

Permitting decisions

Bespoke permit

We have decided to grant the permit for Plantation Farm operated by Crown Chicken Limited.

The permit number is EPR/GP3936QC

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

Purpose of this document

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

- highlights [key issues](#) in the determination;
- summarises the decision making process in the [decision checklist](#) to show how all relevant factors have been taken into account; and
- shows how we have considered the [consultation responses](#).

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

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

Key issues of the decision

New Intensive Rearing of Poultry or Pigs BAT Conclusions document

The new Best Available Techniques (BAT) Reference document (BREF) for the Intensive Rearing of Poultry or Pigs (IRPP) was published on the 21st February 2017. There is now a separate BAT Conclusions document which sets out the standards that permitted farms will have to meet.

The BAT Conclusions document is as per the following link:

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32017D0302&from=EN>

Now the BAT Conclusions are published, all new installation farming permits issued after the 21st February 2017 must be compliant in full from the first day of operation.

There are some new requirements for permit holders. The Conclusions include BAT-Associated Emission Levels (BAT-AELs) for ammonia emissions, which will apply to the majority of permits, as well as BAT-AELs for nitrogen and phosphorous excretion.

For some types of rearing practices, stricter standards will apply to farms and housing permitted after the new BAT Conclusions were published.

New BAT Conclusions review

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

We sent out a not duly made notice requiring the Applicant to confirm that the new installation complies in full with all the BAT Conclusion measures.

The Applicant has confirmed their compliance with all BAT conditions for the new installations their document reference BAT Assessment and dated 18/09/19 which has been referenced in Table S1.2 Operating Techniques of the permit.

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

BAT measure	Applicant compliance measure
BAT 25 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Ammonia emissions	Table S3.3 of the permit concerning process monitoring requires the Operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT Conclusions.
BAT 26 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Odour emissions	The approved odour management plan (OMP) includes the following details for on Farm Monitoring and Continual Improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Daily housekeeping checks are conducted by site staff to detect abnormally high housekeeping odours, should they occur.• Complaints and subsequent actions are to be logged on the Odour Complaints Log, provided in the OMP.
BAT 27 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Dust emissions	Table S3.3 concerning process monitoring requires the Operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT Conclusions. The operator confirmed in their document titles BAT Assessment (received 18/09/19) that monitoring will be carried out by calculation by

BAT measure	Applicant compliance measure
	measuring the dust concentration and the ventilation rate using EN standard methods or other methods (ISO, national or international) ensuring data of an equivalent scientific quality.

More detailed assessment of specific BAT measures

Ammonia emission controls

A BAT Associated Emission Level (AEL) provides us with a performance benchmark to determine whether an activity is BAT. The BAT Conclusions document does not have a BAT-AEL for broiler breeders and therefore an ammonia emission limit value has not been included within the permit.

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 Plantation Farm (dated 18/09/19) 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 for the installation provided with the application lists key potential risks of odour pollution beyond the installation boundary. These activities are as follows:

- Odour from the selection of feed
- Odour from feed delivery and storage
- Odour arising from problems with ventilation systems, inadequate air movement leading to high humidity and wet litter
- Litter management: Odours arising from wet litter. The use of insufficient or poor quality litter. Spillage of water from drinking systems. Disease outbreaks, leading to wet litter.
- Carcass disposal (e.g. inadequate storage or disposal of carcasses)
- House clean out

Odour Management Plan Review

The sensitive receptors that have been considered under odour do not include the operator's property and other people associated with the farm operations, as odour is considered to be an amenity issue, and it is unlikely that complaints will be received from these residents.

There are several sensitive receptors within 400m of the site boundary, one of which is occupied by people associated with the installation which are as follows:

- Old Hall Farm ~75m south of installation boundary (occupied by people associated with the installation)
- Hilltop Bungalow ~24m east of installation boundary
- Hedges ~395m south west of installation boundary
- Mousehall Cottage ~400m 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:

- **Odour from the selection of feed** – no on site milling. Feed specifications prepared by the feed compounder's nutrition specialist.
- **Odour from feed delivery and storage** – feed delivery sealed to minimise atmospheric dust. And spillage of feed around the bin will be immediately swept up. The condition of feed bins will be checked frequently so that any damage or leaks can be identified.
- **Odour arising from problems with ventilation systems, inadequate air movement leading to high humidity and wet litter** – ventilation system regularly adjusted and checked according to the age and

requirements of the flock. Ventilation system will be designed to efficiently remove moisture from the house.

