

Permitting decisions

Variation

We have decided to grant the variation for Rise Farm operated by R & S Marton Limited.

The variation number is EPR/YP3433UA/V004.

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 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>

Now the BAT Conclusions are published all new housing within variation applications 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 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.

New BAT conclusions review

There are 33 BAT conclusion measures in total within the BAT conclusion document dated 21st February 2017.

The Applicant has confirmed their compliance with all relevant BAT conditions for the housing, in their document reference Installation Variation Appendix 2 Non-technical summary 23082022 and dated 23/08/22.

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 it achieves levels of Nitrogen excretion below the required BAT-AEL of 13.0 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 it achieves levels of Phosphorous excretion below the required BAT-AEL of 5.4 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 phosphorous excretion	Table S3.3 Process monitoring requires the operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT conclusions.
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 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. The Applicant has confirmed that emissions will be monitored and demonstrated from each animal house, by use of emission factors.
BAT 30 Ammonia emissions	The Applicant has confirmed it will demonstrate it achieves levels of ammonia below

BAT measure	Applicant compliance measure
from pig houses	the required BAT-AEL for the following pig types: Pigs > 30kg: 5.65 kg NH3/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 30 (pigs)

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

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 Appendix 7 Site condition report Marton Rise Farm (dated 21/11/22) 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:

- Manufacture and selection of feed.
- Feed delivery and storage.
- Waste production and storage.
- Use of materials and storage.
- Dirty water management.
- Fugitive emissions.
- Abnormal operations.
- Drinking water systems.
- Clean out and washing operations.
- Housing ventilation system.
- Carcase storage and disposal.

Odour Management Plan Review

The installation is located within 400m of 3 sensitive receptors. The Operator is required to manage activities in accordance with condition 3.3.1 of the permit and the site OMP.

The OMP includes the following key measures to minimise odour and odour risks:

- Site tours will be undertaken daily by the operators or their representative to ensure odour and risks of odour are assessed.
- Feed composition is closely matched to pigs' requirements. Diets are ad-lib dry pelleted feed. Diets are continually reviewed with a professional nutritionist to ensure good performance. Records of crude protein levels and diet formulation are kept in the site office.
- Dry feeds are stored in silos. No liquid feed storage. Hoppers are filled with a chain and disc system which runs every 15 minutes, so the feed never falls any great distance as it is topping up little and often. The feed storage is checked by the site manager in accordance with the site maintenance schedule.
- Feeders and drinkers have been designed to prevent wastage and leaks. Troughs and feeders are constructed and arranged to minimise feed waste and prevent pigs from climbing in or wallowing.
- Cleaning out occurs as soon as possible after destocking to allow maximum time for the building to dry before restocking. Pen and wall surfaces are constructed from non-porous smooth surfaces.
- All wash water drains to underground dirty water tanks. The drainage system works effectively to prevent ponding of water, which may release strong odours. This is achieved by gradient and type of yard surface, ensuring effective drainage.

- Farmyard manure removed from the scrapes every 2-3 days. No manure storage present within the installation boundary at Rise Farm.
- Spreading is applied to land in the locality owned and managed by the operator. Spreading is co-ordinated with local weather forecasts and follows NVZ regulations (where applicable), The Reduction and Prevention of Agricultural Diffuse Pollution (England) Regulations (2018) (Farming Rules for Water) and Defra Code of Good Agricultural Practice. Application is via a low trajectory splash plate, dribble bar, trailing shoe or injection to reduce creation of bioaerosols.
- Ventilation corresponds to animals' requirements to optimise the housed environment for the pigs and air quality conditions. Air quality is checked as part of minimum twice daily checks on stock.
- Pig carcasses are kept in a sealed storage container and disposed of promptly by a licenced deadstock collector once per week or sooner if required. No incinerator.
- Abnormal events are documented, dated and signed, appropriate plans are also reviewed and updated to prevent reoccurrence.

The complaint details and subsequent investigation will be recorded on the site complaint form and a copy will be kept in the site office.

If two or more odour complaints linked to the installation have occurred during any given pig cycle and are unresolved at the end of that cycle, the Operator will submit an action plan to the Environment Agency for additional measures to rectify the problems and reduce risk of odour pollution. This plan will be submitted for approval in writing to the Environment Agency. Pig placement for the next cycle will not commence until this action plan is agreed by the Environment Agency.

