

Application SCR evaluation – N/A

Operational phase SCR evaluation

Name of activity, address and NGR	Nafferton Wold Egg Unit. Wold Road, Nafferton, East Yorkshire, YO25 4LD. TA 04843 61326.
-----------------------------------	---

Document reference, date and version of application and surrender SCRs	Original application SCR dated 01 April 2013. EPR/EP3538CV/S004 SCR dated September 2020.
--	--

4.0 Changes to the activities

Have there been any changes to the following during the operation of the site?

- a) Activity boundaries
- b) Permitted activities
- c) "Dangerous substances" used or produced

a) – Yes. This was increased by V002 in 2013. The installation originally covered approximately 0.75 hectares of relatively flat land surrounded primarily by arable and grazing land uses. There were no surface waters or surface water features within 250m of the installation boundary. The site was previously arable farming land. No known historic contaminated land or pollution incidents have been recorded prior to the site becoming permitted.

The underlying geology comprised Flamborough Chalk Formation bedrock and some Superficial Deposits of Alluvium. The Chalk was classed as a principal aquifer of high vulnerability. There was a water abstraction borehole on the neighbouring pig unit that supplied drinking water to the poultry. The site was not within a groundwater Source Protection Zone but was within a Nitrate Vulnerable Zone.

b) – No. The site was originally permitted in 2012 under Section 6.9 A(1)(a)(i) - rearing of poultry intensively for layers for egg production for upto 52,200 bird places in one poultry house comprising an enriched colony cage system.

In 2013, V002 this increased to 104,200 enriched colony cage layers and two poultry houses which increased the permitted site boundary.

In 2015, V003 changed the permit to 84,000 bird places. Poultry House 2 changed to a barn system.

c) – None.

5.0 Measures taken to protect land

Has the applicant provided evidence from records collated during the lifetime of the permit, to show that the pollution prevention measures have worked?

The site was regularly inspected between 2013 and 2018. Area Officer site reports indicate that there was an Accident Management Plan to ensure all environmental risks and hazards specific to the site were identified as well as having a copy of the site drainage plan and list of raw materials so members of staff could gain access in the event of an emergency. No Odour or Noise Management Plans were required.

Training records were kept for preventing accidental releases and the actions to be taken should such an accident occur, staff responsibilities, how each person's duties link to compliance, required maintenance of structures and plant, and the potential environmental effects of the installation under routine and abnormal circumstances.

No containers of potentially polluting liquids were observed outside of bunds/drip trays once disinfectants were moved to a bunded container. Feed silos 3 and 4 for the new building required collision protection as they were positioned in an area at risk. Barriers were put in place to prevent damage from vehicles moving on access road. Black and yellow tape was used to further increase visibility and reduce risks further in the turning area.

6.0 Pollution incidents that may have impacted on land and their remediation

Has the applicant provided evidence to show that any pollution incidents which have taken place during the life of the permit and which may have impacted on land or water have been investigated and remediated (where necessary)?

The site was regularly inspected between 2013 and 2018. Area Officer site reports indicate that no pollution incidents happened on site.

7.0 Soil gas and water quality monitoring (where relevant)
Where soil gas and/or water quality monitoring has been undertaken, does this demonstrate that there has been no change in the condition of the land? Has any change that has occurred been investigated and remediated?
N/A.

Surrender SCR Evaluation

8.0 Decommissioning and removal of pollution risk
Has the applicant demonstrated that decommissioning works have been undertaken and that all pollution risks associated with the site have been removed? Has any contamination of land that has occurred during these activities been investigated and remediated?
The site has not been decommissioned, it is still in operation but under the threshold of 40,000 bird places. Therefore, it does not require an EPR permit.

9.0 Reference data and remediation (where relevant)
Has the applicant provided details of any surrender reference data that they have collected and any remediation that they have undertaken?
N/A.

10.0 Statement of site condition
Has the applicant provided a statement, backed up with evidence, confirming that the permitted activities have ceased, decommissioning works are complete and that pollution risk has been removed and that the land and waters at the site are in a satisfactory state?
Production from the site has not stopped, it has now fallen below the permitting threshold of 40,000 bird places as described in the decision document. The site remains in a good condition and there has been no deterioration as a result of the permitted activities since the permit was issued.

Surrender SCR decision summary	Tick decision
Sufficient information has been supplied to show that pollution risk has been removed and that the site is in a satisfactory state – accept the application to surrender the permit.	✓
Date and name of reviewers:	
Liz Ebbs – Ops Asset and Programme Management – 25 Nov 2020.	
Laura Mellor – NPS – 30 Nov 2020.	