- **Litter management (odours arising from wet litter, the use of insufficient or poor quality litter, spillage of water from drinking systems, disease outbreaks, leading to wet litter)** – controls on feed and ventilation (see above) will help maintain litter quality. Additional controls include: insulated walls and ceilings to prevent condensation. Concrete floors to prevent water ingress. Stocking density at optimal levels to prevent overcrowding. Use of a health plan with specialist veterinary input used as necessary.
- **Carcass disposal (e.g. inadequate storage or disposal of carcasses)** – carcasses will be placed in storage and will be transported off site for final disposal.
- **House clean out** – litter will be carefully placed into trailers, positioned at the entrance to each house. Minimal tipping. When full trailers will be covered and that litter taken off site. Dirty water will be in accordance with a manure management plan. Odour from chemicals used for clean out no considered a risk.

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 every 3 years or sooner if a complaint is received.

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 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.

Conclusion

We have assessed the OMP and the H1 risk assessment for odour and conclude that the Applicant has followed the guidance set out in EPR 6.09 Appendix 5 'Odour 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.

Noise

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

Condition 3.4 of the permit reads as follows:

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

There are sensitive receptors within 400 metres of the installation boundary as stated in the odour section above. Water from the wash out of poultry houses is contained within the poultry houses and channelled to underground collection tanks to await export off site. This is then spread to land under the control of third party operators. The Operator has provided an NMP as part of the application supporting documentation, and further details are provided 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:

- Vehicle access and manoeuvring

- Machinery working on site
- Cleanout
- Ventilation systems
- Washing/ disinfection operations

Noise Management Plan Review

Sensitive receptors as listed under 'Odour' section.

As for odour, the sensitive receptors that have been considered under noise do not include the operator's property and other people associated with the farm operations as noise is considered to be an amenity issue, and it is unlikely that complaints will be received from these residents. The properties within 400m of the installation are listed in the Odour section above.

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 in the odour section 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:

- **Vehicle access and manoeuvring** – appropriate speed limits set for HGVs. Revving of engines to be kept to a minimum, reversing sirens not to be used when safe to not use them.
- **Machinery working on site** – catch team are to unload no more than 2 modules at any one time and to work in a one on one off basis to minimise movements to a specific area. Machine operators are to work inside buildings. There is to be no scraping of external concrete aprons – these areas are to be mechanically brushed only.
- **Cleanout** – high pressure air compressors are to be positioned within the building being blown down to help reduce external noise through running of engines. High volume long reach loaders are to load trailer at the eastern end of the site only, so as to be as close to the building as possible.
- **Ventilation systems** – all fan chimney backdraft shutters are mechanically operated and sit on a tight rubber dampener to minimise movement while non-operational. All fans are inspected and maintained at the end of each cycle to maintain operational efficiencies. Air chamber is internally clad and insulated, minimising echoing effects.
- **Washing/ disinfection operations** – modern low noise pumps requested through approved contractor.

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 Bioaerosols

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

There are 2 sensitive receptors within 100m of the installation boundary:

- Old Hall Farm ~75m south of installation boundary
- Hilltop Bungalow ~24m east of installation boundary

The Applicant has provided a dust and bioaerosol management plan.

In addition guidance on our website concludes that Applicants need to produce and submit a dust and bioaerosol management plan beyond the requirement of the initial 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 management 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 the 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, which inherently will reduce bioaerosols:

- Dust from silos – Dust is collected from silo exhaust pipe during delivery
- No on-site milling of compound feeds
- Feed delivery systems are sealed to minimise atmospheric dust
- Any spillage of feed around the bin is immediately swept up
- Feed is delivered mainly in pellet form
- Diets are formulated to meet the needs of the birds. Fat content varies depending on the stage of the diet.
- Exhaust of auger/ feed system is covered
- Feed pans are used for feed delivery to birds. There is control over the depth of feed in feed pans to avoid spilled feed.
- Wood shavings used for bedding as less dusty than straw.
- All topping up of litter carried out inside houses. Fresh bedding used for each crop cycle.