In accordance with H4 Odour Management guidance, the operator will review the effectiveness of odour control measures at least once a year and in the light of any building and management changes and on the outcome of investigations into the causes of any future complaints, if any occur.

Conclusion

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 are sensitive receptors within 400 metres of the Installation boundary as stated in section 4.4.2 above. The Operator has provided a noise management plan (NMP) as part of the Application supporting documentation, and further details are provided in section 4.5.2 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:

- Feed deliveries.
- Feeding systems.

- Maintenance and repairs.
- Personnel.
- Vehicle movements into and around the site.
- Ventilation systems and operations.
- Pig movements.
- Clean out operations.
- Alarms/ standby generators.

Noise Management Plan Review

The installation is located within 400m of 3 sensitive receptors. The Operator is required to manage activities in accordance with condition 3.4.1 of the permit and the site NMP.

The NMP includes the following key measures to minimise noise and noise risks:

- Noise levels are assessed daily by operators who live on site.
- Ad-lib feeding system so no spikes in noise and pig activity due to feeding times.
- Blower and vacuum type delivery vehicles fitted with low noise units.
- No milling and mixing operations carried out on site. All bought-in feed.
- Pigs only moved during the day and maintained in stable batches. Few movements as possible. Pigs handled gently and calmly to reduce stress and potential for noise. Handling systems in places to aid controlled and calm handling of pigs. Contractors and staff instructed not to whistle and shout.
- Loader used for scraping and transport during clean out operations. Engine revs kept low. Carried out mainly during the working day (where 'working day' is referenced, it is taken to mean during the daytime 0700 – 2300) and limited at weekends/ bank holidays. FYM is moved minimum distance or loaded directly into trailer, thereby minimising/ eliminating the need to scrape across an outside area. Pressure washers are operated within the buildings during use. Idling of engines and unnecessary revving is avoided.
- High output equipment reduces working hours during dirty water tanker filling and emptying. Stores located as far as possible from nearest receptors. Tanker filling infrequent and only when necessary and appropriate.
- Manure loading/ transport and spreading is carried out little and often removal reduces the period of activity in any one day, with the highest activity happening to clean out the site between batches.
- Supply and material delivery occur during normal working hours by arrangement.
- The straw bedded buildings are naturally ventilated. Regular maintenance and cleaning take place.
- Interruption to electric supply which would impact the fans would be reported to operator by phone (where applicable). The operators live on and/ or near the site and could either solve the issue or set up the back-up generator immediately.
- The fixed generator, where applicable, would be operated for minimal periods and is located between two buildings which will act as acoustic barriers. Emergency back-up only. For the purposes of routine maintenance, it is operated on a fortnightly basis for an hour, under load and operating conditions providing electricity for farm use.

The NMP will be reviewed in the light of any building and management changes, and on the outcome of investigations into the causes of any future complaints, if any occur, but in any event, at least annually. Any noise complaints will be reported to the operators who will log and investigate causes of all complaints, identifying the source of the noise issue and monitoring noise levels at the site boundary as part of the investigation.

The complaint details and subsequent investigation will be recorded on the site complaint form and a copy will be kept in the site office. The NMP includes a complaints procedure and an example of the complaint report form.

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 Bio aerosols

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, the nearest sensitive receptor (the nearest point of their assumed property boundary) is approximately 3 metres to the south etc. of the installation boundary.

Guidance on our website concludes that applicants need to produce and submit a dust and bio aerosol 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 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 Applicant has confirmed the following measures in their operating techniques to reduce dust:

- Site tours will be undertaken daily to ensure emissions and risks of emissions are assessed.
- No feed mixing or milling is undertaken onsite. Feed is only supplied by a UFAS accredited feed mill, so that only approved raw materials are utilised in production.
- Diets are ad-lib dry pelleted feed with minimal falls into troughs to reduce dust emissions. All feed systems are fully enclosed and automated, and feed blown in through sealed pipe, thus reducing risk of spillage when filling or emptying. The feed storage is checked by the site manager in accordance with the site's maintenance schedule.
- Vehicle washing will take place on concrete floor/pads where the water drains directly to the dirty water tanks.
- Straw based bedding is stored under cover to ensure it is kept clean and dry to prevent wastage and deterioration.
- Rooves are kept clear of dust build-up, reducing risk of contamination of roof water to clean water drainage.

The complaints procedure will follow the requirements set out in the Environment Agency's H4 Odour management guidance. The complaint details and subsequent investigation will be recorded on the site complaint form.

