

Determination of an Application for an Environmental Permit under the Environmental Permitting (England & Wales) Regulations 2016

Decision document recording our decision-making process

The Permit Number is: EPR/YP3837JQ/A001
The Applicant / Operator is: HCF Poultry Limited.
The Installation is located at: Cullingworth, Bradford.

What this document is about

This is a decision document, which accompanies a permit.

It explains how we have considered the Applicant's Application, and why we have included the specific conditions in the permit we are proposing to issue to the Applicant. It is our record of our decision-making process, to show how we have taken into account all relevant factors in reaching our position. Unless the document explains otherwise, we have accepted the Applicant's proposals.

We try to explain our decision as accurately, comprehensively and plainly as possible. Achieving all three objectives is not always easy, and we would welcome any feedback as to how we might improve our decision documents in future. A lot of technical terms and acronyms are inevitable in a document of this nature: we provide a glossary of acronyms near the front of the document, for ease of reference.

Preliminary information and use of terms

We gave the application the reference number **EPR/YP3837JQ/A001**. We refer to the application as "the **Application**" in this document in order to be consistent.

The Application was duly made on **08/08/2018**.

The Applicant is **HCF Poultry Limited**. We refer to HCF Poultry Limited as "the **Applicant**" in this document. Where we are talking about what would happen after the permit is granted, we call HCF Poultry Limited "the **Operator**".

The HCF Poultry Limited facility is located at Station Yard, Station Road, Cullingworth, Bradford, BD13 5HP. We refer to this as "the **Installation**" in this document.

How this document is structured

- Glossary of acronyms
- Our proposed decision
- How we reached our decision
- The legal framework
- The Installation
 - Description of the Installation
 - The site and its protection
 - Operation of the Installation – general issues
- Key issues and assessment of BAT to minimise the environmental impacts
 - Key issue 1 – Odour
 - Key issue 2 – Noise and vibration
 - Key issue 3 – Point source emissions
- Assessing the impact of emissions on the environment and setting appropriate ELVs
 - Impact on Air Quality
 - Impact on Water Quality
 - Impact on Designated Sites
 - Monitoring
 - Reporting
- Other legal requirements
 - The EPR and related Directives
 - National primary legislation
 - National secondary legislation
- Annexes
 - Annex 1 – Improvement Conditions
 - Annex 2 - Consultation Responses

Glossary of acronyms used in this document

(Please note that this glossary is standard for our decision documents and therefore not all these acronyms are necessarily used in this document.)

AQS	<i>Air Quality Strategy</i>
BAT	<i>Best Available Technique(s)</i>
BAT-AEL	<i>BAT Associated Emission Level</i>
BREF	<i>BAT Reference Note</i>
DAA	<i>Directly associated activity – Additional activities necessary to be carried out to allow the principal activity to be carried out</i>
DD	<i>Decision document</i>
EAL	<i>Environmental assessment level</i>
ELV	<i>Emission limit value</i>
EMS	<i>Environmental Management System</i>
EPR	<i>Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 (SI 2016 No. 1154) as amended</i>
ES	<i>Environmental standard</i>
EU-ETS	<i>European Union Emissions Trading System</i>
HRA	<i>Habitats Risk Assessment</i>
IED	<i>Industrial Emissions Directive (2010/75/EU)</i>
NO _x	<i>Oxides of nitrogen (NO plus NO₂ expressed as NO₂)</i>
PC	<i>Process Contribution</i>
PEC	<i>Predicted Environmental Concentration</i>
PPS	<i>Public participation statement</i>
RGS	<i>Regulatory Guidance Series</i>
SAC	<i>Special Area of Conservation</i>
SHPI(s)	<i>Site(s) of High Public Interest</i>
SPA(s)	<i>Special Protection Area(s)</i>
SSSI(s)	<i>Site(s) of Special Scientific Interest</i>

1 Our decision

We have decided to grant the Permit to the Applicant. This will allow them to operate the Installation, subject to the conditions in the permit.

We consider that, in reaching that decision, we have taken into account all relevant considerations and legal requirements and that the permit will ensure that a high level of protection is provided for the environment and human health.

This Application is to operate an installation which is subject principally to the Industrial Emissions Directive (IED).

The permit contains many conditions taken from our standard Environmental Permit template including the relevant Annexes. We developed these conditions in consultation with industry, having regard to the legal requirements of the Environmental Permitting Regulations and other relevant legislation. This document does not therefore include an explanation for these standard conditions. Where they are included in the permit, we have considered the Application and accepted the details are sufficient and satisfactory to make the standard condition appropriate.

2 How we reached our decision

2.1 Receipt of Application

The Application was duly made on 08/08/2018. This means we considered it was in the correct form and contained sufficient information for us to begin our determination but not that it necessarily contained all the information we would need to complete that determination (see Section 2.3 below).

The Applicant is the sole Operator of the Installation.

We are satisfied that the Applicant is the person who will have control over the operation of the Installation after the granting of the Permit; and that the Applicant will be able to operate the Installation so as to comply with the conditions included in the Permit.

The Applicant made no claim for commercial confidentiality. We have not received any information in relation to the Application that appears to be confidential in relation to any party.

It should be noted that in May 2015, we refused an application for an environmental permit for this site, submitted by the same Applicant. This revised Application includes changes made since the previous application, such as:

- Enclosure of the static screen and DAF tank, to prevent the emission of fugitive odours.
- Resurfacing of the front yard, to minimise the noise impact from vehicles and prevent the ingress of pollutants to groundwater.
- Acoustic tiling and noise attenuation enclosures have been installed in blast chiller 5, to minimise the impact of noise from this plant.
- Skips for animal by-products and wastes on site have been covered and/or moved inside a building to prevent to risk of fugitive emissions.
- More robust written management systems and procedures are in place.
- More representative risk assessments have been undertaken.

In addition, as part of this application, the Applicant is proposing to replace the existing blood collection tank, with an integrally bunded tank of similar capacity (25m³). It will be fitted with a high level alarm, a cleaning in place (CIP) system, dedicated carbon filter and facility for the blood collection tanker to back vent via abatement. These features will minimise the fugitive emissions from the tank and comply with BAT.

Where we have identified that further improvements are needed, either through assessment of the Application, or through observations made during site visits, we have included these as improvement conditions.

2.2 Consultation on the Application

We carried out consultation on the Application in accordance with the EPR, our statutory PPS and our own internal guidance RGS Note 6 for Determinations involving Sites of High Public Interest. We consider that this process satisfies, and frequently goes beyond the requirements of the Aarhus Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, which are directly incorporated into the IED, which applies to the Installation and the Application. We have also taken into account our obligations under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (particularly Section 23). This requires us, where we consider it appropriate, to take such steps as we consider appropriate to secure the involvement of representatives of interested persons in the exercise of our functions, by providing them with information, consulting them or involving them in any other way. In this case, our consultation already satisfies the Act's requirements.

We advertised the Application by a notice placed on our website, which contained all the information required by the IED, including telling people where and when they could see a copy of the Application.

We also held a public drop-in event to discuss the proposal with the local community.

We made a copy of the Application and all other documents relevant to our determination available to view on our Public Register. Anyone wishing to see these documents could do so and arrange for copies to be made.

