.25 kg P_2O_5 animal place/year by an estimation using manure analysis for total Phosphorus content. This confirmation was in response to the Not Duly Made Request, received 15/05/2018, which has been referenced in Table S1.2 Operating techniques of the Permit. Table S3.3 of the Permit concerning process monitoring requires the Operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT Conclusions.
BAT 24 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Total nitrogen and phosphorus excretion	Table S3.3 Process monitoring requires the operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT conclusions. The operator will estimate annually by using manure analysis for total nitrogen and phosphorous content as confirmed in their not duly made response, received 15/05/2018.
BAT 25 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Ammonia emissions	Table S3.3 of the Permit concerning process monitoring requires the Operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT Conclusions. The operator will estimate annually by using a mass balance based on the excretion and the total nitrogen present at each manure management stage.
BAT 26 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Odour emissions	The approved OMP includes the following details for on Farm Monitoring and Continual Improvement: • The site will be monitored routinely (daily initial and then weekly after the first six months of operations, if odours are not detected) using sniff testing. • Further sniff testing and observations will be conducted around the various operations on site to identify potential odour risks and sources. • An independent third party will also carry out pro-active monitoring of odours in the area around the site to help detect any off-site odours and identify the cause or causes if present.

BAT measure	Applicant compliance measure
BAT 27 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters -Dust emissions	Table S3.3 Process monitoring requires the operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT conclusions. 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 Not Duly Made Request, received 15/05/2018, which has been referenced in Table S1.2 Operating techniques of the Permit.
BAT 32 Ammonia emissions from poultry houses - Broilers	The BAT-AEL to be complied with is 0.01 – 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

A BAT Associated Emission Level (AEL) provides us with a performance benchmark to determine whether an activity is BAT.

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.

For variations all new housing on existing farms will need to meet the BAT-AEL.

Industrial Emissions Directive (IED)

The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) (Amendment) Regulations 2013 were made on the 20 February 2013 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 The Vinnals Poultry Farm (received13/06/2018) 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 and although condition 3.1.3 is included in the permit no groundwater monitoring will be required.**

Odour

Intensive farming is by its nature a potentially odorous activity. This is recognised in our 'How to Comply with your Environmental Permit for Intensive Farming' EPR 6.09 guidance (http://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/297084/geho0110brsb-e-e.pdf).

Condition 3.3 of the environmental permit reads as follows:

"Emissions from the activities shall be free from odour at levels likely to cause pollution outside the site, as perceived by an authorised officer of the Environment Agency, unless the operator has used appropriate measures, including, but not limited to, those specified in any approved odour management plan, to prevent or where that is not practicable to minimise the 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 there are sensitive receptors (sensitive receptors in this instance excludes properties associated with the farm) 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. In this instance we have assessed the OMP only for the changes brought about by this variation.

The risk assessment for the Installation provided with the Application lists key potential risks of odour pollution beyond the Installation boundary. These activities are as follows:

- Manufacture and selection of feed
- Feed delivery and storage
- Ventilation systems
- Litter management
- Carcass disposal
- House clean out

Odour Management Plan Review

The Installation is located within 400m of a number of sensitive receptors, as listed below (please note, the distances stated are only an approximation from the Installation boundary to the assumed boundary of the properties):

1. The Vinnals – immediately to the north east of the Installation boundary.
2. Lea Haven – approximately 275m to the north of the Installation boundary.
3. Properties at Lower Common – approximately 320m to the north of the Installation boundary.
4. Stapleton Grange – approximately 325m to the north east of the Installation boundary.
5. Little Vinnals Bungalow – approximately 330m to the north east of the Installation boundary.

One property – The Vinnals – is not considered as it is owned and occupied by the Operator. The Operator has provided a revised OMP (received 13/06/2018) in response to a request for further information sent 31/05/2018. This revised OMP has been assessed against the requirements of 'How to Comply with your Environmental Permit for Intensive Farming' EPR 6.09 (version 2), Appendix 4 guidance 'Odour Management at Intensive Livestock Installations' and our Top Tips Guidance and Poultry Industry Good Practice Checklist (August 2013) as well as the site specific circumstances at the Installation. We consider that the OMP is acceptable because it complies with the above guidance, with details of odour control measures, contingency measures and complaint procedures described below.

The Operator is required to manage activities at the Installation in accordance with condition 3.3.1 of the Permit and its OMP. The OMP includes odour control measures, in particular, procedural controls such as feed delivery, storage and distribution, ventilation systems, carcass storage, cleaning out of livestock, storing and spreading of manure and slurry, and dirty water management. The operator has identified the potential sources of odour (see risks bullet pointed above), as well as the potential risks and problems, and detailed actions taken to minimise odour.