The effectiveness of control measures will be reviewed at least once a year or sooner in the event of any complaint or relevant changes to operations.

Conclusion

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

Ammonia

The applicant has demonstrated that the housing will meet the relevant NH3 BAT-AEL.

There are 0 Special Area(s) of Conservation (SAC), 0 Special Protection Area(s) (SPA) and 0 Ramsar sites located within 5 kilometres of the installation. There are 3 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) located within 5 km of the installation. There are also 0 Local Wildlife Sites (LWS), 1 Ancient Woodland (AW) and 0 Local Nature Reserves (LNR) 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 Rise Farm will only have a potential impact on SSSI sites with a precautionary critical level of 1µg/m³ if they are within 3,014 metres of the emission source.

Beyond 3,014m the PC is less than 0.2µg/m³ (i.e. less than 20% of the precautionary 1µg/m³ critical level) and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case all SSSIs are beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

Where the precautionary level of 1µg/m³ 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 1µg/m³ 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)
Golden Hill Pit SSSI	2,488 (The citation for this SSSI says the site is listed as national important in the Geological Conservation Review. Therefore, it has no biological interest and is not sensitive to ammonia, so concludes that the site screens out).
Green Lane Pit SSSI	2,394 (The citation for this SSSI says the site is listed as national important in the Geological Conservation Review. Therefore, it has no biological interest and is not sensitive to ammonia, so concludes that the site screens out).
Cropton Banks and Howlgate Head Woods SSSI	4,957

Ammonia assessment - 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 Rise Farm will only have a potential impact on the AW site with a precautionary critical level of $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ if they are within 1,259 metres of the emission source.

Beyond 1,259m 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 AW is beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

Table 2 – AW Assessment

Name of AW	Distance from site (m)
Riseborough Hagg Wood N AW	2,037

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/Engagement	
Consultation	The consultation requirements were identified in accordance with the Environmental Permitting Regulations and our public participation statement. The application was publicised on the GOV.UK website. We consulted the following organisations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food Standards Agency. • Local Authority – Environmental Health. • Local Authority – Planning. • Health and Safety Executive. • Director of Public Health & UKHSA (formerly PHE). The comments and our responses are summarised in the consultation section .
The facility	
The regulated facility	We considered the extent and nature of the facility at the site in accordance with RGN2 'Understanding the meaning of regulated facility'. 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.
The site	
Extent of the site of the facility	The operator has provided a plan which we consider are 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	The application is within the relevant distance criteria of a site of heritage, landscape or nature conservation, and/or protected species or habitat. 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. We consider that the application will not affect any sites of nature conservation,

Aspect considered	Decision
	<p>landscape and heritage, and/or protected species or habitats identified.</p> <p>The proposed permission is not likely to damage any of the flora, fauna or geological or physiological features which are of special interest at Golden Hill Pit SSSI, Green Lane Pit SSSI or Cropton Banks and Howlgate Head Woods SSSI.</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>
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 permit(s).</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>
Emission limits	<p>ELVs and/ or equivalent parameters or technical measures based on BAT have been set for the following substances.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ammonia. • Nitrogen. • Phosphorous.
Monitoring	<p>ELVs and/ or equivalent parameters or technical measures based on BAT have been set for the following substances.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ammonia. • Nitrogen.

Aspect considered	Decision
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phosphorous.
Reporting	<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>We made these decisions in order to ensure compliance with the Intensive Farming sector BAT conclusions document dated 21/02/17.</p>
Operator competence	
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.
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 following summarises the responses to consultation with other organisations and the way in which we have considered these in the determination process.

Responses from organisations listed in the consultation section

Response received from
UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) on 12/01/23
Brief summary of issues raised
<p>The main emissions of potential public health significance are emissions to air of bioaerosols, dust including particulate matter and ammonia. The farm is located in a rural setting, with infrequent and isolated public health receptors. The applicant has detailed mitigation measures and based on the information provided, the public health risks are considered to be low.</p> <p>Bioaerosols</p> <p>UKHSA note that there are two residential dwellings within 50m of the site, which are occupied by the site operator.</p> <p>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). This should ensure that emissions present a low risk to human health</p>
Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered
<p>BAT Review document requested and received to show compliance to the BAT conclusion document dated 21st February 2017. DMP and bioaerosols risk assessment and management plan received. 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>

No responses were received from the following:

- Members of the public via web publication.
- Food Standards Agency.
- Local Authority – Environmental Health.
- Local Authority – Planning.
- Health and Safety Executive.