We sent copies of the Application to the following bodies, which includes those with whom we have "Working Together Agreements":

- Bradford City Council
- Public Health England
- Director of Public Health
- Yorkshire Water Services
- Health and Safety Executive

These are bodies whose expertise, democratic accountability and/or local knowledge make it appropriate for us to seek their views directly. Note under our Working Together Agreement with Natural England, we only inform Natural England of the results of our assessment of the impact of the installation on designated Habitats sites.

Further details along with a summary of consultation comments and our response to the representations we received can be found in Annex 2A.

We have taken all relevant representations into consideration in reaching our determination.

2.3 Requests for Further Information

Although we were able to consider the Application duly made, we did in fact need more information in order to determine it, and issued an information request on 07/02/2019. A copy of the information request was placed on our public register.

The information request concentrated on seeking clarity on some aspects of the controls in place within the odour and noise management plans.

We also requested further information regarding the proposed blood tank and the existing odour abatement system, as well as information regarding compliance with the trade effluent consent for the site, issued by Yorkshire Water Services Limited.

These responses were placed on the public register.

Finally, we have consulted on our draft decision from 05/07/19 to 02/08/19. A summary of the consultation responses and how we have taken into account all relevant representations is shown in Annex 2B.

3 The legal framework

The permit will be granted under Regulation 13 of the EPR. The Environmental Permitting regime is a legal vehicle which delivers most of the relevant legal requirements for activities falling within its scope. In particular, the regulated facility is an *Installation* as described by the IED.

We address some of the major legal requirements directly where relevant in the body of this document. Other requirements are covered in a section towards the end of this document.

We consider that, if we grant, the permit, it will ensure that the operation of the Installation complies with all relevant legal requirements and that a high level of protection will be delivered for the environment and human health.

We explain how we have addressed specific statutory requirements more fully in the rest of this document.

4 The Installation

4.1 Description of the Installation

4.1.1 The permitted activities

The Installation is subject to the IED because it carries out the following activities listed in Part 1 of Schedule 1 to the EPR:

- Section 6.8 Part A(1)(b) - Slaughtering animals at a plant with a carcass production capacity of more than 50 tonnes per day.
- Section 5.4 Part A(1)(a)(ii) - Disposal of non-hazardous waste with a capacity exceeding 50 tonnes per day involving physico-chemical treatment.

An Installation may also comprise “directly associated activities”, which at this Installation includes activities such as the operation of plant to generate steam and plant to provide chilling and refrigeration. These activities comprise one installation, because the generation of steam and the operation of chilling/refrigeration plant form part of an integrated activity. Together, these listed and directly associated activities comprise the Installation.

4.1.2 The Site

Station Yard is located off Station Road in Cullingworth, Bradford (the site is centred at NGR SE 06446 36647). The area directly surrounding the Installation is largely residential, with some agricultural land to the West. Cullingworth Village School is approx. 110 metres to the South East of the site.

Ellar Carr Beck is approx. 340m to the North, with Manywells Beck approx. 290m to the South. Both these Becks are tributaries of Harden Beck, which runs into the River Aire.

The South Pennines Moors Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and South Pennines Moors Phase 2 Special Protection Area (SPA) are within 10km of the Installation.

The Applicant submitted a plan which we consider is satisfactory, showing the site of the Installation and its extent. A plan is included in Schedule 7 to the Permit, and the Operator is required to carry on the permitted activities within the site boundary.

Further information on the site and its protection is described in Section 4.2

4.1.3 What the Installation does

The Installation takes in end of lay hens, broiler breeders and cockerels for slaughtering. Slaughtered poultry is cut into breast, leg and wing portions. Portioned product is refrigerated to customer specification and sent for despatch.

The facility has no planning constraints in place for operational hours, but the main shift patterns are 7am-5pm (Monday to Saturday).

The main processes at the Installation are:

Bird receipt and lairage

Live birds are delivered to the outside yard area located to the rear of the plant in articulated lorry trailers that carry twenty modules of ten crates in which the birds are accommodated. Modules are unloaded by forklift truck to the covered lairage area and then onto the mechanical handling system and transported to the stun equipment via a conveyor system. The trailer is immediately washed and sanitised in line with site cleaning procedures.

Stunning/Killing

The birds are conveyed to an underground tank for a controlled atmosphere stunning or killing (CAS or CAK). The birds are immersed in an atmosphere which lacks oxygen and consists of an asphyxiant gas; here CO₂ is used. Consciousness is quickly lost before death.

Hang-on

Post CAS/CAK birds are hung by the feet from shackles on a continuous overhead chain system prior to bleeding.

Bleeding

The dead birds pass through a rotating circular blade and are bled over a blood collection trough. Bleed times are in line with BAT. The blood is then pumped to the blood tank outside the offal collection bay. Collection in this manner minimises the volume of blood that is spilled onto the floor of the area that would subsequently be discharged to the effluent treatment plant during washdown. Blood is pumped from the blood collection point to a blood collection tank at a maximum rate of 530 litres per minute.

De-feathering

The birds pass through a scald tank containing hot water, in order to soften the feathers for de-feathering. The scald tank is a multi-chambered unit and operates on a counter-current basis to minimise water use and effluent production. This system uses steam heating of the water tank to provide scald water at 52°C. The scald system includes condensate return of the steam back into the boiler feed. The birds are then de-feathered by rotating rubber flails, with the feathers dropping into a water flume system for collection and recovery as animal by-product.

Evisceration/Cutting

After de-feathering the birds are eviscerated and their crops and necks are removed. Both operations are carried out automatically and the prepared bird, together with its viscera is presented for post-mortem inspection by a Food Standards Agency (FSA) Veterinarian. Any birds failing this inspection are placed in dedicated receptacles for disposal as animal by-products. Birds passing this inspection are matured in a water spin chill prior to entering a chilled room before going for cutting or packaging. The carcass is cut into the defined product requirements (breast, wings, and legs) and then packaged in accordance with food hygiene and customer requirements.

Mechanical meat recovery

To enhance the yield of product from birds selected for cutting and portioning, the installation uses a mechanical meat recovery process. Carcasses from the cutting lines are fed into equipment which crush and grind to recover the available meat from the carcass. The resulting meat is sold for use in food products, such as sausages and the residual "bone-cake" is despatched as Category 3 animal by-product for processing at an approved premises. The use of a recovery process to maximise yields is an element in the Installation's waste minimisation programme. This process operates at less than 75 tonnes per day and, as such, is not an additional listed activity.

Packaging and despatch

Whole carcasses and portions can be despatched either chilled or frozen depending on market requirements. Freezing is achieved in an air-blast freezer. The products are packaged in plastic wraps and plastic trays in accordance with meat hygiene requirements. Wrapped product is then despatched by road transport.

Collection and removal of animal by-products (ABP)

All slaughterhouses and meat production facilities are required to comply with legislation on animal by-products, in particular (EC) No 1069/2009. These regulations require animal by-products to be collected, retained and sent for approved disposal or re-use.

