

# Permitting decisions

## Variation

---

We have decided to grant the variation for Falcons Hall Farm Poultry Unit operated by Crown Chicken Limited. The variation number is EPR/BP3334CB/V006.

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
- 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 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 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>

Now the BAT Conclusions are published, **all new housing within variation applications** issued after 21<sup>st</sup> 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 for ammonia emissions which will apply to the majority of permits, as well as BAT associated levels 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 are published.

This variation determination includes a review of BAT compliance for all housing at the installation.

### **New BAT conclusions review**

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

The operator has confirmed the installation complies in full with all the BAT conclusion measures, in Section Q8a 22, 'Technical standards', of the document reference 'Supporting Information for application to vary environmental permit', dated December 2022, 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	Operator 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	<p>The approved OMP includes the following details for on Farm Monitoring and Continual Improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The farm manager is responsible for a site tour every day, sniff-testing for any abnormal elevated odour levels with the potential to cause annoyance offsite.</li> <li>• The Environmental Manager at Crown Chicken Ltd is responsible for monitoring odour levels, sniff-testing and recording results following a complaint, until elevated odour levels have been returned to normal.</li> </ul>
BAT 27 - Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Dust 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> <p>The operator has confirmed they will report the dust emissions to the Environment Agency annually by multiplying the dust emissions factor for pullets by the number of birds on site.</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. The BAT Conclusions document does not have a BAT AEL for pullets and therefore an ammonia emission limit value has not been included within the permit.

## **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 Falcons Hall Farm Poultry Unit (dated June 2022) 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](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:

- Manufacture and selection of feed
- Feed delivery and storage
- Housing and ventilation system
- Litter management
- Drinking water system
- Destocking and house clean out
- Dirty water management
- Carcass disposal

There is one sensitive receptor within 400 metres of the installation boundary, located approximately 25 metres to the north of the installation boundary. The operator has provided an OMP that has been assessed against the requirements of EPA 6.09 (version 2) Appendix 4 guidance 'Odour Management at Intensive Livestock Installations' and the 'Poultry Industry Good Practice Checklist' version 2, August 2013. We consider that the OMP is acceptable because it complies with the above guidance. The operator is required to manage activities in accordance with condition 3.3.1 of the permit and this OMP.

The OMP sets out the preventative measures that will be taken at the installation as part of the daily management of odour risk at the site. The following key measures are included in the operator's OMP:

- Feed supplied from mills in certification schemes only using approved ingredients; no feed manufacturing, milling, or mixing on site.
- Enclosed silos, pipes, augers and feeding equipment to prevent feed getting wet, and minimise dust and odour.
- Feed silos are protected from collision damage by careful siting relative to traffic flows.
- Feed delivery vehicles are covered.
- Feed deliveries are monitored and any spillage cleared up immediately.
- Computer controlled ventilation system, regularly adjusted and maintained.
- Stockman monitors litter daily for abnormal odour, wetting or capping.
- Water provided via non-leaking nipple drinkers with drip cups to keep litter dry and minimises odour; stockman checks water lines daily to detect leaks and drinking lines are frequently adjusted to avoid spillages, wet litter and water wastage.
- Houses are closed and locked after destocking to contain dust and odour.
- Cleanout occurs during normal working hours (07.00-18.00 hours in the working week (Monday to Friday and Saturday morning but exclusive of bank holidays)) in as short a time as possible.
- Ventilation is reduced to a minimum during cleanout.
- Used litter is transported in covered trailers; no used litter is stored onsite.
- The concrete apron, dirty water grates and drains are kept clear to avoid backing-up, pooling, or run-off into surface water drains or onto unmade ground.
- Dirty water drains are flushed through after washing out to prevent stagnation.
- Carcasses are stored in secure, non-leaking, steel containers away from sensitive receptors.

The OMP includes a section on odour monitoring. The farm manager completes a site tour every day, sniff-testing for any abnormal elevated odour levels with the potential to cause annoyance offsite. The Environmental Manager at Crown Chicken Limited is responsible for monitoring odour levels, sniff-testing and recording results following a complaint, until elevated odour levels have been returned to normal.

The OMP includes contingency measures to minimise odour pollution during abnormal operations. A list of remedial measures is included in the contingency plan, including triggers for commencing and ceasing use of these measures.

The OMP also provides a suitable procedure in the event that complaints are made to the operator and includes a complaint form template.

The operator is required to review the OMP at least every year (as committed to in the OMP), prior to any major changes to operations (to ensure effectiveness) and/or after the Environment Agency has notified the operator that it has substantiated a complaint, and make any appropriate changes to the OMP identified by the review.

### **Odour Management Plan Review**

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.

