

Permitting decisions

Bespoke permit

We have decided to grant the permit for Old Rush Farm operated by Annyalla Chicks (UK) Broilers Limited.

The permit number is EPR/KP3206BK.

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.

The Applicant has confirmed their compliance with all BAT conditions for the new installations in their document reference Old Rush Farm BAT and dated 07/02/20 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 3 Nutritional management - Nitrogen excretion	The Applicant has confirmed it will demonstrate that the installation achieves levels of nitrogen excretion below the required BAT-AEL of 0.6 kg N/animal place/year by an estimation using manure analysis for total nitrogen content. Table S3.3 of the permit concerning process monitoring requires the Operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT Conclusions.
BAT 4 Nutritional management - Phosphorous excretion	The Applicant has confirmed it will demonstrate that the installation achieves levels of phosphorous excretion below the required BAT-AEL of 0.25 kg P ₂ O ₅ animal place/year by an estimation using manure analysis for total Phosphorous content. Table S3.3 of the permit concerning process monitoring requires the Operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT Conclusions.
BAT 24 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Total nitrogen and	Table S3.3 concerning process monitoring requires the Operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT Conclusions.

BAT measure	Applicant compliance measure
phosphorous excretion	
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"> • Twice daily olfactory checks coinciding with stock inspections (normally 07.00-10.00 hrs and 16.00-18.00hrs) any abnormalities recorded and investigated.
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 Applicant has confirmed they will report the dust emissions to the Environment Agency annually by multiplying the dust emissions factor for broilers by the number of birds on site.
BAT 32 Ammonia emissions from poultry houses - Broilers	The BAT-AEL to be complied with is 0.01 – 0.08 kg NH ₃ /animal place/year. The Applicant will meet this as the emission factor for broilers is 0.034 kg NH ₃ /animal place/year. The installation does not include an air abatement treatment facility, hence the standard emission factor complies with the BAT-AEL.

More detailed assessment of specific BAT measures

Ammonia emission controls

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

Ammonia emission controls – BAT conclusion 32

The new BAT Conclusions include a set of BAT-AEL's for ammonia emissions to air from animal housing for broilers.

'New plant' is defined as plant first permitted at the site of the farm following the publication of the BAT Conclusions.

All new bespoke applications issued after the 21st February 2017, including those where there is a mixture of old and new housing, will now need to meet the BAT-AEL.

Industrial Emissions Directive (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 Old Rush Farm (dated 12/05/20) 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.

There is 1 sensitive receptor within 400m, Old Rush Farm is located approximately 140m northwest of the installation boundary.

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 manufacture and selection of feed
- Odour from feed delivery or storage
- Odours arising from problems with housing ventilation system, inadequate air movement within house leading to high humidity and wet litter. Inadequate system design, causing poor dispersal of odours
- 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: inadequate storage of carcasses on site.

- House clean out (de littering)
- House clean out (disinfection and fumigation)

The mitigation measures proposed by the applicant, together with the location of the sensitive receptor, taking into consideration the predominant wind direction will be from the south west, should reduce the risk of odour pollution at the sensitive receptors.

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 4 '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 odour pollution / nuisance.

Noise

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

- Noise Issues from large vehicles travelling to and from farm
- Large vehicles delivering/collecting from site, litter removal, removal of dirty water
- Small vehicle movements
- Feed transfer from lorry to bins
- Ventilation Fans
- Alarm System/Standby Generator
- Chickens
- Personnel
- Repairs and Servicing

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.

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.