Birds that are dead on arrival, inedible offal (heads, viscera, feathers and other waste poultry flesh) and solid waste filtered from the drainage system are stored in skips or trailers in the offal collection area prior to collection for rendering at a licensed off-site facility. Blood pumped from the collection troughs in the kill and bleed area is stored in a tank located outside the offal collection bay prior to collection by tanker for off-site disposal at a licensed rendering facility.

Ancillary processes and equipment

Tray Wash Facility

The site minimises packaging waste by the use of re-useable plastic trays for the transport of products. For hygiene reasons these trays must be cleaned before re-use. This is done in a dedicated tray wash area. Empty trays are collected and manually loaded into an automated tray washer and are conveyed through on a roller system. In the washer the trays are washed with hot water, detergents and rinse agents.

The tray wash unit is fitted with a water sump which allows the recycling of water to minimise water and energy use and reduce effluent production. Cleaned trays are returned to the production line.

Washing and Cleaning

The cleaning regime on site is in accordance with FSA requirements and kept under constant monitoring and review, with changes being implemented as they become necessary. Cleaning follows the basic process of:

- Clean as you go (production staff pick up gross debris from the floor during the working day and put into designated bins). Product lines will be cleaned as necessary during production runs.
- After production finishes a team of specialist cleaners come in to clean the necessary parts of the factory.

In line with food hygiene requirements, there are 5 steriliser baths each with its own electric water heater, for the disinfection of knives and cutting tools. The required temperature of hot water is supplied to the production area from the on-site water heaters. Cleaning chemicals and quantities/concentrations used are chosen via an assessment of their effectiveness and their food safety properties. In line with BAT requirements, all hand wash stations are “water-off” by default and require continued, positive operator action to maintain water flow.

Effluent Treatment

The facility collects and treats all effluents from process related operations. The impermeable, sealed floors within the production areas are fitted with 10mm mesh floor grates. These act to keep solids from entering the drainage system in line with BAT requirements for food production facilities. The effluent is then discharged to the effluent drainage system and is treated on-site prior to discharge off site to Yorkshire Water foul sewer. The effluent treatment system comprises the following steps:

– Effluent sump/pit

Process effluent is discharged to an underground effluent sump/pit, which holds approximately 3.4 m³ of effluent and is constructed of concrete. Process effluent comprises waste water from production, process area cleaning, tray wash, vehicle washing, yard washing and water filter backwash. From the sump/pit, the effluent is pumped into the effluent treatment system. The pump within the effluent sump/pit is on a float switch control.

– Effluent screen

The effluent is pumped via a 3mm screen to remove Animal By-products in compliance with ABP regulations and the screen prevents excessive solids loadings entering the ETP and encourages the segregation of solid wastes. The solids are transferred into a dedicated container and removed off site as Category 2 ABP.

– Effluent Treatment Plant (ETP)

From the screen, the effluent is pumped into the Dissolved Air Flotation (DAF) unit for treatment to remove any remaining solids within the effluent before the final discharge. From the DAF tank, effluent is discharged direct to Yorkshire Water Services sewer. The DAF system is fitted with polymer and ferric chloride dosing to aid the DAF process. The processed effluent is discharged via a composite sampler and flow meter before it leaves site. Routine analysis

is undertaken by Yorkshire Water Services to ensure compliance with the trade effluent consent issued by them. The sludge from the DAF plant is stored in a tank prior to removal off site as a waste stream.

Refrigeration systems

The site has a number of refrigeration systems dedicated to specific areas of the site, which are serviced as appropriate. The systems with greater than 3kg charge are serviced either by suitably qualified site engineers or under contract by an appointed refrigeration engineer. This includes planned and unplanned/reactive works, as necessary. Site engineers perform checks on the plant on a routine basis to ensure that leaks are not occurring, equipment is functioning correctly and emergency situations do not arise. This ensures that every refrigeration system is checked in compliance with current regulations.

Also, the R404 refrigerant is being systematically replaced by R407 refrigerant and will have been completely replaced by the 1st January 2020 deadline, in accordance with F-Gas Regulations.

Boilers

Heat for the production of steam and hot water is generated in two boilers. Hot water is pumped around a ring main system and supplies the killing rooms, cutting rooms, sterilisers, by-product process rooms and tray washing.

Compressors and pumps

The site utilises compressors on the refrigeration plant and to provide compressed air for the site. Vacuum pumps are utilised on site to supply the production processes. The site engineers carry out regular checks which supplement the main service check and breakdown cover. All equipment is further maintained by either specialist contractors and/or the site engineers and forms part of the planned preventative maintenance systems on site.

Local extraction and ventilation systems

The production halls are provided with ventilation and extraction via an air handling unit.

Vehicle wash

Vehicle washing of poultry delivery vehicles is undertaken on site. This comprises dry clean removal of solids to a dedicated bin, followed by immediate jet washing and sanitisation of the vehicle. Effluent from the vehicle wash is discharged to the on-site effluent treatment plant.

Maintenance

Site engineers are responsible for undertaking the maintenance activities on site. Maintenance will take the form of reactive maintenance (reacting to breakdowns) and planned preventative maintenance (to attempt to reduce breakdowns/down time). The site utilises a system to log all items of equipment that require planned preventative maintenance on site and produces work logs for the engineers to ensure that those items requiring maintenance are adequately addressed. Where appropriate, the site employ suitably qualified contractors to undertake specialised items of maintenance.

4.2 The site and its protection

4.2.1 Site setting, layout and history

The site covers an area of approximately 0.67 hectares within a predominantly rural residential setting.

The site was previously the site of Cullingworth Railway Station and associated train lines. The line ceased to operate in the 1950s and following dismantling of the train track, a poultry abattoir was developed on the site from the 1980s onwards.

4.2.2 Site design: potentially polluting substances and prevention measures

The Applicant has submitted a site condition report which includes a report on the baseline conditions as required by Article 22 of the IED. We have reviewed that report and consider that it adequately describes the condition of the soil and groundwater prior to the start of permitted operations.

The baseline report is an important reference document in the assessment of contamination that might arise during the operational lifetime of the Installation and at cessation of activities at the Installation.

4.3 Operation of the Installation – general issues

4.3.1 General Management

The site operates under an in-house Environmental Management System (EMS), which includes a policy to wholly support and comply with the requirements of current environmental legislation and codes of practice. There is also a commitment to minimise waste and reuse or recycle, and minimise energy and water usage. The Operator will also apply the principles of continuous improvement in respect of air, water, noise and light pollution from the premises and reduce any impacts from operations on the environment and local community.

The EMS also includes a commitment to ensure all employees understand the management system and environmental policy, and conform to the high standards they require. The Operator will also ensure that they address any complaints about any breach of their management system and environmental policy promptly and to the satisfaction of all concerned.

Except where we have specified in the improvement conditions and process monitoring requirements, we are satisfied that appropriate management systems and management structures will be in place for this Installation, and that sufficient resources are available to the Operator to ensure compliance with the permit conditions.