## **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.

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:

- Vehicles travelling to and operating on the site
- Livestock
- Ventilation system
- Feeding equipment
- Litter removal
- Generator

There is one sensitive receptor within 400 metres of the installation boundary. The operator has provided an NMP as part of the application supporting documentation. The following key measures are contained in the NMP to minimise noise pollution:

- Deliveries are restricted to normal working times (07.00-23.00 hours in working week Monday to Friday and Saturday morning but exclusive of public and bank holidays).
- Drivers are made aware of driving slowly on and off the farm and minimising noise.
- Engines are switched off when not in use.
- Vehicles fitted with audible 'vehicle reversing' warning systems are only onsite in the daytime.
- Bulk feed storage silos are installed alongside one another to minimise HGV movements during feed deliveries.
- Package ventilation systems designed and installed by a professional contractor & minimise the number of fans required.
- Concrete apron provides a smooth surface for HGV, forklift and loader movements lessening vehicular noise.

- Powered equipment for feed and fuel deliveries, removing litter, cleaning out, etc. is limited to normal working days (07.00-18.00 in the working week (Monday to Friday and Saturday morning but exclusive of public and bank holidays)), as far as is practicable.
- Idling of machines between work periods and revving of engines is avoided.
- Compressors and pressure washers can be placed inside the poultry houses during cleaning.
- Forklift drivers are instructed to move stock carefully, avoid unnecessary scraping & loading modules as smoothly as practical.
- Staff, contractors, and visitors are instructed not to raise voices or play radios unnecessarily at night.
- When repairs are required, works are undertaken with regard to avoiding causing annoyance during the normal working day, and in event works likely to cause significant noise, neighbouring residents will be notified in advance.
- Feed silos are located adjacent the poultry houses minimising the length of flexible augers required for transferring feed into them.
- Litter removal is limited to normal working days (07.00-18.00 hours in the working week (Monday to Friday and Saturday morning but exclusive of public and bank holidays)).
- During destocking bird noise is minimised by careful handling & prompt removal of the lorry from site when full.
- Low noise generators are located in integral acoustic enclosures; located onsite to benefit from screening effect of buildings and earth banks.

We have assessed the NMP and the H1 risk assessment for noise and conclude that the operator 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.

The NMP will be reviewed annually or following a substantiated noise complaint.

## **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 3 sensitive receptors within 100m of the Installation boundary, the nearest sensitive receptor (the nearest point of their assumed property boundary) is approximately 25 metres to the north of the installation boundary.

Guidance on our website concludes that applicants need to produce and submit a dust and bioaerosol risk assessment with their application 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](http://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 operator was required to submit a dust and bioaerosol 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 operator has included control measures in their dust and bioaerosol management plan to reduce dust (which will inherently reduce bioaerosols) for the following potential dust sources:

- Manufacture & selection of feed
- Feed delivery & storage
- Ventilation system
- Litter management
- Destocking
- Clean out operations

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

## Standby Generator

The two standby generators both have net thermal rated inputs of < 1MWth and are each operated for a maximum of 1 hour/week for testing purposes.

## Ammonia

There are no Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Areas (SPA) or Ramsars within 5km of the installation. There are three Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) located within 5 km of the installation. There is also one Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and two Ancient Woodlands (AW) 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 4.6, has indicated that emissions from Falcons Hall Farm Poultry Unit will only have a potential impact on SSSI with a precautionary critical level of  $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  if they are within 1,265 metres of the emission source.

Beyond 1,265 metres the PC is less than  $0.2\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  (i.e. less than 20% of the precautionary  $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  critical level) and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case the SSSI are 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 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  $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  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)
Redgrave & South Lopham Fens	5,287
Burgate Wood	3,457

Detailed modelling ('A Report on the Modelling of the Dispersion and Deposition of Ammonia from the Proposed Pullet Chicken Rearing Houses at Falcons Hall Farm, near Rickinghall in Suffolk', dated 24/11/22) has indicated that the PC for Westhall Wood and Meadow SSSI is predicted to be less than 20% of the critical level for

ammonia emissions/nitrogen deposition/acid deposition therefore it is possible to conclude no damage. The results of the modelling are given in the tables below.

The ammonia modelling assessment has been reviewed and we have confidence that we can agree with the report conclusions.

**Table 2 – Ammonia emissions**

Site	Ammonia Cle ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )	PC ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ )	PC % critical level
Westhall Wood and Meadow SSSI	1*	0.061	6.1

\* Critical level values taken from APIS website ([www.apis.ac.uk](http://www.apis.ac.uk)) – 22/11/22

**Table 3 – Nitrogen deposition**

Site	Critical load kg N/ha/yr*	PC kg N/ha/yr.	PC % critical load
Westhall Wood and Meadow SSSI	15	0.317	2.11

\* Critical load values taken from APIS website ([www.apis.ac.uk](http://www.apis.ac.uk)) – 01/03/23

**Table 4 – Acid deposition**

Site	Critical load keq/ha/yr*	PC keq/ha/yr.	PC % critical load
Westhall Wood and Meadow SSSI	2.068	0.023 <sup>[1]</sup>	1.11

\* Critical load values taken from APIS website ([www.apis.ac.uk](http://www.apis.ac.uk)) – 01/03/23

<sup>[1]</sup> PC for Acid deposition based on 1/14<sup>th</sup> of the maximum nitrogen deposition PC provided in Table 6 of the ammonia modelling report ('A Report on the Modelling of the Dispersion and Deposition of Ammonia from the Proposed Pullet Chicken Rearing Houses at Falcons Hall Farm, near Rickinghall in Suffolk', dated 24/11/22).