There are no sensitive receptors within 100m of the installation boundary, the nearest sensitive receptor (the nearest point of their assumed property boundary) is approximately 140 metres to the northwest of the installation boundary. As there are no receptors within 100m of the installation, the applicant has not submitted a dust and bioaerosol 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 will inherently reduce bioaerosals:

- Feed is stored in purpose built covered feed silos located next to the broiler sheds.
- No milling or mixing of feed takes place at the farm. All feed is delivered to the farm by lorry from feed suppliers.
- Feed is blown directly from the lorry into the storage silos.
- Feed is piped from the silos to the sheds minimising dust emissions
- Ventilation systems are operated to achieve optimum humidity levels for the stage of production in all weather and seasonal conditions.
- Control of minimum ventilation rates is planned to avoid the build-up of moisture in the house.
- Ventilation is appropriate to the age and weight of the animal.
- Litter is removed at crop end and removed off site. Dust is controlled through the management of air quality.
- All broiler houses will have high velocity fans.
- Litter is not stored on the site.

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 are no Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Areas (SPA) or Ramsar sites located within 5 kilometres of the installation. There is one Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) located within 5 km of the installation. There is also one Local Wildlife Site (LWS) 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 an in combination assessment 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 Old Rush Farm will only have a potential impact on the SSSI with a precautionary CLe of $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ if it is within 1,183 metres of the emission source.

Beyond 1,183m 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 screen 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)
Barn Hill Meadows	5,124*

*This site is included at >5km because the screening is based on an approximate centre point of the emissions and includes a buffer distance calculated from this centre point to the furthest point of the boundary to ensure all nature conservation sites within the threshold distance from the installation boundary have been included in the assessment.

No further assessment is required.

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 Old Rush Farm will only have a potential impact on the LWS site with a precautionary CLe of $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ if they are within 406 metres of the emission source.

Beyond 406m the PC is less than $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case the LWS is 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)
North Howden Fish Ponds	2,098*

*This site is included at >2km because the screening is based on an approximate centre point of the emissions and includes a buffer distance calculated from this centre point to the furthest point of the boundary to ensure all nature conservation sites within the threshold distance from the installation boundary have been included in the assessment.

No further assessment is necessary

Decision checklist

Aspect considered	Decision
Receipt of application	
Confidential information	A claim for commercial or industrial confidentiality has not been made.
Identifying confidential information	We have not identified information provided as part of the application that we consider to be confidential.
Consultation	
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"> • Health and Safety Executive • East Riding of Yorkshire Council – Environmental Health <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.
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>

Aspect considered	Decision
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>
Climate change adaptation	<p>We have assessed the climate change adaptation risk assessment.</p> <p>We consider the climate change adaptation risk assessment is satisfactory.</p> <p>We have decided to include a condition in the permit requiring the operator to review and update their climate change risk assessment over the life of the permit.</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"> • Poultry houses 1 to 5 are ventilated by high velocity roof fans and all houses have gable end fan outlets used infrequently for temperature control in hot weather • Litter is exported off site and is spread on land owned/controlled by the operator • Dirty wash water is exported off site and spread on a 3rd party's land. • Roof water drains to an attenuation pond • Sealed and collision-protected feed storage bins • Carcasses are collected daily and stored in a secure container on site prior to removal off site by a licenced contractor • Phosphorus and protein levels are reduced over the production and growing cycle by providing different feeds <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 relevant BREFs.</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>

Aspect considered	Decision
	We consider that the noise management plan is satisfactory.
Permit conditions	
Use of conditions other than those from the template	Based on the information in the application, we consider that we do not need to impose conditions other than those in our permit template.
Raw materials	We have specified limits and controls on the use of raw materials and fuels.
Emission limits	We have decided that emission limits are not required in the permit.
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 accordance with the new Best Available Techniques (BAT) Reference Document (BREF) for the Intensive Rearing of Poultry or Pigs (IRPP) published on the 21st February 2017.</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	There is no known reason to consider that the operator will not be financially able to comply with the permit conditions.
Growth Duty	
Section 108 Deregulation Act 2015 – Growth duty	<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 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</p>

Aspect considered	Decision
	<p>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
East Riding of Yorkshire Council (Environmental Control) – received 13/07/20
Brief summary of issues raised
No comments to make.
Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered
No action required

The Health and Safety Executive and the Director of Public Health were also consulted, with a deadline for responses of 23/07/20, 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 23/07/20.