4.3.2 Operating techniques

We have specified that the Applicant must operate the Installation in accordance with the following documents contained in the Application:

Description	Parts Included	Justification
Application	Accident Management Plan	Details the procedures during incidents and identified non-conformities, procedures for spills and loss of containment and procedures during emergencies, including fire.
	BAT Assessment	Details site specific operational information of how BAT is met, in particular management of drainage, wastes, housekeeping, energy efficiency and emissions control.
	Installations Report	Details the operations in more detail, provides full plant details, materials and emissions inventory including refrigerants, cleaning chemicals, waste streams and ABP. Maintenance schedule also included.
	Environmental Risk Assessment	Details risks during normal and abnormal operations, identifies relevant receptors and the risks thereto. Summarises key risk management controls, linking to management systems. Quantifies aerial emissions. Demonstrates compliance with Oil Storage requirements.
	Noise Management Plan (NMP)	Details nearby receptors in proximity. Provides an inventory of noise sources and the protection measures in place. Details noise monitoring, complaints procedures and community engagement.
RFI response	(Revised) Odour Management Plan (OMP)	Details nearby receptors in proximity. Provides an inventory of odour sources and the protection measures in place including contingency arrangements. Details odour monitoring, complaints procedures and community engagement.
	NMP Noise Source Spreadsheet addendum	Provides location and noise power ratings of relevant plant on site.

The details set out above describe the techniques that will be used for the operation of the Installation that have been assessed by the Environment Agency; they form part of the permit through permit condition 2.3.1 and Table S1.2 in the Permit Schedules.

5 Key issues and the assessment of BAT to minimise the environmental impacts

Regulated activities can present different types of risk to the environment. These include odour, noise and vibration; fugitive emissions to air and water; as well as point source releases to air and direct discharges to ground or water. All these factors are discussed in this and other sections of this document.

The next sections of this document explains how we have approached the critical issue of assessing the likely impact of the emissions from the Installation on amenity and the environment, and what measures we are requiring to ensure a high level of protection.

We have used the following technical guidance notes, best practice guides and sector specific reference documents to identify key applied BAT requirements:

- European Commission IPPC Reference Document on Best Available Techniques in the Slaughterhouses and Animal By-products Industries (May 2005).
- Environment Agency Supplementary Odour Guidance for abattoirs and poultry processors (June 2010).

5.1 Key issue 1 - Odour

The site is a potentially significant source of odour from point source and fugitive emissions by the nature of the activities undertaken at the installation. The site is in close proximity to human receptors and has been the source of odour complaints in the past. Our approach is that BAT requirements embed the hierarchy of preventing, minimising, and capturing and treating odours to ensure the Operator takes all reasonable steps to minimise the risk of odour pollution. The application of BAT together with the implementation of a robust management system and Odour Management Plan (OMP) ensures that the risks are minimised as far as reasonably practicable.

5.1.1 Odour modelling and assessment.

The Applicant provided an air dispersion modelling report undertaken by AS Modelling and Data Limited using ADMS 5.2, to quantitatively assess the odour impacts from the scald tank emission point, which is the only point source emission of odour.

We have assessed the model and decided that it is sufficient to use for permit determination.

The results of the assessment establish a baseline for the Installation.

Based on the most realistic scenario, the applicant can achieve odour concentrations below the relevant benchmark standard of $30\mu\text{E}/\text{m}^3$ as per our H4 Odour Guidance.

However, this conclusion is based on point source emissions only and does not consider any further sources of odour from the site, as fugitive emissions are difficult to quantify.

As there have historically been odour issues from the site, the modelling results demonstrates that fugitive odour sources are likely to significantly contribute to the causes of complaints.

As a result, it is important that any fugitive emissions from the installation are controlled and minimised through the application of BAT. Additional protection measures are secured through the improvement conditions.

5.1.2 Key BAT requirements to minimise and prevent odorous emissions

The Applicant provided a full BAT assessment in support of their Application.

We have assessed the Application to ensure the operator can comply with the appropriate requirements. These requirements are embedded into the Permit through the permit conditions (including any improvement conditions), operating techniques, EMS and OMP.

Key BAT requirements	How this is achieved
Implement an effective OMP to identify all potential sources of odour and the control measures needed during normal and abnormal operation.	<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.</p> <p>The OMP is embedded into the permit through the operating techniques.</p>
Operating procedures should include odour control measures.	Odour is a key consideration and odour control measures are included in the operating techniques referred to in Section 4.3.2 of this document.
Staff training and awareness of odour issues is essential.	This is a key consideration of the OMP and EMS.
Housekeeping and maintenance standards need to be high in areas where odour can arise.	This is a key requirement of the OMP and EMS.
Store ABP in covered skips.	Animal by-products are stored in covered skips as detailed in "BAT Assessment" document.
Collect ABP daily to minimise odour potential.	Animal by-products are collected daily as detailed in "BAT Assessment" document.
Wash down floors/yard in storage area regularly.	Yard and floors are washed continuously during processing and each night as detailed in "BAT Assessment" document.

We are satisfied that the outcome of the quantitative assessment, the application of BAT and the controls in place at the Installation, together with the improvement programme requirements will ensure that the Applicant can comply with permit condition 3.3.1.

5.2 Key issue 2 - Noise and vibration

There is the potential for amenity issues arising from noise and vibration from this Installation, based on the nature of the permitted activities.

5.2.1 Noise impact assessment.

As part of this permit application, the Applicant provided a quantitative noise impact assessment, having undertaken noise monitoring at a representative proxy location to establish a background noise level. In accordance with BS4142, this is an acceptable method if the installation cannot be “switched off”. The survey establishes an observed (measured) daytime background noise level of 44 dB LA90 and night time background noise level of 40 dB LA90. This is within the usual range for a rural location.

The survey also includes monitoring of the noise levels whilst the site is running. This presented an observed (measured) noise level +1 dBA above the night-time background at sensitive locations. This is below the level which is likely to cause nuisance in accordance with our H3 Noise Guidance. The source of noise at night is from refrigeration plant, which must operate continuously.

The results of the assessment establish a baseline for the Installation.

We also asked the operator to provide sound power ratings of the noise sources on site and embed this into the Noise Management Plan. This data confirms that blast chiller 5 is the piece of plant which is most likely to cause an impact, based on the power rating and proximity to sensitive receptors. Blast chiller 5 is fitted with noise attenuation equipment to minimise the impacts.

As a result, it is important that the operator regularly monitors and maintains plant and attenuation equipment to ensure noise is kept below acceptable levels from these sources. In addition, the operator needs to ensure that noisy activities are not undertaken during night time hours. These requirements are controlled through the application of BAT, the permit conditions, EMS and Noise Management Plan (NMP).

5.2.2 Key BAT requirements to minimise and prevent odorous emissions

The following key BAT requirements in terms of noise management are demonstrated as follows:

Key BAT requirements	How this is achieved
Implement a noise management system	<p>We have reviewed the noise management plan in accordance with our guidance on noise management.</p> <p>We consider that the management plan is satisfactory.</p> <p>The NMP is embedded into the permit through the operating techniques.</p>
Reduce noise at source	<p>Attenuation is in place where required. The operating techniques embedded into the permit will ensure that these attenuation measures are contained.</p>

We are satisfied that the outcome of the quantitative assessment, the application of BAT and the controls in place at the Installation will ensure that the Applicant can comply with Permit Condition 3.4.1.