- Catching curtains used.(the operator has confirmed that: “Catching curtains are PVC curtains that are commonly used in poultry operations to segregate and confine birds to aid in the catching process at the end of the cycle. Catching curtains are not intended to be routinely used as part of Plantation Farm operations, though may be a future consideration should this be appropriate to facilitate operations” in a Schedule 5 response dated 21/11/2019.
- Ventilation systems operated at optimum rate for bird welfare using high speed ridge fans. This design increases atmospheric dispersion of any dust/Bioaerosols.
- Housing is thoroughly cleaned / disinfected from one crop to the next.

Conclusion

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

Ammonia

There is 1 Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) located within 5 km of the installation boundary. There are also 3 Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) within 2 km of the installation boundary.

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 Plantation Farm will only have a potential impact on SSSIs with a precautionary CLe of $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ if they are within 1,436 metres of the emission source.

Beyond 1,436m the PC is less than $0.2\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (i.e. less than 20% of the precautionary $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ CLe) and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case the SSSI is beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screens out of any further assessment.

Where the precautionary level of $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ is used and the PC is assessed to be less than 20%, the site automatically screens out as insignificant and no further assessment of CLo is necessary. In this case the $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ 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)
Shelfanger Meadows	2,679

Ammonia assessment - LWS

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 Plantation Farm will only have a potential impact on the LWS sites with a precautionary CLe of $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ if they are within 492 metres of the emission source.

Beyond 492m the PC is less than $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case all LWS are beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

Table 2 – LWS Assessment

Name of LWS	Distance from site (m)
Valley Farmhouse Meadow	1,538
Home Wood & The Belt	773
New Plantn & Brick Kiln Covert	806

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	
Consultation	<p>The consultation requirements were identified in accordance with the Environmental Permitting Regulations and our public participation statement.</p> <p>The application was publicised on the GOV.UK website.</p> <p>We consulted the following organisations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Health England • Director of Public Health (Norfolk) • Health and Safety Executive • Environmental Health (South Norfolk Council and Broadland District Council) <p>The comments and our responses are summarised in the consultation section.</p>
Operator	
Control of the facility	We are satisfied that the Applicant (now the Operator) is the person who will have control over the operation of the facility after the grant of the permit. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on legal operator for environmental permits.
The facility	
The regulated facility	<p>We considered the extent and nature of the facility at the site in accordance with RGN2 'Understanding the meaning of regulated facility'.</p> <p>The extent of the facility is defined in the site plan and in the permit. The activities are defined in table S1.1 of the permit.</p>
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.

Aspect considered	Decision
Site condition report	The Operator has provided a description of the condition of the site, which we consider is satisfactory. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on site condition reports.
Biodiversity, heritage, landscape and nature conservation	<p>The application is within the relevant distance criteria of a site of heritage, landscape or nature conservation, and/or protected species or habitat.</p> <p>We have assessed the application and its potential to affect all known sites of nature conservation, landscape and heritage and/or protected species or habitats identified in the nature conservation screening report as part of the permitting process.</p> <p>We consider that the application will not affect any sites of nature conservation, landscape and heritage, and/or protected species or habitats identified.</p> <p>We have not consulted Natural England on the application. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance.</p>
Environmental risk assessment	
Environmental risk	<p>We have reviewed the Operator's assessment of the environmental risk from the facility.</p> <p>The Operator's risk assessment is satisfactory.</p>
Operating techniques	
General operating techniques	<p>We have reviewed the techniques used by the Operator and compared these with the relevant guidance notes and we consider them to represent appropriate techniques for the facility.</p> <p>The operating techniques that the Applicant must use are specified in table S1.2 in the environmental permit.</p> <p>The operating techniques are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All poultry houses are ventilated by high velocity roof fans with an emission point higher than 5.5 metres above ground level and an efflux speed greater than 11 metres per second. • All poultry houses have gable end fans, although these are operated infrequently to maintain temperature, typically in the summer months. • All litter is exported from the installation for spreading on land owned by third parties. • Water from the wash out of poultry houses is contained within the poultry houses and channelled to underground collection tanks to await export off site and is spread on third party land. • Uncontaminated yard water and roof water from all 4 houses drains to French drains acting as soakaways, which lead to a surface drain which leads to an attenuation pond before discharging to a ditch on the eastern boundary of the site. • Feed is blown from bulk trailers into the silos, an auger system will then convey feed to pan feeders. • Mortalities are collected daily and stored in a secure container on site for

