

Permitting decisions

Variation

We have decided to grant the variation for Ploddy House Farm Poultry Unit operated by Mark Davison.

The variation number is [EPR/SP3439UP/V003](#).

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

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

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 will set 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>

BAT conclusions review

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

We sent out a request for information requiring the Applicant to confirm that the installation complies in full with all the BAT conclusion measures.

The Applicant has confirmed their compliance with all BAT conditions for in their document reference Ploddy House Farm and dated 20/02/2021.

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	<p>The Operator has confirmed it will demonstrate it achieves levels of nitrogen excretion below the required BAT-AELs of:</p> <p>Broilers 0.6 kg N/animal place/year</p> <p>by calculation by using a mass balance of nitrogen based on the feed intake, crude protein content of the diet, total phosphorus and animal performance.</p> <p>This confirmation was in response to Request for Further Information, received 20/02/21, which has been referenced in Table S1.2 Operating Techniques of the Permit.</p> <p>Table S3.3 of the Permit concerning process monitoring requires the Operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT Conclusions.</p>
BAT 4 Nutritional management Phosphorous excretion	<p>The Operator has confirmed it will demonstrate it achieves levels of phosphorus excretion below the required BAT-AELs of:</p> <p>Broilers 0.25 kg P₂O₅ animal place/year</p> <p>by calculation by using a mass balance of phosphorus based on the feed intake, crude protein content of the diet, total phosphorus and animal performance.</p> <p>This confirmation was in response to the Request for Further Information, received 20/02/21, which has been referenced in Table S1.2 Operating Techniques of the Permit.</p> <p>Table S3.3 of the Permit concerning process monitoring requires the Operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT Conclusions.</p>
BAT 24 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Total nitrogen and phosphorous excretion	<p>Table S3.3 Process monitoring requires the operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT conclusions</p>
BAT 25 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Ammonia emissions	<p>Table S3.3 of the Permit concerning process monitoring requires the Operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT Conclusions.</p>

BAT measure	Applicant compliance measure
BAT 26 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Odour emissions	The approved OMP includes the following details for on Farm Monitoring and Continual Improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The staff will perform a daily checks for high housekeeping odours.
BAT 27 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters -Dust emissions	Table S3.3 Process monitoring requires the operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT conclusions. <p>The Operator has confirmed they will report the dust emissions to the Environment Agency annually by multiplying the dust emissions factors for broilers and turkeys by the number of birds on site.</p> <p>This confirmation was in response to the Request for Further Information received 20/02/21, which has been referenced in Table S1.2 Operating techniques of the Permit.</p>
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. <p>The Operator will meet this as the emission factor for broilers is 0.034 kg NH₃/animal place/year.</p> <p>The Installation does not include an air abatement treatment facility, hence the standard emission factor complies with the BAT AEL.</p>

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.

For variations all housing on farms will 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 Ploddy House Farm Poultry Unit (dated 06/06/07) 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, there is a sensitive receptor (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 manufacture and election of feed
- Odour from feed delivery or storage
- Odours arising from problems with housing ventilation
- Litter management
- Carcass disposal
- House clean out

Odour Management Plan Review

The Installation is located within 400m of a sensitive receptor, as listed below (please note, the distances stated are only an approximation from the Installation boundary to the assumed boundary of the properties):

1. Haskins Farm – approximately 368m to the east of the Installation

The Operator has provided a revised OMP (received 22/02/21). This revised OMP has been assessed against the requirements of 'How to Comply with your Environmental Permit for Intensive Farming' EPR 6.09 (version 2), Appendix 4 guidance 'Odour Management at Intensive Livestock Installations' and our Top Tips Guidance and Poultry Industry Good Practice Checklist (August 2013) as well as the site specific circumstances at the Installation. We consider that the OMP is acceptable because it complies with the above guidance, with details of odour control measures, contingency measures and complaint procedures described below.

The Operator is required to manage activities at the Installation in accordance with condition 3.3.1 of the Permit and its OMP. The OMP includes odour control measures, in particular, procedural controls such as feed delivery, storage and distribution, ventilation systems, carcass storage, cleaning out of livestock, storing and spreading of manure and slurry, and dirty water management. The operator has identified the potential sources

of odour (see risks bullet pointed above), as well as the potential risks and problems, and detailed actions taken to minimise odour including contingencies for abnormal operations.

The OMP also provides a suitable procedure in the event that complaints are made to the Operator. The OMP is required to be reviewed at least every year and/or after a complaint is received, whichever is the sooner.

The Environment Agency has reviewed the OMP and considers 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 H4 Odour management guidance note. Although there is the potential for odour pollution from the Installation, the Operator's compliance with the Permit and its OMP will minimise the risk of odour pollution beyond the Installation boundary. The risk of odour pollution at sensitive receptors beyond the Installation boundary is therefore not considered significant.

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 in the '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 'Noise Management Plan Review' 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 movements
- Fans
- Alarm system
- Standby generator
- Chickens
- Feed transfer from lorry to bins
- Personnel
- Repairs

Noise Management Plan Review

Sensitive receptors have been 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' (Received 24/01/21)).

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

Operations with the most potential to cause noise nuisance have been assessed and control measures put in place for all vehicles accessing the site and manoeuvring around, vehicles and machinery carrying out operations on site, feed delivery and transfer from lorry to storage, bird movements on site, waste collections, general deliveries and staff vehicles, stocking and destocking of poultry houses, operation of ventilation systems, personnel, bird noise, clean out and manual washing and cleaning of equipment.

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.

Ammonia

It was not necessary to complete a full ammonia assessment as the variation proposed (the stocking of broilers instead of turkeys) will see a reduction in emission that can be demonstrated through the following calculation:

Turkeys – 52,000 male turkeys x 0.45kgNH₃/animal place/year = 23,400kg NH₃/year

Broilers – 320,000 broilers x 0.034 kgNH₃/animal place/year = 10,880Kg NH₃/year

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/Engagement	
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"> • Local Authority – Environmental Health • Health & Safety Executive <p>No responses were received.</p>
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.
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 not completed a detailed assessment of 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, as the ammonia emissions are lower as a result of the changes brought about by the variation.</p> <p>See Ammonia section in the Key Issues above for more details.</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>

Aspect considered	Decision
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 for the turkeys are unchanged as a result of this variation.</p> <p>Broilers will be housed at a day old and depopulated at around 32-40 days of age with approximately 7 days empty between cycles. The site will be operated on and all in all out basis. There will be between 6 to 8.5 cycles per annum.</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	
Updating permit conditions during consolidation	<p>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 permits.</p>
Use of conditions other than those from the template	<p>Based on the information in the application, we consider that we do not need to impose conditions other than those in our permit template.</p>
Improvement programme	<p>Confirmation of compliance with previously imposed improvement conditions confirmed by Area.</p>
Emission limits	<p>We have decided that emission limits are required in the permit. BAT AELs 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.</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>

Aspect considered	Decision
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 grant 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 Health and Safety Executive and the Local Authority Environmental Health team were also consulted, with a deadline for responses of 04/03/21, but no responses were received.

In addition, the application was publicised on the www.gov.uk website, with a deadline for comments of 04/03/21, but no comments were received.