The OMP also provides a suitable procedure in the event that complaints are made to the Operator. The OMP is required to be reviewed at least every 4 years and/or after a complaint is received, whichever is the sooner.

The Environment Agency has reviewed the OMP and considers 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.

Conclusion

We have assessed the OMP and the H1 risk assessment for odour and conclude that the Applicant has followed the guidance set out in H4 Odour management guidance note. Although there is the potential for odour pollution from the Installation, the Operator's compliance with the Permit and its OMP will minimise the risk of odour pollution beyond the Installation boundary. The risk of odour pollution at sensitive receptors beyond the Installation boundary is therefore not considered significant.

Noise

Intensive farming by its nature involves activities that have the potential to cause noise pollution. This is recognised in our 'How to Comply with your Environmental Permit for Intensive Farming' EPR 6.09 guidance. Under section 3.4 of this guidance a Noise Management Plan (NMP) must be approved as part of the permitting determination, if there are sensitive receptors within 400m of the Installation boundary.

Condition 3.4 of the Permit reads as follows:

Emissions from the activities shall be free from noise and vibration at levels likely to cause pollution outside the site, as perceived by an authorised officer of the Environment Agency, unless the operator has used appropriate measures, including, but not limited to, those specified in any approved noise and vibration management plan, to prevent or where that is not practicable to minimise the noise and vibration.

There are sensitive receptors within 400 metres of the Installation boundary as stated in the 'Odour' section above. The Operator has provided a noise management plan (NMP) as part of the Application supporting documentation, and further details are provided in 'Noise Management Plan Review' below.

The risk assessment for the Installation provided with the Application lists key potential risks of noise pollution beyond the Installation boundary. These activities are as follows:

- Ventilation fans
- Feed deliveries
- Fuel deliveries
- Feeding systems
- Alarm systems

- Bird catching
- Clean out operations
- Maintenance and repair
- Set-up and placement
- Standby generators
- Personnel / staff / contractors

Noise Management Plan Review

Sensitive receptors have been listed under 'Odour' section.

The sensitive receptors that have been considered under odour and noise do not include the operator's property and other people associated with the farm operations as odour and noise are amenity issues.

A noise management plan (NMP) has been provided by the operator) as part of the application supporting documentation (reference 'Noise Management Plan' (Revised and received 13/06/2018).

The NMP also provides a suitable procedure in the event of complaints in relation to noise. The NMP is required to be reviewed at least every 4 years, however the operator has confirmed that it will be reviewed if a complaint is received, whichever is sooner.

Operations with the most potential to cause noise nuisance have been assessed and control measures put in place for all vehicles accessing the site and manoeuvring around, vehicles and machinery carrying out operations on site, feed delivery and transfer from lorry to storage, bird movements on site, waste collections, general delivers and staff vehicles, stocking and destocking of poultry houses, operation of ventilation systems, personnel, bird noise, clean out and manual washing and cleaning of equipment.

We have included our standard noise and vibration condition 3.4.1 in the Permit, which requires that emissions from the activities shall be free from noise and vibration at levels likely to cause pollution outside the Installation, as perceived by an authorised officer of the Environment Agency, unless the Operator has used appropriate measures, including, but not limited to, those specified in any approved noise and vibration management plan (which is captured through condition 2.3 and Table S1.2 of the Permit), to prevent or where that is not practicable to minimise the noise and vibration.

We are satisfied that the manner in which operations are carried out on the Installation will minimise the risk of noise pollution.

Conclusion

We have assessed the NMP and the H1 risk assessment for noise and conclude that the Applicant has followed the guidance set out in EPR 6.09 Appendix 5 'Noise management at intensive livestock installations'. We are satisfied that all sources and receptors have been identified, and that the proposed mitigation measures will minimise the risk of noise pollution / nuisance.

Dust and Bioaerosols

The use of Best Available Techniques and good practice will ensure minimisation of emissions. There are measures included within the Permit (the 'Fugitive Emissions' conditions) to provide a level of protection. Condition 3.2.1 'Emissions of substances not controlled by an emission limit' is included in the Permit. This is used in conjunction with condition 3.2.2 which states that in the event of fugitive emissions causing pollution following commissioning of the Installation, the Operator is required to undertake a review of site activities, provide an emissions management plan and to undertake any mitigation recommended as part of that report, once agreed in writing with the Environment Agency.

There is 1 sensitive receptor within 100m of the Installation boundary, the nearest sensitive receptor (the nearest point of their assumed property boundary) is immediately to the north east of the installation boundary.