5.3 Key issue 3 - Point source emissions

5.3.1 Point source emissions to air

There are three main point source emissions to air on this site, as follows:

A1 – Natural gas fired 3MWth boiler (Duty)

A2 – Gas oil fired 2.5MWth boiler (Duty/Stand-by)

A3 – Scald tank (via scrubber unit).

The main impacts from emissions are the gaseous products of combustion (A1 and A2) and odour (A3). The assessment of the impact of the boiler emissions on air quality is set out in Section 6.1 of this document below, whilst our assessment of the odour impacts from the scald tank is in Section 5.1 above.

5.2.2 Point source emissions to water and sewer

There are two point source emissions to sewer only on this site, as follows:

S1 – Discharge of clean and uncontaminated surface water run-off to sewer.

S2 – Discharge of treated process effluent to sewer.

There are no direct point source emissions to controlled waters.

The assessment of the impact of point source emissions on the objectives of the Water Framework Directive is set out in Section 6.2 of this document.

5.2.3 Point source emissions to groundwater.

There are no point source emissions to groundwater. This is considered to be BAT for this sector.

6. Assessing the impact of emissions on the environment and setting appropriate ELVs.

6.1 Impact on Air Quality

6.1.1 Our Assessment Methodology

A methodology for risk assessment of point source emissions to air, which we use to assess the risk of applications we receive for permits, is set out in our guidance 'Air emissions risk assessment for your environmental permit' and has the following steps:

- Describe emissions and receptors
- Calculate process contributions
- Screen out insignificant emissions that do not warrant further investigation
- Decide if detailed air modelling is needed
- Assess emissions against relevant standards
- Summarise the effects of emissions

The methodology uses a concept of “process contribution (PC)”, which is the estimated concentration of emitted substances after dispersion into the receiving environmental media at the point where the magnitude of the concentration is greatest. The methodology provides a simple method of calculating PC primarily for screening purposes and for estimating process contributions where environmental consequences are relatively low. It is based on using dispersion factors. These factors assume worst case dispersion conditions with no allowance made for thermal or momentum plume rise and so the process contributions calculated are likely to be an overestimate of the actual maximum concentrations. More accurate calculation of process contributions can be achieved by mathematical dispersion models, which take into account relevant parameters of the release and surrounding conditions, including local meteorology – these techniques are expensive but normally lead to a lower prediction of PC.

PCs are considered **Insignificant** if:

- the **long-term** process contribution is less than **1%** of the relevant ES; and
- the **short-term** process contribution is less than **10%** of the relevant ES.

The **long term** 1% process contribution insignificance threshold is based on the judgements that:

- It is unlikely that an emission at this level will make a significant contribution to air quality;
- The threshold provides a substantial safety margin to protect health and the environment.

The **short term** 10% process contribution insignificance threshold is based on the judgements that:

- spatial and temporal conditions mean that short term process contributions are transient and limited in comparison with long term process contributions;
- the threshold provides a substantial safety margin to protect health and the environment.

Where an emission is screened out in this way, we would normally consider that the Applicant's proposals for the prevention and control of the emission to be BAT. That is because if the impact of the emission is already insignificant, it follows that any further reduction in this emission will also be insignificant.

However, where an emission cannot be screened out as insignificant, it does not mean it will necessarily be significant.

For those pollutants which do not screen out as insignificant, we determine whether exceedences of the relevant ES are likely. Where an exceedance of an Ambient Air Quality Directive (AAD) limit value is identified, we may require the Applicant to go beyond what would normally be considered BAT for the Installation or we may refuse the application if the applicant is unable to provide suitable proposals. Whether or not exceedences are considered likely, the application is subject to the requirement to operate in accordance with BAT.

This is not the end of the risk assessment, because we also take into account local factors (for example, particularly sensitive receptors nearby such as a SSSIs, SACs or SPAs). These additional factors may also lead us to include more stringent conditions than BAT.

If, as a result of reviewing the risk assessment and taking account of any additional techniques that could be applied to limit emissions, we consider that emissions **would cause significant pollution**, we would refuse the Application.

6.1.2 The Applicants Assessment

The Applicant's assessment of the impact of air quality is set out in Section 6.1 of the Environmental Risk Assessment (Document Reference HCF-ERA/0) submitted by the applicant in support of the Application. The assessment comprises a screening assessment of emissions to air from the operation of the two boilers, using the H1 methodology. We are satisfied that the main pollutants have been identified. The results of this assessment are presented in the table below.

Pollutant	ES / EAL (µg/m ³)	Back-ground (µg/m ³)	Process Contribution (PC) (µg/m ³)	PC as % of ES	Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC) (µg/m ³)	PEC as % ES
Predicted short term impact						
NO ₂	200	21.2	38.4	19.2	59.6	29.8
PM ₁₀	50	15.4	1.8	3.6	N/A	--
CO	10	--	76.7	0.77	N/A	--
SO ₂	350	--	1.5	0.43	N/A	--
Predicted long term impacts						
NO ₂	40	10.6	2.3	5.75	12.9	32.25
PM ₁₀	48	7.7	0.1	0.255	N/A	--
CO ⁽¹⁾	--	--	--	--	--	--
SO ₂	125	--	0.9	0.72	N/A	--

(1) There is no long term standard for Carbon Monoxide

6.1.3 Our Assessment of the results

(i) Screening out emissions which are insignificant

From the tables above the following emissions can be screened out as insignificant in that the process contribution is < 1% of the long term ES and <10% of the short term ES. These are:

- Particulate matter
- Carbon monoxide
- Sulphur dioxide

Therefore we consider the Applicant's proposals for preventing and minimising the emissions of these substances to be BAT for the Installation.

(ii) Emissions unlikely to give rise to significant pollution

Also from the tables above the following emissions (which were not screened out as insignificant) have been assessed as being unlikely to give rise to significant pollution in that the predicted environmental concentration is less than 100% of both the long term and short term ES.

- *Nitrogen Dioxide*

For these emissions, we have assessed the Applicant's proposals to ensure that they are applying the Best Available Techniques to prevent and minimise emissions of these substances.

(iii) Emissions requiring further assessment

There are no emissions which require further assessment. All emissions either screen out as insignificant or where they do not screen out as insignificant are considered unlikely to give rise to significant pollution.

6.1.4 Setting ELVs for emissions to air from combustion plant

When setting ELVs for combustion plant, we must consider the requirements of the IED. Chapter III requirements are not applicable for this Installation due to the size of the combustion plant (including consideration for the aggregation rule). Therefore, the relevant ELVs are found in the Medium Combustion Plant Directive (MCPD). Based on the size, the mandatory limits as set out in the Medium Combustion Plant Directive (MCPD) will not apply to this existing plant until 2030.

These limits will be imposed in a timely manner when the permit is reviewed, or relevant limits applied as a result of a permit variation (when the plant is replaced or substantially refurbished).

6.2 Impact on Water Quality

6.2.1 Our Assessment Methodology

The discharge to sewer arising from the effluent treatment plant is unlikely to contain any significant quantities of hazardous pollutants and as such, a quantitative screening assessment of the effluent is not required. In addition we would not expect Applicants to undertake an assessment of the organic (sanitary) pollutants for a direct discharge to sewer. These decisions are in accordance with our H1 Annex D1 and Annex D2 guidance.

