

Permitting decisions

Variation

We have decided to grant the variation for Moorfield Farm operated by Moorefield Farm Limited.

The variation number is EPR/FP3837QF/V002.

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.

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>

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.

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 21st February 2017.

The Operator has confirmed the installation complies in full with all the BAT conclusion measures, in their BAT document received with the application. This has been referenced in Table S1.2 Operating Techniques of the permit.

The following is a more specific review of the measures the Operator has applied to ensure compliance with the above key BAT measures.

BAT measure	Operator compliance measure
BAT 3 - Nutritional management - Nitrogen excretion	The Operator has confirmed it will demonstrate it achieves levels of Nitrogen excretion below the required BAT-AEL of 0.6 kg N/animal place/year by an estimation using manure analysis for total Nitrogen content.
BAT 4 - Nutritional management - Phosphorous excretion	The Operator has confirmed it will demonstrate it achieves levels of Phosphorous excretion below the required BAT-AEL of 0.25 kg P ₂ O ₅ /animal place/year by an estimation using manure analysis for total Phosphorous content.
BAT 24 - Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Total nitrogen and phosphorous excretion	Table S3.3 of the Permit concerning 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 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"> • Twice daily olfactory checks coinciding with stock inspections (normally 07.00-10.00 hrs and 16.00-18.00hrs) any abnormalities recorded and investigated. • Monitoring carried out weekly at monitoring points at the installation boundary by means of "sniff testing", by persons not involved directly with the operations at the installation. In the event of elevated odour levels being recorded, staff will be alerted to implement contingency measures. Retesting at the installation boundary will be conducted following any actions implemented to ensure their effectiveness.

BAT measure	Operator compliance measure
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 Applicant has confirmed they will report the dust emissions to the Environment Agency annually by multiplying the dust emissions factor for broilers by the number of birds on site.</p>
BAT 32 - Ammonia emissions from poultry houses - Broilers	<p>The BAT-AEL to be complied with is 0.08 kg NH₃/animal place/year.</p> <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 – 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 new housing on existing 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.

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 or storage.
- Housing ventilation system.
- Litter management.
- Carcass disposal.
- House clean out.

There are seventeen sensitive receptors within 400 metres of the installation boundary, the nearest receptor is located approximately 145 metres to the south of the installation boundary. The operator has provided an OMP that has been assessed against the requirements of EPR 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:

- Twice daily olfactory checks coinciding with stock inspections.
- No on-site milling and mixing of feed; feed is supplied only from UKASTA accredited feed mills, so that only approved raw materials are used.
- Feed delivery systems are sealed to minimise atmospheric dust.
- Feed deliveries are monitored to avoid dust and spills; any spillage of feed around the bin is immediately swept up.
- Use of extraction fans to aid dispersion.
- The ventilation and heating system is regularly adjusted to match the age and requirements of the flock.
- The ventilation system is designed to efficiently remove moisture from the house.
- Additional gable end fans operated only during hot weather to aid cooling.
- Use of nipple drinkers with drip cups to minimise spillage.
- Daily checks of drinker height and pressures to avoid capping.
- Mortalities collected daily from the houses and placed into plastic sealed bags, stored in sealed, shaded and vermin proof containers away from sensitive receptors.
- Carcass collection is timed to prevent the release of odour; at least twice weekly during the crop cycle, frequency increased during summer months and crop age to three times per week.
- Litter carefully placed into trailers positioned close to doors; trailers sheeted before leaving fill position.
- Clean out carried out as soon as possible following destocking (within one day; total average time for site de-littering is two days).
- Houses awaiting de-littering kept sealed, with minimum ventilation operated during de-littering. Houses are resealed awaiting washing operations.
- No storage of used litter on site at any time.
- Used litter is spread on third party owned land in strict accordance with a Manure Management Plan.
- Washing operations are carried out within one day of de-littering.
- All sediment traps and drains are cleaned both before and after washing operations.
- Working areas around houses are concreted and kept clean during the production cycle.

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
- Clean out operations
- Generator
- Personnel
- Maintenance and Repairs

There are seventeen sensitive receptors within 400 metres of the installation boundary. The Operator has provided a noise management plan (NMP) as part of the Application supporting documentation. The following key measures are contained in the NMP to minimise noise pollution:

- Feed delivery lorries are fitted with silencers.
- Large capacity lorries utilised to reduce the number of deliveries.
- Feed delivery time restrictions in place (07.00-19.00 hrs).
- The standby generator is test run during normal working hours (08.00-18.00hrs), and is housed in an acoustic building.
- Noise from fans is assessed during twice daily inspections.
- Any noisy fans are isolated, and the electrician is notified.
- Daily inspections of bin stocks to prevent augers running empty.
- Fuel deliveries are time restricted (07.00-18.00hrs).
- No idling of engines allowed, or audible reversing alarms during night hours.
- Catch teams are fully trained and advised of the need to keep noise to a minimum.
- Litter and wash water removal carried out during normal working hours (07.00-18.00hrs).
- Washing operations are completed during normal working hours (08.00-18.00hrs).
- Maintenance and repairs undertaken during normal working hours (07.00-1800hrs) excepting emergencies/breakdown.
- Bird placement carried out during normal working hours (08.0018.00hrs).

