Permitting decisions

Variation

We have decided to grant the variation for Langley Burrell Poultry Unit operated by Devonshire Poultry Limited.

The variation number is EPR/CP3907ST/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.

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 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.

This variation determination includes a review of compliance with the best available techniques (BAT) conclusions, as defined in the intensive rearing of poultry or pigs (IRPP) BAT conclusions document, dated 21/02/17, for new housing introduced with this variation, and existing housing permitted before 21/02/17.

New BAT conclusions review

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

We have sent out a not duly made request for information requiring the operator to confirm that the installation complies in full with all the BAT conclusion measures.

The operator has confirmed their compliance with all BAT conditions for the housing, in their email dated 02/03/24, which has been referenced in Table S1.2, Operating Techniques.

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 that the installation achieves levels of Nitrogen excretion below the required BAT-AEL of 0.6 kg N/animal place/year using a mass balance of nitrogen based on the feed intake, dietary content of crude protein, and animal performance.
BAT 4 - Nutritional management - Phosphorous excretion	The operator has confirmed it will demonstrate that the installation achieves levels of Phosphorous excretion below the required BAT-AEL of 0.25 kg P_2O_5/animal place/year using a mass balance of phosphorus based on the feed intake, dietary content of crude protein, total phosphorus and animal performance.
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	The approved OMP includes the following details for odour monitoring: Noting there are sensitive receptors within 400 metres of the installation boundary,

BAT measure	Operator compliance measure
parameters - Odour emissions	regular monitoring and plans to undertake monitoring at higher frequencies in the event of odours arising will be undertaken and matters resolved. These include the following: • Daily (sniff) tests by staff on site to detect abnormally high housekeeping odours. • Daily site tours of the installation perimeter to be undertaken by persons who do not work regularly on the farm. • Periodic monitoring of odour emissions to air will be undertaken to EN standards (e.g. use of dynamic olfactometry according to EN 13725) in order to determine odour concentration. • Monitoring of high offsite odour (self-assessed or complaints).
BAT 27 - Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Dust emissions	Table S3.3 of the permit concerning process monitoring requires the operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT conclusions. The operator 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.
BAT 32 - Ammonia emissions from poultry houses - Broilers	The BAT-AEL to be complied with is 0.08 kg NH3/animal place/year. The operator will meet this as the emission factor for broilers is 0.034 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 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.

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 Langley Burrell Poultry Unit (dated March 2024) 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:

- Selection of feed.
- Feed delivery and storage.
- Ventilation systems.
- Litter management.
- Carcass disposal.
- House clean-out.

There are a number of sensitive receptors located within 400m of the installation boundary for Langley Burrell Poultry Unit, the nearest receptor is located approximately 165 metres to the south of the installation boundary. There have been no odour complaints linked to the installation historically.

The Operator has provided a revised odour management plan (OMP) (submitted 28/03/24) and this has been assessed against the requirements of 'How to Comply with your Environmental Permit for Intensive Farming' EPR 6.09 (version 2), Appendix 4 guidance 'Odour Management at Intensive Livestock Installations' and our Top Tips Guidance and Poultry Industry Good Practice Checklist (August 2013). We consider that the OMP is acceptable because it complies with the above guidance, with details of odour control measures, contingency measures and complaint procedures described below. The operator is required to manage activities in accordance with condition 3.3.1 of the permit and this OMP.

The OMP includes odour control measures, in particular, procedural controls such as manufacture and selection of feed, feed delivery and storage, carcass storage and disposal, etc. The operator has identified the potential sources of odour, as well as the potential risks and problems, and detailed actions taken to minimise odour.

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

The Environment Agency has reviewed the OMP and considers it complies with the requirements of our H4 Odour management guidance note. We agree with the scope and suitability of key measures, but this should not be taken as confirmation that the details of equipment specification design, operation and maintenance are suitable and sufficient. That remains the responsibility of the Operator.