The discharge is subject to further treatment at the sewage treatment works. The Statutory Undertaker has set appropriate limits through the Trade Effluent Consent to protect the works. The Trade Effluent Consent for this site, issued by Yorkshire Water Services Limited, contains the following limits.

Pollutant	Maximum concentration
COD concentration	3,000 mg/l
COD load	500 k/d
Settleable solids concentration	600 mg/l
Settleable solids load	100 kg/d

The operator also confirmed the screening arrangements that they have in place to prevent gross solids getting into the sewer system. These screening arrangements, upstream controls and treatment technology represent BAT.

These requirements are embedded into the permit through the operating techniques. This not only serves to ensure protection of the receiving environment, but will also serves to minimise the odours from the effluent when discharging into the sewer by ensuring good effluent quality and minimising the gross solids in the discharge.

6.2.1 Setting ELVs for emissions to sewer

There are currently no benchmark emission limits for direct discharges to sewer in this sector and we would not replicate the limits set in the trade effluent consent. Based on the effluent stream, treatment method and discharge route; we do not consider a need to set ELVs in the permit at this time.

6.3 Impact on Designated Sites

6.3.1 Sites Considered

There are no designated Habitats (i.e. Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas and Ramsar) sites, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, or non-statutory local wildlife and conservation sites located within 500 metres of the Installation.

This screening distance was determined by using the Agency's guidance 'AQTAG014: Guidance on identifying *'relevance'* for assessment under the Habitats Regulations for installations with combustion processes' to determine the appropriate screening distance based on the size of the plant.

In accordance with this guidance, this Installation is not considered *'relevant'* for assessment under the Environment Agency's procedures which cover the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994 (Habitats Regulations).

There are no other emissions from the installation, thus no detailed assessment of the effect of the releases from the installation on SACs, SPAs and Ramsar sites is considered necessary. This approach has been applied to SSSI's and other non-statutory conversation sites in accordance with our guidance.

6.4 Other Permit conditions

6.4.1 Monitoring

We have decided that monitoring should be carried out for the parameters listed in Schedule 3 using the methods and to the frequencies specified in those tables. These monitoring requirements have been included in order to ensure an annual assessment of the odour emissions against the emission concentrations presented in the odour risk assessment is undertaken. The data will also assist the Operator when reviewing and updating their Odour Management Plan.

For emissions to air, the methods for periodic monitoring are in accordance with the Environment Agency's Guidance M2 for monitoring of stack emissions to air.

For process monitoring, the methods for periodic monitoring are in accordance with what we would consider appropriate to ensure the efficient operation of relevant plant and equipment, and minimise fugitive emissions. These requirements have been included where they are not already routinely undertaken or included in the operating techniques.

Based on the information in the Application and the requirements set in the conditions of the permit we are satisfied that the Operator's techniques, personnel and equipment will have either MCERTS certification or MCERTS accreditation, as appropriate.

6.4.2 Reporting

We have specified the reporting requirements in Schedule 5 of the Permit either to meet the reporting requirements set out in the IED, or to ensure data is reported to enable timely review by the Environment Agency to ensure compliance with permit conditions and to monitor the efficiency of material use and energy recovery at the Installation.

7 Other legal requirements

In this section we explain how we have addressed other relevant legal requirements, to the extent that we have not addressed them elsewhere in this document.

7.1 The EPR 2016 and related Directives

The EPR delivers the requirements of a number of European and national laws.

7.1.1 Schedules 1 and 7 to the EPR 2016 – IED Directive

We address the requirements of the IED in the body of this document above.

7.1.3 Schedule 22 to the EPR 2016 – Water Framework and Groundwater Directives

To the extent that it might lead to a discharge of pollutants to groundwater (a “groundwater activity” under the EPR 2016), the Permit is subject to the requirements of Schedule 22, which delivers the requirements of EU Directives relating to pollution of groundwater. The Permit will require the taking of all necessary measures to prevent the input of any hazardous substances to groundwater, and to limit the input of non-hazardous pollutants into groundwater so as to ensure such pollutants do not cause pollution, and satisfies the requirements of Schedule 22.

No releases to groundwater from the Installation are permitted. The Permit also requires material storage areas to be designed and maintained to a high standard to prevent accidental releases.

7.1.4 Directive 2003/35/EC – The Public Participation Directive

Regulation 60 of the EPR 2016 requires the Environment Agency to prepare and publish a statement of its policies for complying with its public participation duties. We have published our public participation statement.

This Application has been consulted upon in line with this statement, as well as with our guidance RGS6 on Sites of High Public Interest, which addresses specifically extended consultation arrangements for determinations where public interest is particularly high. This satisfies the requirements of the Public Participation Directive.

Our decision in this case has been reached following a programme of public consultation on the original application. The way in which this has been done is set out in Section 2.2.

7.2 National primary legislation

7.2.1 **Environment Act 1995**

(i) Section 4 (Pursuit of Sustainable Development)

We are required to contribute towards achieving sustainable development, as considered appropriate by Ministers and set out in guidance issued to us. The Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs has issued *The Environment Agency's Objectives and Contribution to Sustainable Development: Statutory Guidance (December 2002)*. This document:

“provides guidance to the Agency on such matters as the formulation of approaches that the Agency should take to its work, decisions about priorities for the Agency and the allocation of resources. It is not directly applicable to individual regulatory decisions of the Agency”.

The Environment Agency considers that it has pursued the objectives set out in the Government's guidance, where relevant, and that there are no additional conditions that should be included in this Permit to take account of the Section 4 duty

In respect of regulation of industrial pollution through the EPR, the Guidance refers in particular to the objective of setting permit conditions *“in a consistent and proportionate fashion based on Best Available Techniques and taking into account all relevant matters...”*. The Environment Agency considers that it has pursued the objectives set out in the Government's guidance, where relevant, and that there are no additional conditions that should be included in this Permit to take account of the Section 4 duty.

(ii) Section 5 (Preventing or Minimising Effects of Pollution of the Environment)

We are satisfied that our pollution control powers have been exercised for the purpose of preventing or minimising, remedying or mitigating the effects of pollution.

(iii) Section 6(1) (Conservation Duties with Regard to Water)

We have a duty to the extent we consider it desirable generally to promote the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty and amenity of inland and coastal waters and the land associated with such waters, and the conservation of flora and fauna which are dependent on an aquatic environment.

We consider that no additional or different conditions are appropriate for this Permit.

(iv) Section 6(6) (Fisheries)

We have a duty to maintain, improve and develop fisheries of salmon, trout, eels, lampreys, smelt and freshwater fish.

We consider that no additional or different conditions are appropriate for this Permit.

(v) Section 7 (Pursuit of Conservation Objectives)

This places a duty on us, when considering any proposal relating to our functions, to have regard amongst other things to any effect which the proposals would have on sites of archaeological, architectural, or historic interest; the economic and social well-being of local communities in rural areas; and to take into account any effect which the proposals would have on the beauty or amenity of any rural area.

We considered whether we should impose any additional or different requirements in terms of our duty to have regard to the various conservation objectives set out in Section 7, but concluded that we should not.