The NMP provides a suitable procedure in the event of complaints in relation to noise.

The NMP will be reviewed annually or following a substantiated complaint, and any appropriate changes made to the NMP, as identified by the review.

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

There are no sensitive receptors within 100m of the Installation boundary (the nearest point of their assumed property boundary) and so the Operator was not required to submit a dust and bioaerosol management plan.

Standby generator

The standby generator has a net thermal rated input of 0.378MWth, for use in the event of mains power failure. The generator will not be tested more than 50 hours per annum, and will not be used more than 500 hours per annum, averaged over a 3 year period. The generator falls outside of the requirements of the Medium Combustion Plant Directive.

Improvement Programme

Following receipt of this variation application, the requirements of the improvement conditions detailed in Table S1.3 of the permit have been satisfied and they have been marked as complete.

Due to changes in guidance, IC1 is no longer applicable for slurry lagoons used purely for storing poultry wastewater.

IC2 has been satisfied following a review of the proposed lightly contaminated and dirty water site drainage at the installation, detailed as part of this variation application.

IC3 has been satisfied following the proposed change in livestock type and number, as a result of this variation application.

Ammonia

There are no Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Areas (SPA) or Ramsar sites located within 5 kilometres of the installation. There are seven Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) located within 5 km of the installation. There are also eight Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) and seven 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 (CL_e) or critical load (CL_o) 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 Moorfield Farm will only have a potential impact on SSSI with a precautionary critical level of 1µg/m³ if they are within 2,123 metres of the emission source.

Beyond 2,123 metres, 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 the SSSIs below 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)
Hopwood Dingle	4,229
Berry Mound Pastures	4,934
Bittell Reservoirs	4,834
Dagnell End Meadow	4,144
Clowes Wood & New Fallings Coppice	2,793
River Blythe	4,088

Screening using the ammonia screening tool version 4.6 has indicated that the PC for Windmill Naps Wood SSSI is predicted to be less than 20% of the critical load for nitrogen deposition/acid deposition therefore it is possible to conclude no damage. The results of the ammonia screening tool version 4.6 are given in the tables below.

Table 2 – Nitrogen deposition

Site	Critical load kg N/ha/yr*	PC kg N/ha/yr.	PC % critical load
Windmill Naps Wood SSSI	10	1.136	11.4

* Critical load values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) – 08/06/23

Table 3 – Acid deposition

Site	Critical load keq/ha/yr*	PC keq/ha/yr.	PC % critical load
Windmill Naps Wood SSSI	3.217	0.081	2.5

* Critical load values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) – 08/06/23

No further assessment is required.

Screening using the ammonia screening tool version 4.6, has determined that the PCs of ammonia emissions from the application site are over the 20% threshold, and therefore may cause damage to features of the SSSI. An in-combination assessment has therefore been carried out.

There are no other farms acting in combination with this application. The PC is predicted to be less than 50% of the critical level significance threshold. Under Environment Agency guidelines, it is therefore possible to conclude no likely damage to the site from the installation, no further assessment is required.

Table 4 – Ammonia emissions

Site	Critical level ammonia µg/m ³	Predicted process contribution µg/m ³	% of critical level
Windmill Naps Wood SSSI	1*	0.219	21.9

* Critical load values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) – 08/06/23

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 Moorfield Farm will only have a potential impact on the LWS/AW sites with a precautionary critical level of 1µg/m³ if they are within 887 metres of the emission source.

Beyond 887 metres, the PC is less than 1µg/m³ and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case the LWS/AWs below 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)
Lake at Mount Pleasant LWS	1,976
River Arrow LWS	1,782
Storage Wood LWS/AW	1,749
Lion Wood LWS/AW	2,000
Blackoak Wood AW	1,157
Checkleys Coppice AW	1,622
Windmill Naps AW	2,023
Graves Coppice AW	1,981
Unknown AW	2,021

Screening using the ammonia screening tool version 4.6 and detailed modelling (Reference 'A Report on the Modelling of the Dispersion and Deposition of Ammonia from the Existing Pullet Chicken Rearing Houses and the Proposed Broiler Chicken Rearing Houses at Moorfield Farm, Lilley Green Road, Alvechurch, Birmingham', and dated 17/04/23) has determined that the PC on the LWS/AW for ammonia emissions/nitrogen deposition/acid deposition from the application site are under the 100% significance threshold and can be screened out as having no likely significant effect. See results below.

