Permitting decisions

Variation

We have decided to grant the variation for Hilltop Farm Poultry Unit operated by Noble Foods Limited.

The variation number is EPR/YP3632MC/V005.

We consider in reaching that decision we have taken into account all relevant considerations and legal requirements and that the permit will ensure that the appropriate level of environmental protection is provided.

Purpose of this document

This decision document provides a record of the decision making process. It summarises the decision making process in the decision checklist to show how all relevant factors have been taken in to account.

This decision document provides a record of the decision making process. It:

- highlights key issues in the determination
- summarises the decision making process in the decision checklist to show how all relevant factors have been taken into account

Unless the decision document specifies otherwise we have accepted the applicant's proposals.

Read the permitting decisions in conjunction with the environmental permit and the variation notice. The introductory note summarises what the variation covers.

Key issues of the decision

Industrial Emissions Directive (IED)

The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) (Amendment) Regulations 2013 were made on the 20 February 2013 and came into force on 27 February 2013. These Regulations transpose the requirements of the IED.

This permit implements the requirements of the European Union Directive on Industrial Emissions.

Groundwater and soil monitoring

As a result of the requirements of the Industrial Emissions Directive, all permits are now required to contain a condition relating to protection of soil, groundwater and groundwater monitoring. However, the Environment Agency's H5 Guidance states **that it is only necessary for the operator to take samples** of soil or groundwater and measure levels of contamination where there is evidence that there is, or could be existing contamination and:

- The environmental risk assessment has identified that the same contaminants are a particular hazard; or

- The environmental risk assessment has identified that the same contaminants are a hazard and the risk assessment has identified a possible pathway to land or groundwater.

H5 Guidance further states that it is **not essential for the Operator** to take samples of soil or groundwater and measure levels of contamination where:

- The environmental risk assessment identifies no hazards to land or groundwater; or
- Where the environmental risk assessment identifies only limited hazards to land and groundwater and there is no reason to believe that there could be historic contamination by those substances that present the hazard; or
- Where the environmental risk assessment identifies hazards to land and groundwater but there is evidence that there is no historic contamination by those substances that pose the hazard.

The site condition report (SCR) for Hilltop Farm Poultry Unit (dated 08/12/06) demonstrates that there are no hazards or likely pathway to land or groundwater and no historic contamination on site that may present a hazard from the same contaminants. **Therefore, on the basis of the risk assessment presented in the SCR, we accept that they have not provided base line reference data for the soil and groundwater at the site at this stage and although condition 3.1.3 is included in the permit no groundwater monitoring will be required.**

Odour

Intensive farming is by its nature a potentially odorous activity. This is recognised in our 'How to Comply with your Environmental Permit for Intensive Farming' EPR 6.09 guidance

(http://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/297084/geho0110brsb-e-e.pdf).

Condition 3.3 of the environmental permit reads as follows:

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

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

The risk assessment (OMP dated 15/08/2019) for the Installation provided in response to a Schedule 5 Notice (dated 25/07/2019) lists key potential risks of odour pollution beyond the Installation boundary. These activities are as follows:

- Livestock (poultry)
- Delivery and storage of compound animal feed
- Fallen stock
- Manure/ litter within the poultry sheds
- Storage of wastes
- Odours caused during process failures, fires or spillage of odorous materials

Odour Management Plan Review

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

There are several sensitive receptors within 400m of the site boundary which are as follows:

- Forest Farm ~18m south east of installation boundary
- Hilltop Bungalow ~24m east of installation boundary
- Carrowkeel ~64m east of installation boundary

- Nods Nook ~106m south east of installation boundary

The operator has identified the potential sources of odour (see above), as well as the potential risks and problems, detailed actions taken to minimise odour, and contingencies to minimise odour pollution. These measures include:

Livestock (poultry)

- Ventilation systems/ Electrical systems are maintained
- Standby Generator is on the farm to start upon interruption of electrical supply
- Standards of management of birds are audited under the IPPC and Lion Code audits.
- Training is provided for all staff undertaking bird welfare duties on the farm.
- Disease and Bio security arrangements are in place