Odour Modelling Review

The operator provided an odour modelling assessment with the application (reference 'A Dispersion Modelling Study of the Impact of Odour from the Existing and Proposed Broiler Chicken Rearing Houses at Langley Burrell Poultry Farm, Sutton Lane, near Langley Burrell in Wiltshire'), dated 29/04/2021, but this has not been reviewed as part of the permit variation determination. We do not request odour modelling for intensive agriculture applications unless it is being used to check the efficacy of specific abatement techniques. In general, if odour modelling assessments are submitted in support of an EPR intensive agriculture installation application, we will not review it but focus on establishing whether odour management techniques represent Best Available Techniques and ensure as appropriate the approval of a robust Odour Management Plan.

In the case of intensive agriculture sector, odour modelling uncertainties are excessively high especially in the locations of interest where receptors are close to the farm. This is because in close proximity, the ratios of the observed peak to mean odour concentrations are high rendering the benchmarks that are typically used for assessment unreliable. This is exacerbated by uncertainties in the model algorithms in the wake regions of buildings that can render predictions indicative only in such locations. Therefore, it is concluded not to make permitting decisions based on odour modelling predictions adjacent to intensive agriculture installations.

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 above. There have been no noise complaints linked to the installation historically.

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:

- Birds.
- Vehicles operating on site.
- Feed transfer.
- Ventilation system.
- Alarm system and stand-by generator.
- Personnel.
- Building work/repairs.

The Operator has provided a revised noise management plan (NMP) (submitted 28/03/24), as part of the Application supporting documentation.

Operations with the most potential to cause noise nuisance have been assessed and control measures put in place, for example procedural controls for vehicles and machinery accessing the site and operating on site; ventilation system; feeding equipment; stand-by generators etc.

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

The NMP is required to be reviewed at least every year, or following any changes to operations, and/or after a substantiated complaint is received, whichever is the sooner.

Conclusion

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.

Noise modelling review

The operator provided a noise modelling assessment with the application (reference 'Broiler House Ventilation Fan Noise Assessment'), dated 18/05/21, but this has not been reviewed as part of the permit variation determination. In general, if noise modelling assessments are submitted in support of an EPR intensive agriculture installation application, we will not review it but focus on establishing whether noise management techniques represent Best Available Techniques and ensure as appropriate the approval of a robust Noise Management Plan.

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 is one sensitive receptor within 100m of the Installation boundary, which is located (the nearest point of their assumed property boundary) adjacent to the installation boundary, to the south-west.

The risk assessment for the Installation provided with the Application lists key potential risks of dust and bioaerosol pollution beyond the Installation boundary.

In addition, guidance on our website concludes that applicants need to produce and submit a dust and bioaerosol management plan with their applications if there are relevant receptors within 100m 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 operator was required to submit a dust and bioaerosol management plan in this format (revised version submitted 28/03/24).

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.

Conclusion

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

Standby generator

There are two standby generators located within the installation boundary, each with a net thermal rated input of 0.206MWth, for use in the event of mains power failure. The generators will not be tested for more than 52 hours per annum and will not be used for more than 500 hours per annum (emergency use and testing), averaged over a 3-year period. The generators fall outside of the requirements of the Medium Combustion Plant Directive.

Improvement programme

All improvement conditions have been marked as complete following confirmation from area that they have been closed.

Ammonia

There are no European designated sites within 5 km of the installation boundary. There are five Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) within 5 km of the installation, and thirteen other nature conservation sites within 2 km comprising of nine Local Wildlife Sites (LWSs) and four ancient woodlands (AWs).

Ammonia assessment – SSSIs

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 5km of the SSSI.

Initial screening using the ammonia screening tool version 4.6, dated 07/02/24, has indicated that emissions from Langley Burrell Poultry Unit, based on 437,818 broilers, will only have a potential impact on SSSIs with a precautionary critical level of 1µg/m^3 if they are within 1,764m of the emission source.

