

# Permitting decisions

## Variation

---

We have decided to grant the variation for Park Farm operated by Mr Alan Fairs and Mr Sam Fairs (trading as Loombest Limited).

The variation number is EPR/PP3431XK/V003.

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; and
- shows how we have considered the [consultation responses](#).

Unless the decision document specifies otherwise we have accepted the Operator'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 sets out the standards that permitted farms have to meet.

The BAT Conclusions document can be found through the following link: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32017D0302&from=EN>.

Now that the BAT Conclusions are published, all new housing within variation applications issued after the 21<sup>st</sup> February 2017 must be compliant in full from their first day of operation. For some types of rearing practices, stricter standards will apply.

There are some new requirements for permit holders. The Conclusions include BAT-Associated Emission Levels (BAT-AELs) for ammonia, which will apply to the majority of permits, in addition to BAT-AELs for nitrogen and phosphorous excretion. A BAT-AEL provides us with a performance benchmark to determine whether an activity uses BAT.

This 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 the determination of this variation application.

### New BAT Conclusions review

There are 34 BAT conclusion measures in total within the BAT Conclusion document dated 21<sup>st</sup> February 2017.

We sent a Schedule 5 Notice requiring the Operator to confirm that the new housing at the Installation will comply in full with all the relevant BAT Conclusion measures. The Operator confirmed their compliance with all BAT conditions for the new housing in their response on 17/08/18 (document reference 3865-137-G). This has been referenced as an operating technique in table S1.2 of the permit.

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

<b>BAT measure</b>	<b>Operator compliance measure</b>
BAT 3 Nutritional management - Nitrogen excretion	The Operator has confirmed it will demonstrate levels of nitrogen excretion below the required BAT-AEL of 0.6 kg N/animal place/year.
BAT 4 Nutritional management - Phosphorous excretion	The Operator has confirmed it will demonstrate levels of phosphorous excretion below the required BAT-AEL of 0.25 kg P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> /animal place/year.
BAT 24 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Total nitrogen and phosphorous excretion	Table S3.3 of the permit, concerning process monitoring, requires the Operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT Conclusions.
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.
BAT 26 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Odour emissions	The approved Odour Management Plan (OMP) includes provision for routine daily sniff tests at the site boundary.  If abnormally high odours are detected, or an odour complaint is received, monitoring will be undertaken by a person who does not work continuously on the site and in accordance with the requirements of our H4 guidance.

BAT measure	Operator compliance measure
BAT 27 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Dust emissions	Table S3.3 of the permit, concerning 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 NH <sub>3</sub> /animal place/year. The Operator will meet this as the emission factor for broilers is 0.034 kg NH <sub>3</sub> /animal place/year.  The Installation does not include an air abatement treatment facility, hence the standard emission factor complies with 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 transposed 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 Park Farm (dated 22/03/18, received 28/03/18) 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](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, as is the case here, sensitive receptors (excluding properties associated with the farm) are within 400 metres 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 risk assessment provided with the application lists the key potential risks of odour pollution beyond the Installation boundary. These activities are as follows:

- handling and storage of feed;
- litter management;
- ventilation of poultry houses;
- disposal of carcasses;
- house clean-out operations; and
- management of dirty water and manure.

#### Odour Management Plan review

Although there are a number of properties located within 400 metres of the Installation; those within 100 metres are associated with the operation of Park Farm and it is therefore considered to pose a low risk of causing odour pollution.

We have assessed the OMP and the risk assessment for odour and concluded that the Operator has followed the guidance set out in Appendix 4 ‘Odour management at intensive livestock installations’ to the EPR 6.09 guidance. We are satisfied that all sources and receptors have been identified, and that the proposed mitigation measures will minimise the risk of odour pollution / nuisance.

## **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 400 metres 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.’

As there are sensitive receptors within 400 metres of the Installation boundary, the Operator provided a NMP as part of the application supporting documentation and further details are provided below.

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

- use of vehicles on site;
- operation of feed storage bins;
- operation of ventilation fans in the poultry houses;
- use of alarms;
- housing of livestock;

- personnel;
- maintenance; and
- use of standby generators and the ground source heat pump.

#### Noise Management Plan review

Although there are a number of properties located within 400 metres of the Installation, those within 100 metres are associated with the operation of Park Farm. The site is therefore considered to have a low risk of causing noise pollution.