Delivery and storage of compound animal feed

- Delivery vehicles / pipework are subject to inspections prior to use. All faulty equipment is taken out of service.
- Feed bins / auger / conveyance systems are an enclosed system and are subject to daily / weekly / monthly inspections, maintenance
- Spillage controls in place to remove unexpected release of feed

Fallen stock

- Standby Generator on the farm to start upon interruption of electrical supply.
- Standards of management of birds are audited.
- Training provided for staff undertaking bird welfare duties.
- Additional carcass waste removal company in place to ensure uninterrupted collection of fallen stock.

Manure/ litter within the poultry sheds

- Standards of management of birds are audited
- Training provided for staff undertaking bird welfare duties.
- Nipple drinkers used to ensure water contamination of litter is reduced and minimised

Storage of wastes

- All farm waste placed in either clear / black sealed bags
- All skips are secured upon use
- Collections twice weekly and sub-contractors in place if unable to attend site

Odours caused during process failures, fires or spillage of odorous materials

- Regular inspections of storage areas for stored materials.
- Bunds in place for all hazardous materials, diesel / chemicals etc.
- Staff trained in spillage control with adequate spill kits around the farm
- Trained fire wardens on the farm.
- Fire extinguishers in place for all farm buildings

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

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

Noise

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

Condition 3.4 of the Permit reads as follows:

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

There are sensitive receptors within 400 metres of the Installation boundary as stated in Odour section above. The Operator has provided a noise management plan (NMP) as part of the Application supporting documentation, and further details are provided in section 4.5.2 below.

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

- Noise generated from medium to large vehicles, delivering feed and chicks and collecting pullets
- Noise from lawn mowing/ strimming activities around the site
- Feed transfer from feed lorry to bins
- Operation of fans
- Maintenance activities carried out on the farm
- Start up of farm generator on a weekly basis for testing
- Noise from chickens during the growing period
- Noise created by farm personnel and visiting contractors

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

<u>Noise Management Plan Review</u>

Sensitive receptors as listed under 'Odour' section.

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

A noise management plan (NMP) has been provided by the operator) as part of the application supporting documentation (reference Noise Management Plan') (see 'Odour' section for distances of individual properties).

There is the potential for noise from the installation beyond the installation boundary. As long as the NMP is followed, the risk of noise beyond the installation boundary is considered unlikely to cause a nuisance.
The prevailing wind is from the south west indicating the receptors located to the north east of the installation would potentially be at the highest risk. There are no receptors to the north east of the installation boundary.

The operator has identified the receptors and are listed above. The operator has identified the potential sources of odour (see above), as well as the potential risks and problems, detailed actions taken to minimise noise, and contingencies to minimise noise pollution. These measures include:

- Deliveries of feed and fuel to be completed during working hours (07:00 – 18:00), catching of birds may take place between 18:00 – 22:00, however this will only occur at 16 week intervals and will still be outside te statutory nuisance times for noise. Vehicles will be driven slowly up the track and past local receptors. Vehicles will be switched off when stationary.
- Activities to be completed within working hours in order to reduce the likelihood of complaints. Mowing vehicle maintained in accordance with maintenance scheme. Daily checks completed on equipment before every use.
- Vehicles maintained under statutory requirements so any noise made is minimised by design and maintenance. Feed transfer to be completed in normal working hours to reduce the likelihood of nuisance.
- Fans are checked daily to ensure they are working effectively. Fans are maintained should any faults occur. The noise generated from the fans is considered to be low.
- Contractor inductions undertaken for all contractors. Maintenance activities to be undertaken in normal working hours so outside of the statutory nuisance hours for noise and where receptors are most sensitive to noise.
- Weekly test (of generator) completed at set intervals during normal working house. The generator is housed in its own building with louvers to reduce the noise produced.
- The noise generated by chickens cannot usually be heard until entering the rearing house itself. It is unlikely to be a source of nuisance.
- There will only usually be a small number of employees on sire at any one time. Staff will not make excessive noise due to disturbing the rearing pullets. Other contractors and catching personnel are required to carry out their work without shouting. No loud music is permitted on site

The NMP also provides a suitable procedure in the event of complaints in relation to noise.