Beyond 1,764m the PC is less than 0.2µg/m^3 (i.e. less than 20% of the precautionary 1µg/m^3 critical level) and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case, the SSSIs are beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

Where the precautionary level of 1µg/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 1µg/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)
Kellaways – West Tytherton, River Avon SSSI	1,774
Stanton St. Quintin Quarry and Motorway	3,788
Bencroft Hill Meadows	4,335
Harries Ground, Rodbourne	5,055

Screening using the ammonia screening tool version 4.6, dated 07/02/24, has indicated that the PC for the SSSI is predicted to be less than 20% of the critical load for acid deposition therefore it is possible to conclude no damage. The results of the ammonia screening tool version 4.6, based on 437,818 broilers, are given in the table below.

Table 2 – Acid deposition

Site	Critical load keq/ha/yr*	PC keq/ha/yr.	PC % critical load
Sutton Lane Meadows SSSI	4.856	0.735	15.1

*Critical load values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) – 07/02/24

No further assessment is required.

Detailed modelling [A Report on the Modelling of the Dispersion and Deposition of Ammonia from the Existing and Proposed Broiler Chicken Rearing Houses at Langley Burrell Poultry Farm, Sutton Lane, near Langley Burrell in Wiltshire, dated 29/04/21] has indicated that the PC for the SSSI is predicted to be less than 20% of

the critical level/load for ammonia emissions therefore it is possible to conclude no damage. The results are given in the tables below.

The ammonia modelling assessment has been audited in detail by our Air Quality Modelling and Assessment Unit and we have confidence that we can agree with the report conclusions.

It should be noted that the applicants modelling, and the results included in the tables below, have been based on 400,000 broilers in-line with the initial proposal. However, the applicant later requested to maintain bird numbers at the current permitted figure of 437,818 broilers. Check modelling has been undertaken as part of the audit, which included checks on the impacts at Sutton Lane Meadows SSSI based on 437,818 broilers. Our modelling checks indicate that there will be no likely exceedances of the relevant critical levels and loads at the SSSI.

Table 3 – **Ammonia emissions**

Site	**Ammonia CIe (µg/m^3)**	**PC (µg/m^3)**	**PC % critical level**
Sutton Lane Meadows SSSI	3*	0.472	15.7

*Critical level values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) – 07/02/24

No further assessment is required.

Screening using the ammonia screening tool version 4.6, based on 437,818 broilers, dated 07/02/24, has determined that the PC of nitrogen deposition from the application site is over the 50% threshold at the SSSI. However, comparison between the impacts on the SSSI from existing operations and proposed operations at the installation indicates that the impact resulting from the proposed changes to operations is approximately 12% lower than those from the existing operation (see tables below) for nitrogen deposition and therefore there is a reduction of impact at the SSSI as a result of the proposals. On this basis we agree that the permit variation can be granted based on a reduction of impacts on the SSSI. In addition, check modelling has been undertaken on the detailed modelling [A Report on the Modelling of the Dispersion and Deposition of Ammonia from the Existing and Proposed Broiler Chicken Rearing Houses at Langley Burrell Poultry Farm, Sutton Lane, near Langley Burrell in Wiltshire, dated 29/04/21] as part of the audit. Our modelling checks indicate that there will be no likely exceedances of the relevant critical load at Sutton Lane Meadows SSSI, based on 437,818 broilers.

It should be noted that the applicant incorrectly applied a CLo of 20kg N/ha/yr rather than 10kg N/ha/yr for Sutton Lane Meadows SSSI in their modelling. Our modelling checks have been completed using the correct CLo of 10 kgN/ha/yr.

Table 4 – Nitrogen deposition – existing scenario

Site	**Predicted PC kg N/ha/yr**
Sutton Lane Meadows SSSI	11.673

Table 5 – Nitrogen deposition – proposed scenario

Site	**Predicted PC kg N/ha/yr**
Sutton Lane Meadows SSSI	10.285

No further assessment is required.

Ammonia assessment - LWSs/AWs

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, dated 07/02/24, has indicated that emissions from Langley Burrell Poultry Unit, based on 437,818 broilers, will only have a potential impact on the LWSs/AWs with a precautionary critical level of 1µg/m^3 if they are within 605m of the emission source.