We have assessed the NMP and the risk assessment for noise and conclude that the Operator has followed the guidance set out in Appendix 5 'Noise management at intensive livestock installations' to the EPR 6.09 guidance. 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 dust and bioaerosol 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, the Operator will be required to undertake a review of site activities, provide an emissions management plan and undertake any mitigation recommended as part of that report once agreed in writing with the Environment Agency.

Guidance on our website concludes that applicants need to produce and submit a dust and bioaerosol risk assessment with their applications if there are relevant receptors within 100 metres of their farm, including farmhouses or farm workers' houses (see [www.gov.uk/guidance/intensive-farming-risk-assessment-for-your-environmental-permit#air-emissions-dust-and-bioaerosols](http://www.gov.uk/guidance/intensive-farming-risk-assessment-for-your-environmental-permit#air-emissions-dust-and-bioaerosols)).

There are four sensitive receptors within 100 metres of the Installation boundary; two of these properties are within the permit boundary. The Operator was therefore required to submit a dust and bioaerosol risk assessment and management plan.

The proposed good management of the Installation will reduce the risk of dust impacting the nearest receptors. The Operator has confirmed the following measures in their operating techniques to reduce dust:

- feed systems are sealed and are regularly inspected;
- spillages of feed are immediately swept up;
- the dust content of the litter is minimised;
- dust is routinely cleaned from ventilation exhausts;
- used litter is transported in covered trailers;
- curtains are used during flock inspection and catching operations; and
- carcasses are stored in enclosed bins.

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

## **Ammonia**

There are two Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), one Special Protection Area (SPA), one Ramsar site and four Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) located within 5 km of Park Farm. There are also seven Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) and five Ancient Woodlands (AW) within 2 km of the installation.

#### Ammonia assessment – SAC/SPA/Ramsar

The following trigger thresholds have been designated for the assessment of European sites:

- If the process contribution (PC) is below 4% 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 with a PC of 4% or more identified within 5 km of the SAC/SPA/Ramsar site.

#### Minsmere to Walberswick SPA and Ramsar site

Screening using the ammonia screening tool (version 4.5) has determined that the PC of ammonia emissions, nitrogen deposition and acid deposition from Park Farm will be over the 4% significance threshold. As such, it is not possible to conclude no adverse effect alone. Where the PC falls between 4% and 20%, Environment Agency guidance indicates that an in-combination assessment should be undertaken.

There are no other farms acting in-combination with the Minsmere to Walberswick SPA and Ramsar site. The PC is predicted to be less than 20% of the critical level and load significance thresholds. It is therefore possible to conclude no adverse effect to the sites from the installation and therefore no further assessment is required for these sites. See results in tables 1, 2 and 3 below.

**Table 1 – Ammonia emissions**

Site	Critical level ammonia $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	Predicted process contribution $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	% of critical level
Minsmere to Walberswick – SPA and Ramsar site	3*	0.19**	6.3

\* APIS designates a critical level of  $3\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  for higher plants ([www.apis.ac.uk](http://www.apis.ac.uk)) – 18/09/18

\*\* PC taken from the detailed modelling 'Ammonia Modelling Report – Park Farm' (document reference 3857-137-A, version 1.1, dated 23/03/18). Although this modelling focusses on the Minsmere to Walberswick Heaths and Marshes SAC, the designations directly overlap and so we can assume the same PC for the SPA and the Ramsar site.

**Table 2 – Nitrogen deposition**

Site	Critical load kg N/ha/yr	Predicted PC kg N/ha/yr	PC % of critical load
Minsmere to Walberswick – SPA and Ramsar site	10*	1.117	11.2

\* Critical load values taken from APIS website ([www.apis.ac.uk](http://www.apis.ac.uk)) – 18/09/18

**Table 3 – Acid deposition**

Site	Critical load keq/ha/yr	Predicted PC keq/ha/yr	PC % of critical load
Minsmere to Walberswick – SPA and Ramsar site	1.237*	0.08	6.4

\* Critical load values taken from APIS website ([www.apis.ac.uk](http://www.apis.ac.uk)) – 18/09/18

#### Minsmere to Walberswick Heaths and Marshes SAC

Screening using the detailed modelling 'Ammonia Modelling Report – Park Farm' (document reference 3857-137-A, version 1.1, dated 23/03/18) has determined that the process contributions of ammonia from Park Farm will be over the 4% significance threshold. As such, it is not possible to conclude no adverse effect alone. Where the PC falls between 4% and 20%, Environment Agency guidance indicates that an in-combination assessment should be undertaken.