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

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

Conclusion

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

Dust and Bio aerosols

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

There are 4 sensitive receptors within 100m of the Installation boundary, which are listed in the Odour section above.

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

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

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

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

Poultry Feed

- Feed bin silo system is totally enclosed. Storage is in 6 feed bins located around the farm, with enclosed conveyance and auger systems.
- Feed bin system is subject to checks and routine maintenance.
- Pre start checks are carried out to verify no leaks from the feed system are present prior to the augers / conveyors running.
- Spillages are cleaned up immediately to prevent further atmospheric dispersion.

Bedding material/ litter systems

- Bedding is supplied in bales to the farm rather than blown loose bedding.
- Bedding is applied internally to the poultry sheds floor.
- Bedding is monitored and audited during daily poultry shed checks by the farm staff.
- Extensive cleans at Turnaround are carried out for all poultry sheds in between flocks to remove all old bedding and litter.

Ventilation

- Ventilation for the poultry sheds is managed in accordance with bird age and local environment / temperature requirements.
- Ventilation systems are subject to checks and routine maintenance.
- Ventilation shrouds and hoods to help dissipate the dust are cleaned periodically to reduce proliferation of any dust external to the poultry sheds.
- Fully feathered birds are more tolerant to increased airflows that are required during summer months.

Waste disposal of spilled material

- All spills are cleaned up immediately to prevent dispersal by wind. Minimise source strength by means of low drop heights.
- Skip location to the north of the site away from the closest receptors in the south east of the site.

Vehicle Exhaust Emissions

- All spills are cleaned up immediately to prevent dispersal by wind. Minimise source strength by means of low drop heights.
- Skip location to the north of the site away from the closest receptors in the south east of the site.

Non road going machinery exhaust emissions –Tractor

- Regulatory controls and best-practice measures to minimise source strength, maintenance of the tractor.
- Tractor training for all staff that use the vehicle to minimise emissions through non aggressive driving techniques

Emissions for wheel wash aerosols – biosecurity measures (presence of legionella in cold water systems)

- Chlorinated mains water in use. There is no water storage onsite where legionella could proliferate.
- Wheel wash facilities are present on the farm at the entrance, via a knap sack to store the wheel wash cleaner.
- Quantities are so small when washing wheels that the emissions generated are of minimal / no concern

Emissions from washing down the poultry sheds between flocks (turnaround)

- Chlorinated mains water is used to assist in removing gross soiling / clean surfaces.
- Poultry shed wash facilities are undertaken by contractors to remove gross soiling.
- The run off is captured in wash water tanks during the cleaning down process and removed off site once completed

Conclusion

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

Ammonia

There are 0 Special Area(s) of Conservation (SAC), /Special Protection Area(s) (SPA), /Ramsar sites located within 5 kilometres of the installation. There are 3 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) located within 5 km of the installation. There are also 6 Local Wildlife Sites (LWS), /Ancient Woodlands (AW) and Local Nature Reserves (LNR) within 2 km of the installation.

Ammonia assessment – SSSI

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

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

Initial screening using the ammonia screening tool version 4.5 has indicated that emissions from Hilltop Farm will only have a potential impact on SSSI sites with a precautionary critical level of 1µg/m^3 if they are within 3084 metres of the emission source. Beyond 3084m the PC is less than 0.2µg/m^3 (i.e. less than 20% of the precautionary 1µg/m^3 critical level) and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case all SSSIs are beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

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

Table 1 – SSSI Assessment

Name of SSSI	Distance from site (m)
Newhall Reservoir Meadow	4624

Rainworth Lakes	3629
Rainworth Heath	3700

Ammonia assessment - LWS/AW/LNR

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

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

Initial screening using ammonia screening tool version 4.5 has indicated that emissions from Hilltop Farm will only have a potential impact on the LWS/AW/NNR sites with a precautionary critical level of 1µg/m^3 if they are within 1288 metres of the emission source.