(vi) Section 39 (Costs and Benefits)

We have a duty to take into account the likely costs and benefits of our decisions on the applications ('costs' being defined as including costs to the environment as well as any person). This duty, however, does not affect our obligation to discharge any duties imposed upon us in other legislative provisions.

In so far as relevant we consider that the costs that the permit may impose on the applicant are reasonable and proportionate in terms of the benefits it provides.

7.2.2 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.

(viii) Section 81 (National Air Quality Strategy)

We have had regard to the National Air Quality Strategy and consider that our decision complies with the Strategy, and that no additional or different conditions are appropriate for this Permit.

We have also had regard to the clean air strategy 2019 and consider that our decision complies with the Strategy, and that no additional or different conditions are appropriate for this Permit.

7.2.3 Human Rights Act 1998

We have considered potential interference with rights addressed by the European Convention on Human Rights in reaching our decision and consider that our decision is compatible with our duties under the Human Rights Act 1998. In particular, we have considered the right to life (Article 2), the right to a fair trial (Article 6), the right to respect for private and family life (Article 8) and the right to protection of property (Article 1, First Protocol). We do not believe that Convention rights are engaged in relation to this determination.

7.2.4 Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW 2000)

Section 85 of this Act imposes a duty on Environment Agency to have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty (AONB). There is no AONB which could be affected by the Installation.

7.2.5 Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981

Under section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 the Environment Agency has a duty to take reasonable steps to further the conservation and enhancement of the flora, fauna or geological or physiographical features by reason of which a site is of special scientific interest. Under section 28I the Environment Agency has a duty to consult Natural England in relation to any permit that is likely to damage SSSIs.

We assessed the Application and concluded that the Installation will not damage the special features of any SSSI for the reasons set out in Section 6.3.

7.2.6 Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006

Section 40 of this Act requires us to have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of our functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. We have done so and consider that no different or additional conditions in the Permit are required.

7.2.7 Countryside Act 1968

Section 11 imposes a duty on the Environment Agency to exercise its functions relating to any land, having regard to the desirability of conserving the natural beauty and amenity of the countryside including wildlife. We have done so and consider that no different or additional conditions in the Permit are required.

7.2.8 National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949

Section 11A and section 5(1) imposes a duty on the Environment Agency when exercising its functions in relation to land in a National Park, to have regard to the purposes of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the areas, and of promoting opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of National Parks by the public.

There is no National Park in proximity which could be affected by the Installation.

7.3 National secondary legislation

7.3.1 Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017

We have assessed the Application in accordance with guidance agreed jointly with Natural England and concluded that there will be no likely significant effect on any European Site.

7.3.2 Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) Regulations 2017

Consideration has been given to whether any additional requirements should be imposed in terms of the Environment Agency's duty under regulation 3 to secure compliance with the requirements of the Water Framework Directive and the EQS Directive through (inter alia) environmental permits, and its obligation in regulation 33 to have regard to the river basin management plan (RBMP) approved under regulation 31 and any supplementary plans prepared under regulation 32. However, it is felt that existing conditions are sufficient in this regard and no other appropriate requirements have been identified.

We are satisfied that granting this application with the conditions proposed would not cause the current status of the water body to deteriorate.

7.4 Other relevant legal requirements

7.4.1 **Duty to Involve**

S23 of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 require us where we consider it appropriate to take such steps as we consider appropriate to secure the involvement of interested persons in the exercise of our functions by providing them with information, consulting them or involving them in any other way. S24 requires us to have regard to any Secretary of State guidance as to how we should do that.

The way in which the Environment Agency has consulted with the public and other interested parties is set out in section 2.2 of this document. The way in which we have taken account of the representations we have received is set out in Annex 2A. Our public consultation duties are also set out in the EP Regulations, and our statutory Public Participation Statement, which implement the requirements of the Public Participation Directive. In addition to meeting our consultation responsibilities, we have also taken account of our guidance in Environment Agency Guidance Note RGS6 and the Environment Agency's Building Trust with Communities toolkit.

ANNEX 1: Improvement Conditions

Based in the information in the Application we consider that we need to set improvement conditions. These conditions are set out below:

Improvement programme requirements		
Reference	Requirement	Date
IC1a	<p>The operator shall install a new blood collection and storage tank. The design of the blood tank shall meet the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The tank shall be integrally banded. • The tank shall be located on an impermeable surface with sealed construction joints. • The tank shall have odour abatement comprising activated carbon filters, using two in series, with monitoring in between. • The operator shall employ controls to ensure the back venting of displaced road tanker air via abatement during tank emptying. • The tank shall have a cleaning in place system installed. • The tank shall have leak detection, high level alarms and overfill protection. • The tank shall be protected from impact. • The contents of the tank shall be protected from solar gain. 	Within 2 months of permit issue.
IC1b	<p>One month prior to installation of the tank, the operator shall provide the Environment Agency with full construction details, demonstrating how the above requirements will be met, for agreement in writing. The tank shall be installed in accordance with the agreed plan.</p>	1 month prior to completion of IC1a
IC1c	<p>All relevant written management systems shall be updated following installation of the new tank.</p>	Within 1 month of completion of IC1a

Improvement programme requirements		
Reference	Requirement	Date
IC2	<p>The operator shall submit to the Environment Agency a report undertaken by a suitably qualified engineer to demonstrate whether the enclosure around the effluent pit/sump is structurally sound and fit for purpose to prevent the emissions of fugitive odour.</p> <p>Where improvements are identified, the operator shall submit details, as part of the report, of the schedule of works for the improvements to be made, and shall implement those improvements in accordance with the written approval of the Environment Agency.</p> <p>Any improvement works shall be completed in accordance with the agreed plan.</p> <p>All relevant written management systems shall be updated within 1 month following completion of any improvement works.</p>	Within 6 months of permit issue
IC3	<p>In addition to the requirements in Table S3.1, the operator shall undertake monitoring of the odour concentrations (using method BS EN 13649) from emission point A3 during full operation under activity reference PR1.</p> <p>The operator shall provide to the Environment Agency a report which details the results of the odour monitoring undertaken to complete IC3, in comparison with the monitoring/modelling data used to undertake the impact assessment submitted in support of the permit application.</p> <p>Drawing on the conclusions of the comparison, the report shall review whether the emissions data used for the assessment was representative, and whether the dispersion stack remains adequate as the primary method of minimising the off-site odour impacts, or if an abatement system is required. The operator shall provide options for appropriate abatement, if required, and a schedule of works for instalment, for approval in writing by the Environment Agency.</p>	Within 6 months of permit issue.

	<p>Any improvement works shall be completed in accordance with the agreed plan.</p> <p>All relevant written management systems shall be updated within 1 month following completion of any improvement works.</p>	
--	---	--

IC1a-c has been imposed to ensure that a BAT compliant replacement blood collection and storage tank is installed. The installation of this tank will represent a significant improvement to the current situation, which comprises a single skinned tank with no odour abatement, cleaning in place or protection measures. The requirements of this condition are such that the risk of fugitive odour emissions from this source is minimised, as far as reasonably practicable.

IC2 has been imposed to ensure that the effluent pit/sump is sufficiently enclosed and the building integrity of the enclosure is structurally sound, so that the risk of fugitive odour emissions from this source is minimised, as far as reasonably practicable. This was identified as an area for future improvement during Environment Agency site visits.