In line with our current process, only those farms with a PC above 4% of the CLe are considered in our in-combination assessment. A search of all existing active intensive agriculture installations permitted by the Environment Agency has identified one farm within 5 km of the maximum concentration point for Minsmere to Walberswick Heaths and Marshes SAC (x, y grid reference: 644362, 272388).

Initial screening using the ammonia screening tool (AST, version 4.5) indicates that Darsham Poultry Unit (EPR/MP3433UX) could act in-combination as its PC is 4.4% of the CLe. However, due to the precautionary nature of the AST, the PC of 4.4% is highly conservative. Since our tool does not consider wind directionality nor plume depletion, a more realistically modelled PC would be less than 4% and insignificant. We can therefore consider that there are no other farms which could act in-combination with Park Farm on Minsmere to Walberswick Heaths and Marshes SAC.

Detailed modelling provided by the Operator has been audited in detail by our Air Quality Monitoring and Assessment Unit (AQMAU) and we have confidence that we can agree with the report conclusions.

**Table 4 – Ammonia emissions**

Site	Critical level ammonia $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	Predicted process contribution $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	% of critical level
Minsmere to Walberswick Heaths and Marshes – SAC	1*	0.19	19

\* APIS sets critical level of  $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  due to lichens and bryophytes ([www.apis.ac.uk](http://www.apis.ac.uk)) – 18/09/18.

Where a site screens out with a critical level of  $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  it is not necessary to consider critical loads for nutrient nitrogen and acid deposition. No further assessment is required for this habitat site.

#### Dew's Ponds SAC

##### Ammonia

Screening using the ammonia screening tool (AST, version 4.5) has determined that the PC for ammonia emissions from Park Farm on Dew's Ponds SAC are over the 4% threshold, and are therefore potentially significant. An in combination assessment has been carried out. There is one other farm acting in-combination with this application. A detailed assessment has been carried out as shown below.

A search of all existing active intensive agriculture installations permitted by the Environment Agency has identified the following farms within 5 km of the maximum concentration point for Dew's Ponds SAC with a PC above 4% of the CLe.

**Table 5 – In-combination farms assessment for ammonia emissions**

Name of Farm	PC $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	Critical level $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	PC as % of critical level
Park Farm	0.156*	3**	5.2
Darsham Poultry Unit	0.126*	3**	4.2
<b>Total PC</b>	<b>0.282</b>	<b>3**</b>	<b>9.4</b>

\* The predicted PC for each of the farms listed above has been calculated using the Environment Agency's AST. The values are conservative in their estimate of process contribution and thus predict a greater impact than would be predicted if detailed modelling was undertaken for each farm.

\*\* APIS sets critical level of  $3\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  for higher plants ([www.apis.ac.uk](http://www.apis.ac.uk)) – 18/09/18

Table 5 shows that the total process contribution at Dew's Ponds SAC from all farms in-combination is 9.4% for ammonia emissions. In line with Environment Agency guidelines, where the total PC is less than 20% of the critical load, in-combination impacts can be considered as having no adverse effect. No further assessment is required for this habitat.

### Nitrogen deposition

Screening using the ammonia screening tool (AST, version 4.5) has determined that the PC for nitrogen deposition from Park Farm on Dew's Pond SAC is over the 4% significance threshold. As such, it is not possible to conclude no adverse effect alone. Where the process contribution falls between 4% and 20%, Environment Agency guidance indicates that an in-combination assessment should be undertaken.

There are no other farms acting in-combination with this application. The PC is predicted to be less than 20% of the critical load significance threshold. It is therefore possible to conclude no adverse effect to the site from the installation and no further assessment is required. See results in table 5 below.

**Table 6 – Nitrogen deposition**

Site	Critical load kg N/ha/yr*	Predicted PC kg N/ha/yr.	PC % of critical load
Dew's Ponds SAC	20	0.81	4.1

\* Critical load values taken from APIS website ([www.apis.ac.uk](http://www.apis.ac.uk)) – 07/09/18

### Acid deposition

We have considered the broad habitat listed by Natural England for the Dew's Ponds SAC designation as neutral grassland – low and medium altitude meadows. As data on APIS suggests that the habitat type is not sensitive to acidity, we have not assessed the PC for acidity on the Dew's Ponds SAC.