Beyond 1288m the PC is less than 1µg/m^3 and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case the following LWS/AW/LNRs are beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

Table 2 – LWS/AW/LNR Assessment

Name of SAC/SPA/Ramsar	Distance from site (m)
Southwell Trail	2072
Blidworth Playing Field	1871
Farnsfield Disused Railway	1416
Rainworth Disused Railway	2092
Combs Wood	2109

Screening using the ammonia screening tool version 4.5 has determined that the PC on the LWS for ammonia emissions/nitrogen deposition/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 below.

Table 3 - Ammonia emissions

Site	Critical level ammonia µg/m^3	Predicted PC µg/m^3	PC % of critical level
Blidworth Colliery Soil	3*	1.014	33.8

* CLe 3 applied as no protected lichen or bryophytes species were found when checking Easimap layer

Table 4 – Nitrogen deposition

Site	Critical load kg N/ha/yr. *	Predicted PC kg N/ha/yr.	PC % of critical load
Blidworth Colliery Soil	10	5.268	52.7

* Critical load values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) – 26/07/19

Table 5 – Acid deposition

Site	Critical load keq/ha/yr*	Predicted PC keq/ha/yr.	PC % of critical load
Blidworth Colliery Soil	0.723	0.376	52

* Critical load values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) – 26/07/19

No further assessment is required.

Decision checklist

Aspect considered	Decision
Receipt of application	
Confidential information	A claim for commercial or industrial confidentiality has not been made.
Identifying confidential information	We have not identified information provided as part of the application that we consider to be confidential. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on confidentiality.
Consultation/Engagement	
Consultation	The consultation requirements were identified in accordance with the Environmental Permitting Regulations and our public participation statement. The application was publicised on the GOV.UK website. We consulted the following organisations: • Public Health England • Director of Public Health (Nottingham) • Health and Safety Executive • Environmental Health The comments and our responses are summarised in the consultation section.
The facility	
The regulated facility	We considered the extent and nature of the facility at the site in accordance with RGN2 'Understanding the meaning of regulated facility'. The extent of the facility defined in the site plan and in the permit. The activities are defined in table S1.1 of the permit.
The site	
Extent of the site of the facility	The operator has provided a plan which we consider is satisfactory, showing the extent of the site of the facility. The plan is included in the permit.
Biodiversity, heritage, landscape and nature conservation	The application is not within the relevant distance criteria of a site of heritage, landscape or nature conservation, and/or protected species or habitat. The original ammonia pre application screening showed that the Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) 'Blidworth Colliery Spoil' screening in at 105.4% for PC as % of CLo N Deposition, which would require detailed modelling. However, after checking the relevant details on Easimap, we have changed the habitat type from Coniferous Woodland to Acid Grassland (using Non Mediterranean dry acid and neutral closed grassland on APIS website). This changes the CLo N Deposition from 5 to 10, therefore the site screens out as <100% so no detailed modelling required. Refer to the email dated 24/07/19 from Habitats lead on EDRM for further information.