Guidance on our website concludes that applicants need to produce and submit a dust and bioaerosol risk assessment with their applications only if there are relevant receptors within 100 metres of their farm, e.g. the farmhouse or farm worker's houses. Details can be found via the link below:

www.gov.uk/guidance/intensive-farming-risk-assessment-for-your-environmental-permit#air-emissions-dust-and-bioaerosols.

As there are receptors within 100m of the Installation, the Applicant was required to submit a dust and bioaerosol risk assessment in this format.

In the guidance mentioned above it states that particulate concentrations fall off rapidly with distance from the emitting source. This fact, together with the proposed good management of the Installation such as keeping areas clean from build-up of dust, and other measures in place to reduce dust and risk of spillages (e.g. litter and feed management/delivery procedures) all reduce the potential for emissions impacting the nearest receptors. The Applicant has confirmed the following measures in their operating techniques to reduce dust:

- Vehicle movements onto and off site and movement of vehicles onsite – vehicles will adhere to a site speed limit; all vehicles entering and leaving the site will be sheeted; yard area keep clean and swept regularly; appropriate landscaping; regular inspections of the site.
- Poultry feed – no on site milling and mixing of feed carried out; use of pelleted feed delivered in sealed systems; feed delivery systems are sealed to minimise atmospheric dust, any spillage of feed around the bin is immediately swept up; the condition of the feed bins are checked frequently so any damage or leaks can be identified.
- Ventilation – the ventilation system is designed to modern standards and is routinely checked and maintained to ensure efficient functioning and specification; dust baffles can be used to assist in dust collection.
- Bedding materials – controls on feed, water and ventilation systems to help maintain litter quality; stocking densities at optimal levels to prevent overcrowding and the creation of dust; appropriate use of small bales of shaving or straw with high welfare system used; bedding applied internally and opened in the housing to reduce dust; no storage of litter outside.
- House clean out – there is no storage of used litter outside the houses at any time; yards are cleaned down at clean out; litter is carefully placed into trailers positioned inside the doors of the houses; litter will be loaded into trailers at clean out, which are then sheet and taken off site.
- Screening of the site – vegetative screens in place to reduce dust levels.

Conclusion

We are satisfied that the measures outlined in the Application will minimise the potential for dust and bioaerosol emissions from the Installation.

Ammonia

There is 1 Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) located within 5 km of the installation. There are also 4 other nature conservation sites comprising of 2 Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) and 2 Ancient Woodlands (AW) within 2 km of the installation.

Ammonia assessment – SSSI

The following trigger thresholds have been applied for assessment of SSSIs:

- If the process contribution (PC) is below 20% of the relevant critical level (CLe) or critical load (CLo) then the farm can be permitted with no further assessment.
- Where this threshold is exceeded an assessment alone and in combination is required. An in combination assessment will be completed to establish the combined PC for all existing farms identified within 5 km of the SSSI.

Initial screening using the ammonia screening tool version 4.5 has indicated that emissions from The Vinnals Poultry Farm will only have a potential impact on SSSI site with a precautionary critical level of 1µg/m^3 if they are within 1626 metres of the emission source.

Beyond 1626m the PC is less than 0.2µg/m^3 (i.e. less than 20% of the precautionary 1µg/m^3 critical level) and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case the SSSI is beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

Where the precautionary level of 1µg/m^3 is used, and the process contribution is assessed to be less than 20% the site automatically screens out as insignificant and no further assessment of critical load is necessary. In this case the 1µg/m^3 level used has not been confirmed by Natural England, but it is precautionary. It is therefore possible to conclude no likely damage to these sites.

Table 1 – SSSI Assessment

Name of SSSI	Distance from site (m)
Earl's Hill & Habberley Valley	3836

No further assessment is required.

Ammonia assessment - LWS/AW

The following trigger thresholds have been applied for the assessment of these sites:

- If the process contribution (PC) is below 100% of the relevant critical level (CLe) or critical load (CLo) then the farm can be permitted with no further assessment.

Initial screening using ammonia screening tool version 4.5 has indicated that emissions from The Vinnals Poultry Farm will only have a potential impact on the LWS/AW sites with a precautionary critical level of 1µg/m^3 if they are within 587 metres of the emission source.

Beyond 587m the PC is less than 1µg/m^3 and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case all LWS/AW are beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

Table 2 – LWS/AW Assessment

Name of LWS/AW	Distance from site (m)
Coalpits/Moat Stapleton LWS	2082
Lyth Hill LWS	1832
HAYS COPPICE AW	1907
SPRING COPPICE AW	1832

No further assessment is necessary

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/Engagement	
Consultation	The consultation requirements were identified in accordance with the Environmental Permitting Regulations and our public participation statement. The application was publicised on the GOV.UK website. We consulted the following organisations: • Public Health England • Director of Public Health, Shropshire Council • Local Environmental Health Department, Shropshire Council • Health and Safety Executive The comments and our responses are summarised in the consultation section.
The facility	
The regulated facility	We considered the extent and nature of the facility at the site in accordance with RGN2 'Understanding the meaning of regulated facility'. 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.
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	The operator has provided a description of the condition of the site, which we consider is satisfactory. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on site condition reports and baseline reporting under the Industrial Emissions Directive.
Biodiversity, heritage, landscape and nature conservation	The application is within the relevant distance criteria of a site of heritage, landscape or nature conservation, and/or protected species or habitat. 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.