No further assessment is required.

### **Ammonia assessment - LWS/AW**

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 4.6 has indicated that emissions from Falcons Hall Farm Poultry Unit will only have a potential impact on the LWS/AW sites with a precautionary critical level of  $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  if they are within 451 metres of the emission source.

Beyond 451 metres 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/AWs are beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

**Table 5 – LWS/AW Assessment**

Name of LWS/AW	Distance from site (m)
Calke Wood LWS	2,354
Calke Wood AW	2,359
Westhall Wood AW	1,379



# Decision checklist

Aspect considered	Decision
<b>Receipt of application</b>	
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.
<b>Consultation</b>	
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"> <li>• Local Authority - Environmental Health – Mid Suffolk District Council</li> <li>• Health and Safety Executive (HSE)</li> <li>• Director of Public Health</li> <li>• UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA)</li> </ul> <p>The comments and our responses are summarised in the <a href="#">consultation section</a>.</p>
<b>The facility</b>	
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>
<b>The site</b>	
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 and baseline reporting under the Industrial Emissions Directive.
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>

Aspect considered	Decision
<b>Environmental risk assessment</b>	
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>
<b>Operating techniques</b>	
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 include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poultry houses are ventilated by medium or high velocity roof fans.</li> <li>• Water is provided via nipple drinkers.</li> <li>• Mortalities are collected daily and stored in secure, covered containers, awaiting collection by an approved transporter under the National Fallen Stock Scheme, or incineration in the on-site Animal Health and Veterinary Laboratories Agency (AHVLA) approved incinerator.</li> <li>• Manure is removed from the site for spreading on third party owned land, in accordance with a manure management plan, or for fuel for local power generation.</li> <li>• Water from the wash out of poultry houses is channelled to underground collection tanks close to the houses to await export off site for spreading on third party owned land.</li> <li>• Roof water, via French drains alongside poultry houses A1, A2 and B3 to B4, and water draining from the yard areas discharges to a tributary of the Little Ouse River.</li> <li>• Roof water, via French drains alongside poultry houses C1 to C4, and water draining from the yard areas discharges to a tributary of the Little Ouse River, via an unlined attenuation pond prior to the ditch.</li> </ul>
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> <p>See the <a href="#">key issues</a> section.</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> <p>See the <a href="#">key issues</a> section.</p>
<b>Permit conditions</b>	
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</p>

Aspect considered	Decision
	protection as those in the previous permit.
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.
Emission limits	We have decided that emission limits are not required in the permit. See the <a href="#">key issues</a> section.
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.  See the <a href="#">key issues</a> section.
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.
<b>Operator competence</b>	
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.
<b>Growth Duty</b>	
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> <p>Any unique condition, that is a condition distinct from a site specific condition needed to deliver the legislative standards need to be justified</p> <p>Provide additional text if needed, for example where specific comment on the</p>

<b>Aspect considered</b>	<b>Decision</b>
	growth duty is made by the applicant in their application.

# 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

<b>Response received on 10/01/23 from</b>
Mid Suffolk District Council
<b>Brief summary of issues raised</b>
The council is not aware of any noise or other amenity issues at this site, and there is no relevant enforcement action. Matters relating to Environmental Protection were assessed as part of the planning application and considered to be appropriate.
<b>Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered</b>
No action required.

<b>Response received on 31/01/23 from</b>
UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA)
<b>Brief summary of issues raised</b>
UKHSA note that the main emissions of potential public health significance are emissions to air of bioaerosols, dust, including particulate matter, and ammonia. The existing operations on site and existing proximity of sensitive receptors are also noted. It is noted that if there are sensitive receptors within 100m from the boundary of such units the applicant is required to carry out a bioaerosol risk assessment. It is assumed by UKHSA 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.
<b>Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered</b>
The installation will be operated and managed in accordance with BAT. As there are relevant sensitive receptors within 100 metres of the Installation boundary, the operator was required to submit a dust and bioaerosols risk assessment and management plan, in accordance with our guidance. Appropriate measures have been proposed to manage fugitive emissions, in accordance with our technical guidance note for intensive farming, including ammonia, dust, bioaerosols and particulates and we are satisfied that the proposed measures will minimise the potential for emissions from the installation. Standard conditions 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 concerning fugitive emissions have been included in the permit.

No further responses were received.