Table 6 - Ammonia emissions

Site	Critical level ammonia µg/m ³	Predicted PC µg/m ³	PC % of critical level
Ponds north of Watery Lane LWS ^[1]	3*	1.850	61.7
Dagnell Brook LWS ^[1]	3*	1.184	39.5
River Cole LWS ^[2]	3*	1.5702	52.6
Moorfield Coppice LWS/AW ^[2]	3*	2.01	67.0

* Cle 3 applied as no protected lichen or bryophytes species were found when checking Easimap layer

Note, detailed modelling was based on a precautionary Cle1.

[1] Based on AST.

[2] Detailed modelling, based on 200,000 broilers.

Table 7 – Nitrogen deposition

Site ^[1]	Critical load kg N/ha/yr. *	Predicted PC kg N/ha/yr.	PC % of critical load
Ponds north of Watery Lane LWS	10	9.607	96.1
Dagnell Brook LWS	10	6.148	61.5

* Critical load values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) – 08/06/23

[1] Based on AST.

Table 8 – Acid deposition

Site	Critical load keq/ha/yr*	Predicted PC keq/ha/yr.	PC % of critical load
River Cole LWS ^[1]	2.739	1.451	53.0
Ponds north of Watery Lane LWS ^[1]	2.739	0.686	25.0
Dagnell Brook LWS ^[1]	2.733	0.439	16.1
Moorfield Coppice LWS/AW ^[2]	2.739	1.118 ^[3]	40.8

* Critical load values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) – 08/06/23

[1] Based on AST.

[2] Detailed modelling based on 200,000 broilers.

[3] Based on 1/14 of nitrogen deposition PC.

No further assessment is required.

Detailed modelling (Reference 'A Report on the Modelling of the Dispersion and Deposition of Ammonia from the Existing Pullet Chicken Rearing Houses and the Proposed Broiler Chicken Rearing Houses at Moorfield Farm, Lilley Green Road, Alvechurch, Birmingham', and dated 17/04/23) has determined that the PC on the LWS/AW for nitrogen deposition from the application site are over the 100% significance threshold and cannot be screened out as having no likely significant effect. See results below.

Table 9 – Nitrogen deposition

Site	Critical load kg N/ha/yr. *	Predicted PC kg N/ha/yr.	PC % of critical load
River Cole LWS	10	12.233	122.3
Moorfield Coppice LWS/AW	10	15.66	156.6

* Critical load values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) – 08/06/23

However, it should be noted that the applicants' detailed modelling was based on a maximum of 200,000 broilers and therefore represents a worst case scenario. We have carried out sensitivity checks on the applicants' modelling during our audit and have concluded that based on 185,000 broilers, the PC will not exceed the 100% significance threshold for nitrogen deposition at the two sites in Table 9.

No further assessment is required.

Decision checklist

Aspect considered	Decision
Receipt of application	
Confidential information	A claim for commercial or industrial confidentiality has not been made.
Identifying confidential information	We have not identified information provided as part of the application that we consider to be confidential.
Consultation	
Consultation	<p>The consultation requirements were identified in accordance with the Environmental Permitting Regulations and our public participation statement.</p> <p>The application was publicised on the GOV.UK website.</p> <p>We consulted the following organisations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Authority – Environmental Health – Bromsgrove District Council • 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 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> <p>See key issues section.</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 that the Operator 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"> • The houses are ventilated using roof inlets and side extraction fans. All five houses also have gable end fans. • The houses are warmed by Liquid Petroleum Gas (LPG). • Litter is exported off site and sold for spreading on third party land. • Wash water is channelled to an underground concrete slurry pit, fitted with floating cover, and subsequently exported off site and spread on third party land. • Roof water from the poultry houses is intercepted, via grassed areas acting as soakaways and French drains, prior to discharge to ditch. • Yard surface water is intercepted via French drains prior to discharge to ditch. • During clean out operations a diverter valve is used to channel yard surface water to the underground slurry pit for exporting off site. • Mortalities are collected daily and stored in locked and sealed containers on site, prior to removal and disposal in accordance with the Animal By-Product Regulations.
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 key issues 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 key issues section.</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.</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 based on BAT have been set for the following substances:</p>

Aspect considered	Decision
	Nitrogen Phosphorus Ammonia See key issues 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.
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.
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> <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 growth duty is made by the applicant in their application.</p>