Aspect considered	Decision
	We consider that the application will not affect any sites of nature conservation, landscape and heritage, and/or protected species or habitats identified. We have not consulted Natural England on the application. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance.
Environmental risk assessment	
Environmental risk	We have reviewed the operator's assessment of the environmental risk from the facility. The operator's risk assessment is satisfactory.
Operating techniques	
General operating techniques	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 operating techniques include the following: • Poultry houses 1-4 are ventilated by medium velocity roof fan outlets. • Litter is exported off site and is spread on land farmed by the application or on land owned by third parties. • Dirty wash water is exported off site and spread to operator-owned land. • Carcasses are collected daily and stored in sealed vermin proof containers and collected by a licensed agent. • There is an existing ground source heat system in place, located in a specialist service building on the site. This provides the necessary heating requirements along with gas tanks. • Roof water and water draining from yard (excluding all times yards are contaminated e.g. catching, mucking out or poultry house wash out periods) is intercepted by stone trenches prior to discharge immediately north west of the poultry houses. The operating techniques that the applicant must use are specified in table S1.2 in the environmental permit.
Odour management	We have reviewed the odour management plan in accordance with our guidance on odour management. We consider that the odour management plan is satisfactory.
Noise management	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.
Permit conditions	
Updating permit conditions during consolidation	We have updated permit conditions to those in the current generic permit template as part of permit consolidation. The conditions will provide the same level of protection as those in the previous permit(s).
Use of conditions other than those from the template	Based on the information in the application, we consider that we do not need to impose conditions other than those in our permit template.

Aspect considered	Decision
Emission limits	We have decided that emission limits are required in the permit. BAT AELs have been added in line with the Intensive Farming sector BAT conclusions document dated 21/02/17. These limits are included in permit table S3.3.
Monitoring	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. These monitoring requirements have been imposed in order to ensure compliance with Intensive Farming BAT conclusions document dated 21/02/17.
Reporting	We have specified reporting in the permit. We made these decisions in order to ensure compliance with Intensive Farming BAT conclusions document dated 21/02/17.
Operator competence	
Management system	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.
Growth Duty	
Section 108 Deregulation Act 2015 – Growth duty	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. Paragraph 1.3 of the guidance says: "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." 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. 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.

Consultation

The following summarises the responses to consultation with other organisations, our notice on GOV.UK for the public, and the way in which we have considered these in the determination process.

Responses from organisations listed in the consultation section

Response received from
Public Health England (PHE) – received 26/06/2018
Brief summary of issues raised
PHE's response in summary is as follows: We recommend that any Environmental Permit issued for this site should contain conditions to ensure that the following potential emissions do not impact upon public health: fugitive dust and odour emissions. Based solely on the information contained in the application provided, PHE has no significant concerns regarding risk to health of the local population from this proposed facility, providing that the applicant takes all appropriate measures to prevent or control pollution, in accordance with the relevant sector technical guidance or industry best practice.
Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered
To prevent significant emissions from the site the Operator has proposed appropriate measures to manage dust and bioaerosols - a site specific risk assessment has been provided by the Operator. This includes the use of appropriate housing design and management and appropriate containment of feedstuff. We are satisfied that these measures will appropriately mitigate emissions to prevent a significant impact from the site. We only require an Operator to produce a dust and bioaerosol risk assessment with an application if there are relevant receptors within 100m of the farm e.g. farmhouse or farm worker's houses, or other receptors outside of the installation boundary – the Operator has provided an appropriate risk assessment. This is an agreed standard, established, and used consistently with such applications. Notwithstanding the above, Condition 3.2 of the environmental permit also deals with emissions of substances not controlled by emission limits. Under this condition, if notified by the Environment Agency that the activities are giving rise to pollution, the Operator must submit an emissions management plan which identifies and minimises the risks of pollution from emissions of substances not controlled by emission limits. The Operator has also provided a comprehensive odour management plan. We have no record of odour complaints as a result of operations from this site.

We also consulted with the HSE, the Director of Public Health at Shropshire Council and Local Environmental Health Department at Shropshire Council. No responses were received within the appropriate timeframe. No public comments were received.