Aspect considered	Decision
Environmental risk assessment	
Environmental risk	We have reviewed the operator's assessment of the environmental risk from the facility. The operator's risk assessment is satisfactory.
Operating techniques	
General operating techniques	We have reviewed the techniques used by the operator and compared these with the relevant guidance notes and we consider them to represent appropriate techniques for the facility. The operating techniques that the applicant must use are specified in table S1.2 in the environmental permit. • All buildings are insulated and are mechanically ventilated with air being taken in through the vents in the roof and leaving the house through the fans on the side of the house. • All litter is exported from the installation for spreading on land owned by third parties. • Water from the wash out of all poultry houses is channelled to underground collection tanks close to the houses to await export off site. Roof water from all houses and water draining from the yard (excluding periods of washout when water from the yard drains to the underground tanks) dissipates onto surrounding grassland which acts as a soak away.
Odour management	We have reviewed the odour management plan in accordance with our guidance on odour management. We consider that the odour management plan is satisfactory.
Noise management	We have reviewed the noise management plan in accordance with our guidance on noise assessment and control. We consider that the noise management plan is satisfactory.
Permit conditions	
Updating permit conditions during consolidation	We have updated permit conditions to those in the current generic permit template as part of permit consolidation. The conditions will provide the same level of protection as those in the previous permit(s).
Improvement programme	Based on the information on the application, we consider that we need to impose an improvement programme. The improvement programme requirements have been carried over from pervious permit versions. These were considered completed in September 2008 (IC1) and June 2009 (IC2 & IC3).
Emission limits	We have decided that emission limits are required in the permit. BAT AEL's have been added in line with the Intensive Farming sector BAT conclusions document dated 21/02/17. These limits are included in permit table S3.3.

Aspect considered	Decision
Monitoring	We have decided that monitoring should be carried out for the parameters listed in the permit, using the methods detailed and to the frequencies specified. These monitoring requirements have been imposed in order to ensure compliance with Intensive Farming BAT conclusions document dated 21/02/17.
Reporting	We have specified reporting in the permit. We made these decisions in order to ensure compliance with Intensive Farming BAT conclusions document dated 21/02/17
Operator competence	
Management system	There is no known reason to consider that the operator will not have the management system to enable it to comply with the permit conditions.
Growth Duty	
Section 108 Deregulation Act 2015 – Growth duty	We have considered our duty to have regard to the desirability of promoting economic growth set out in section 108(1) of the Deregulation Act 2015 and the guidance issued under section 110 of that Act in deciding whether to grant this permit. Paragraph 1.3 of the guidance says: "The primary role of regulators, in delivering regulation, is to achieve the regulatory outcomes for which they are responsible. For a number of regulators, these regulatory outcomes include an explicit reference to development or growth. The growth duty establishes economic growth as a factor that all specified regulators should have regard to, alongside the delivery of the protections set out in the relevant legislation." We have addressed the legislative requirements and environmental standards to be set for this operation in the body of the decision document above. The guidance is clear at paragraph 1.5 that the growth duty does not legitimise non-compliance and its purpose is not to achieve or pursue economic growth at the expense of necessary protections. We consider the requirements and standards we have set in this permit are reasonable and necessary to avoid a risk of an unacceptable level of pollution. This also promotes growth amongst legitimate operators because the standards applied to the operator are consistent across businesses in this sector and have been set to achieve the required legislative standards.

Consultation

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

Responses from organisations listed in the consultation section

Response received from
Public Health England (PHE) (Dated 24/07/19)
Brief summary of issues raised
A Bioaerosol Risk Assessment is required as there are sensitive receptors within 100m of the boundary and it is assumed by PHE that the installation will comply in all respects with the requirements of the permit, including the application of Best Available Techniques (BAT).
Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered
The operator has submitted a Dust and Bioaerosols Risk Assessment (Dated 15/08/2019) which we have assessed and concluded is satisfactory (see Dust and Bioaerosols section within this Decision Document for further details). There are conditions within the permit requiring with the BAT Conclusions 2017.

Response received from
Director of Public Health (Nottinghamshire) (Dated 06/08/19)
Brief summary of issues raised
Nottinghamshire County Council Public Health are in agreement with The Public Health England (PHE) assessment and response to EPR/YP3632MC/V005 made on the 24th July. Whereby It is assumed by PHE that the installation will comply in all respects with the requirements of the permit, including the application of Best Available Techniques (BAT) which should ensure that emissions present a low risk to human health.
Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered
The operator has submitted a Dust and Bioaerosols Risk Assessment (Dated 15/09/2019) which we have assessed and concluded is satisfactory (see Dust and Bioaerosols section within this Decision Document for further details). There are conditions within the permit requiring with the BAT Conclusions 2017.