Aspect considered	Decision
	<p>removal by a licensed collection agent, in accordance with the latest Animal By-Products Regulations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phosphorus and protein levels are reduced throughout the flock cycle. <p>The proposed techniques for priorities for control are in line with the benchmark levels contained in the Sector Guidance Note EPR6.09 and we consider them to represent appropriate techniques for the facility. The permit conditions ensure compliance with the relevant BREF.</p>
Odour management	<p>We have reviewed the odour management plan in accordance with our guidance on odour management.</p> <p>We consider that the odour management plan is satisfactory.</p>
Noise management	<p>We have reviewed the noise management plan in accordance with our guidance on noise assessment and control.</p> <p>We consider that the noise management plan is satisfactory.</p>
Permit conditions	
Emission limits	<p>We have decided that emission limits are not required in the permit.</p> <p>There is no BAT AEL for Broiler Breeders.</p>
Monitoring	<p>We have decided that monitoring should be carried out for the parameters listed in the permit, using the methods detailed and to the frequencies specified.</p> <p>These monitoring requirements have been imposed in order to ensure compliance with Intensive Farming BAT conclusions document dated 21/02/17.</p>
Reporting	<p>We have specified reporting in the permit.</p> <p>We made these decisions in order to ensure compliance with Intensive Farming BAT conclusions document dated 21/02/17</p>
Operator competence	
Management system	<p>There is no known reason to consider that the Operator will not have the management system to enable it to comply with the permit conditions.</p> <p>The decision was taken in accordance with the guidance on operator competence and how to develop a management system for environmental permits.</p>
Relevant convictions	<p>The Case Management System has been checked to ensure that all relevant convictions have been declared.</p> <p>No relevant convictions were found. The Operator satisfies the criteria in our guidance on operator competence.</p>
Financial competence	<p>There is no known reason to consider that the operator will not be financially able to comply with the permit conditions.</p>
Growth Duty	
Section 108 Deregulation	<p>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</p>

Aspect considered	Decision
Act 2015 – Growth duty	<p>under section 110 of that Act in deciding whether to vary this permit.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.3 of the guidance says:</p> <p>“The primary role of regulators, in delivering regulation, is to achieve the regulatory outcomes for which they are responsible. For a number of regulators, these regulatory outcomes include an explicit reference to development or growth. The growth duty establishes economic growth as a factor that all specified regulators should have regard to, alongside the delivery of the protections set out in the relevant legislation.”</p> <p>We have addressed the legislative requirements and environmental standards to be set for this operation in the body of the decision document above. The guidance is clear at paragraph 1.5 that the growth duty does not legitimise non-compliance and its purpose is not to achieve or pursue economic growth at the expense of necessary protections.</p> <p>We consider the requirements and standards we have set in this permit are reasonable and necessary to avoid a risk of an unacceptable level of pollution. This also promotes growth amongst legitimate operators because the standards applied to the Operator are consistent across businesses in this sector and have been set to achieve the required legislative standards.</p>

Consultation

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

Responses from organisations listed in the consultation section

Response received from
Environmental Health (South Norfolk Council and Broadland District Council) (received 25/09/2019)
Brief summary of issues raised
“(We) not aware of any noise or other amenity issues at this site and thus no enforcement action has been taken and neither is any pending. Having regard to the above we have no adverse comments to offer regarding this application”.
Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered
N/A

Response received from
Public Health England (received 23/10/2019)
Brief summary of issues raised
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). This should ensure that emissions present a low risk to human health
Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered
N/A

The Health and Safety Executive and Director of Public Health (Norfolk) were consulted, with a deadline for responses of 25/09/19, but no responses were received.

In addition, the application was publicised on the www.gov.uk website, but no comments were received by the deadline of 23/09/19.