IC3 has been imposed to ensure that the monitoring/modelling data provided in the impact assessment, in support of the application, is representative compared to actual operations, and to ensure the dispersion via the emission stack is the most appropriate method of reducing off-site odour impacts. The IC also secures necessary improvements should the odour impact be greater than predicted from this source.

ANNEX 2: Consultation Responses

A) Advertising and Consultation on the Application

The Application has been advertised and consulted upon in accordance with the Environment Agency's Public Participation Statement. The way in which this has been carried out along with the results of our consultation and how we have taken consultation responses into account in reaching our decision is summarised in this Annex. Copies of all consultation responses have been placed on the Environment Agency public register.

The Application was advertised on the Environment Agency website from 24/08/2018 to 5/10/2018. The Application was made available to view at the Environment Agency Public Register at Lateral House, Leeds.

We also held a public drop-in event on 14/09/2018 at Cullingworth Methodist Church.

The following statutory and non-statutory bodies were consulted on the duly made application:

- Bradford City Council
- Public Health England
- Director of Public Health
- Yorkshire Water Services Limited
- Health and Safety Executive

1) Consultation Responses from Statutory and Non-Statutory Bodies

Response Received from Bradford City Council	
Brief summary of key issues raised:	Summary of action taken / how this has been covered:
The Authority has received complaints concerning HCF Poultry Ltd dating back a number of years. The complaints have [mainly] been about odour from the factory. However, since 2016 there has been a gradual reduction in the number of complaints received about the operation of the plant. Enforcement notices have previously been served due to noise and rats. These notices were complied with.	Information taken into account during determination.
HCF Poultry occupy a long established B2 industrial premises on a former railway goods yard. There are no planning conditions restricting the type of industrial process or the operating hours.	No action necessary.

Response Received from Public Health England	
Brief summary of key issues raised:	Summary of action taken / how this has been covered:
Particulate fugitive emissions to air (e.g. from de-feathering) was screened out by the applicant. We recommend that the regulator is satisfied that such emissions are minimal and that adequate control measures are in place.	We are satisfied that adequate control measures are in place and that such emissions will not give rise to significant pollution of the environment or harm to human health.
The odour modelling considers output from a single stack, but does not consider fugitive emissions. It is recommended that the regulator be satisfied that fugitive odour emissions are minimal and do not affect the results of the odour modelling.	This is covered in Section 5.1 above.
The applicant has not proposed specific maximum holding times during routine operations, nor in the case of any equipment failure affecting processing operations.	The site is a Red Tractor approved facility. This scheme requires that <i>“systems must be in place to ensure that birds are held in the lairage for the minimum time possible (maximum of six hours)”</i> . In terms of abnormal operations, the OMP states that <i>“In the event of a failure of equipment at the plant preventing processing, arrangements are in place to delay the catching and dispatch of the birds from the farms supplying the plant and any birds in transit would be diverted to an alternative processing facility. This will prevent vehicles containing large numbers of potentially odorous live birds from backing up outside the plant in the event of a breakdown”</i> .

No responses were received from the Director of Public Health, Health and Safety Executive and Yorkshire Water Services.

2) Consultation Responses from Members of the Public and Community Organisations

We received 9 representations from members of the local community.

Brief summary of key issues raised:	Summary of action taken / how this has been covered:
Concerns raised regarding road safety, in particular, lack of footpath and speed limits/traffic restrictions not being adhered to.	Road safety concerns fall outside of the remit of the Environmental Permitting Regulations. Road traffic impacts are the purview of the local highways authority and matters relating to compliance with traffic restrictions are a police matter.
Concerns raised regarding the volume of traffic visiting the site.	The volume of traffic visiting the site falls outside of the remit of the Environmental Permitting Regulations.
Concerns raised regarding odour from the site.	We have addressed this in Section 5.1 and are satisfied that the Applicant will be able to comply with permit condition 3.3.1. The improvement programme will also contribute to further improvements to the control of odours at the site.
Concerns raised regarding odour from the sewers.	We have addressed this in Section 6.2
Commented that the site is too small for the operations.	In terms of development control, the size of the site is outside the remit of the Environmental Permitting Regulations. However, we would have consideration for this where the constraints of the site are such that it would prevent BAT being achieved. We have therefore had regard for this in the overall context of the application of BAT and are satisfied that there is adequate room to carry out the operations without causing significant pollution or harm to human health.
Concerns raised regarding the noise from the site, in particular, night-time noise from operations.	We have addressed this in Section 5.2.
Concerns raised regarding noise from vehicles visiting the site.	Noise from vehicle movements outside of the permitted boundary falls outside of the remit of the Environmental Permitting Regulations. Noise from vehicles on site has been taken into account.

Brief summary of key issues raised:	Summary of action taken / how this has been covered:
Commented that noise from “new fridge” is an issue at night.	In summer 2017, the Council served notice under the Environmental Protection Act 1990. This notice was complied with and the Applicant installed noise attenuation equipment on Blast Chiller 5. The impact of the noise from this piece of equipment has been addressed in Section 5.2 and we are satisfied that the Operator will be able to comply with permit condition 3.4.1.
Commented that odour from two roof fans from the “plucking room” have caused odour issues.	These fans were located near the defeathering room and have since been ducted to emission point A3. The impact of the emissions from Point A3 have been taken into consideration in Section 5.1.
Commented that pests are a problem at the site.	In summer 2017, the Council served a notice under the Prevention of Damage by Pests Act 1949. We have been informed that this notices was complied with, and we have not been made aware of any current issues at the site. We are satisfied that the Operator will be able to comply with permit condition 3.6.1.
Commented that the site operatives engage in inappropriate behaviour off-site.	Behaviour of operatives falls outside of the remit of the Environmental Permitting Regulations. However, the EMS covers the training and behaviours of operatives on site.

B) Advertising and Consultation on the Draft Decision

This section reports on the outcome of the public consultation on our draft decision carried out between 05/07/2019 and 02/08/2019.

a) Consultation Responses from Statutory and Non-Statutory Bodies

A response was received from Public Health England, who raised no further comment.

b) Representations from Local MP, Assembly Member (AM), Councillors and Parish / Town / Community Councils

No responses received.

c) Representations from Individual Members of the Public

One response was received from an individual member of the public, who raised the following issues:

Brief summary of key issues raised:	Summary of action taken / how this has been covered
Raised the issue that the Operator has not dealt with the current odour issues on site.	We have identified the improvements made by the Operator in Section 2.1 Annex 1 also sets out an improvement programme which will have to be made following grant of the permit. The issue of this permit brings the site into regulation, and the Operator must operate under the permit conditions.
Raised the issue that the site generates heavy traffic, which often speed.	These concerns were raised during the public consultation and are addressed in Annex 2A. It should be noted that there is no additional plant or equipment being installed at the site as a result of this permit application.
Raised the issue that the grant of the permit will lead to an increase in odour from the sewer.	There is no increase in the emissions to sewer as a result the issue of this permit. Emissions to sewer are primarily regulated by the Statutory Undertaker but there are also conditions in the permit to control the discharge from the installation.