### 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 (CL<sub>e</sub>) or critical load (CL<sub>o</sub>) 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 with a PC of 20% or more identified within 5 km of the SSSI.

Initial screening using the ammonia screening tool version 4.5 has indicated that emissions from Park Farm will only have a potential impact on SSSIs with a precautionary CL<sub>e</sub> of 1µg/m<sup>3</sup> if they are within 2,403 m of the emission source.

Beyond 2,403 m the PC is less than 0.2µg/m<sup>3</sup> (i.e. less than 20% of the precautionary 1µg/m<sup>3</sup> critical level) and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case, three of the SSSIs are beyond 2,403 m (see table 7 below) and screen out of any further assessment.

Where the precautionary level of 1µg/m<sup>3</sup> is used, and the PC is assessed to be less than 20%, the site automatically screens out as insignificant and assessment of critical load is considered unnecessary. In this case the 1µg/m<sup>3</sup> 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 7 – SSSI Assessment**

Name of SSSI	Distance from site (m)
Potton Hall Fields, Westleton	4,023
Dew's Ponds	2,874
Holton Pit	4,835

Screening using the detailed modelling 'Ammonia Modelling Report – Park Farm' (document reference 3857-137-A, version 1.1, dated 23/03/18) has indicated that the PC for Minsmere to Walberswick Heaths and Marshes SSSI is predicted to be less than 20% of the critical level for ammonia, therefore it is possible to conclude no damage – see table 8 below. No further assessment is required for this SSSI.



**Table 8 – SSSI Assessment**

Site	Critical level ammonia $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	Predicted process contribution $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	% of critical level
Minsmere to Walberswick Heaths and Marshes – SSSI	1*	0.19	19

\* APIS sets critical level of  $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  due to lichens and bryophytes ([www.apis.ac.uk](http://www.apis.ac.uk)) – 12/01/18.

#### Ammonia assessment – LWS and 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 (AST, version 4.5) has indicated that emissions from Park Farm will only have a potential impact on the LWS and AW sites with a precautionary critical level of  $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  if they are within 826 m of the emission source.

Beyond 826 m the PC is less than  $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case 12 of the LWS and AW are beyond this distance (see table 9 below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

**Table 9 – LWS and AW Assessment**

Name of LWS/AW	Distance from site (m)
Thorington Road Meadows – LWS	1,490
Blackheath – LWS	1,821
Church Farm Meadows – LWS	1,550
Holly Hills Wood – LWS	963
Hinton Long Spring – LWS	1,552
Sillett's Wood – LWS	2,168
Bramfieldhall Wood – LWS	1,311
Sillett's Wood – AW	2,169
Hinton Long Spring – AW	1,552
Big/Common Woods – AW	1,042
Bramfieldhall Wood – AW	1,311
Hollyhill Wood – AW	963

Screening using the AST has determined that the PC on the LWS and AW shown in tables 10 and 11 for ammonia emissions and acid deposition from the application site are under the 100% significance threshold and can be screened out as having no likely significant effect. See results in tables below.

**Table 10 - Ammonia emissions**

Site	Critical level ammonia $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	Predicted PC $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	PC % of critical level
Big, Common and Haw Woods - LWS	3*	2.068	68.9
Unknown - AW	3*	2.062	68.7

\* CLe of  $3\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  applied as no protected lichen or bryophytes species were found when checking Easimap layer.

**Table 11 – Acid deposition**

Site	Critical load keq/ha/yr*	Predicted PC keq/ha/yr.	PC % of critical load
Big, Common and Haw Woods - LWS	2.768	0.767	27.7
Unknown - AW	2.768	0.765	27.6

\* Critical load values taken from APIS website ([www.apis.ac.uk](http://www.apis.ac.uk)) – 18/09/18

Screening using the AST indicates that the PC on the Big, Common and Haw Woods LWS and 'Unknown' AW for nitrogen deposition from Park Farm will be above the 100% threshold (see results in table 12 below). However, the results of the AST are conservative and provide a worst case scenario. Our Air Quality Monitoring and Assessment Unit (AQMAU) have undertaken check modelling with some conservative plume depletion which indicates that modelling would screen this PC out as under the 100% significance threshold.

As the PC is only marginally above the critical load, a risk based decision has been taken in this case and it has been concluded that there will be no likely damage to the LWS and AW as a result of this application. No further assessment is required.

**Table 12 – Nitrogen deposition**

Site	Critical load kg N/ha/yr. *	Predicted PC kg N/ha/yr.	PC % of critical load
Big, Common and Haw Woods - LWS	10	10.739	107.4
Unknown - AW	10	10.708	107.1

\* Critical load values taken from APIS website ([www.apis.ac.uk](http://www.apis.ac.uk)) – 18/09/18

## 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.
<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>• Health and Safety Executive</li> <li>• Local Planning Authority (Suffolk Coastal District Council)</li> <li>• Local Authority Environmental Health (Suffolk Coastal District Council)</li> </ul> <p>The comments from the Environmental Protection Team, Suffolk Coastal District Council and our responses are summarised in the <a href="#">consultation section</a>. Comments were not received from the other consultees.</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.
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>We have consulted Natural England on our Habitats Regulations assessments, and taken their comments into account in the permitting decision. The comments from Natural England are summarised in the <a href="#">consultation section</a>.</p>
<b>Environmental risk assessment</b>	
Environmental risk	<p>We have reviewed the Operator's assessment of the environmental risk from the facility.</p> <p>The Operator's risk assessment is satisfactory.</p>

Aspect considered	Decision
<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.</p> <p>The operating techniques that the Operator must use are specified in table S1.2 in the environmental permit.</p>
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 <a href="#">key issues</a> for further details.</p>
Noise management	<p>We have reviewed the noise management plan in accordance with our guidance on noise assessment and control.</p> <p>We consider that the noise management plan is satisfactory. See <a href="#">key issues</a> for further details.</p>
<b>Permit conditions</b>	
Updating permit conditions during consolidation	<p>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 permits.</p>
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>
Emission limits	<p>Emission limit values (ELVs) have been set for the following substances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• nitrogen (0.6 kg N/animal place/year);</li> <li>• phosphorous (0.25 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/animal place/year); and</li> <li>• ammonia (0.08 kg NH<sub>3</sub>/animal place/year).</li> </ul> <p>For existing housing, these ELVs will apply from 21/02/21.</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 implement the BAT Conclusions.</p>
Reporting	<p>We have specified reporting in the permit. We have made these decision in accordance with the relevant BAT Conclusions.</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>
<b>Growth duty</b>	
Section 108 Deregulation	<p>We have considered our duty to have regard to the desirability of promoting</p>

<b>Aspect considered</b>	<b>Decision</b>
Act 2015 – Growth duty	<p>economic growth set out in section 108(1) of the Deregulation Act 2015 and the guidance issued under section 110 of that Act in deciding whether to grant this permit.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.3 of the guidance says:</p> <p>“The primary role of regulators, in delivering regulation, is to achieve the 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>
Environmental Protection Team, Suffolk Coastal District Council
<b>Brief summary of issues raised</b>
No objections.
<b>Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered</b>
None required.

<b>Response received from</b>
Natural England
<b>Brief summary of issues raised</b>
Natural England raised concerns regarding the predicted emissions at the Minsmere to Walberswick Heaths and Marshes SAC, SPA and Ramsar nature conservation site. Natural England noted that critical loads for atmospheric nitrogen and ammonia deposition are already exceeded at this site and they advised a precautionary approach to allowing activities which would cause deterioration of the vegetation communities present.
<b>Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered</b>
We have assessed the predicted emissions from Park Farm and determined that these will be below the current threshold for atmospheric ammonia and ammonia deposition (acid and nitrogen) of 20% of the relevant critical level/load for SACs, SPAs and Ramsar sites. Though the modelling report provided by the Operator predicts a process contribution of 19% for ammonia on the SAC, we have audited this and concluded that 19% is likely to be an overestimation of emissions. A more representatively modelled process contribution would be above 4% but well below the 20% upper threshold. The Operator has also demonstrated that the new housing will be operated in accordance with present BAT. We have therefore determined that the proposal will not adversely affect the nature conservation site.