Beyond 605m, the PC is less than 1µg/m^3 and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case the LWSs/AWs are beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

Table 6 – LWS/AW Assessment

Site	Distance from site (m)
The Cuttings LWS	638
Railway Reed Beds, Bremhill LWS	1,001
Poor Lain's Coppice LWS	1,493
Old Coppice LWS	1,581
The Shrubbery LWS	1,586
Sydney's Wood LWS	1,609
Long Pond Plantation LWS	2,094
Poor Lains Copse AW	1,493
Old Copse AW	1,581
Weir Wood AW	1,586
Sydneys Wood AW	1,609

Screening using the ammonia screening tool version 4.6, based on 437,818 broilers, dated 07/02/24, has determined that the PC on the LWS 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 7 – Ammonia emissions

Site	Critical level ammonia µg/m^3	Predicted PC µg/m^3	PC % of critical level
Sutton Lane Meadows LWS	3*	1.55	51.7

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

Table 8 – Nitrogen deposition

Site	Critical load kg N/ha/yr.	Predicted PC kg N/ha/yr.	PC % of critical load
Sutton Lane Meadows LWS	10*	8.049	80.5

*Critical load values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) – 07/02/24

Table 9 – Acid deposition

Site	Critical load keq/ha/yr	Predicted PC keq/ha/yr.	PC % of critical load
Sutton Lane Meadows LWS	4.856*	0.575	11.8

*Critical load values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) – 07/02/24

Detailed modelling [A Report on the Modelling of the Dispersion and Deposition of Ammonia from the Existing and Proposed Broiler Chicken Rearing Houses at Langley Burrell Poultry Farm, Sutton Lane, near Langley Burrell in Wiltshire, dated 29/04/21] has determined that the PC on the LWS 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.

Detailed modelling provided by the applicant has been audited in detail by our Air Quality Modelling and Assessment Unit (AQMAU) and we have confidence that we can agree with the report conclusions.

It should be noted that the applicant incorrectly applied a CLe of 1µg/m^3 rather than 3µg/m^3 for Bristol Avon River LWS in their modelling. The applicant also incorrectly calculated the nutrient nitrogen process contribution for Bristol Avon River LWS. These errors have been corrected in the tables below.

It should also be noted that the applicants modelling, and the results in the tables below, have been based on 400,000 broilers in-line with the initial proposals. However, the applicant later requested to maintain bird numbers at the current permitted figure of 437,818 broilers. Check modelling has been undertaken as part of the audit, which included checks on the impacts at Bristol Avon River LWS based on 437,818 broilers. Our modelling checks indicate that there will be no likely exceedances of the relevant critical levels and loads at the LWS.

Table 10 - Ammonia emissions

Site	Critical level ammonia µg/m^3	Predicted PC µg/m^3	PC % of critical level
Bristol Avon River LWS	3*	1.669	55.6**

*CLe 3 applied as no protected lichen or bryophytes species were found when checking Easimap layer
**Corrected based on CLe of 3µg/m^3.

Table 11 – Nitrogen deposition

Site	Critical load kg N/ha/yr.	Predicted PC kg N/ha/yr.	PC % of critical load
Bristol Avon River LWS	10*	8.669**	86.7

*Critical load values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) – 07/02/24
**PC correctly calculated, based on a deposition velocity of 0.02 and ammonia PC of 1.669 (taken from modelling report).

Table 12 – Acid deposition

Site	Critical load keq/ha/yr	Predicted PC keq/ha/yr.	PC % of critical load
Bristol Avon River LWS	4.856*	0.619**	12.8

*Critical load values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) – 07/02/24
**Based on 1/14th of maximum PC for nitrogen deposition calculated in Table 11.

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.
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 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	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, landscape and heritage, and/or protected species or habitats identified. We have not consulted Natural England on the application. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance. See key issues section.
Environmental risk assessment	
Environmental risk	We have reviewed the operator's assessment of the environmental risk from the facility. The operator's risk assessment is satisfactory.
Operating techniques	
General operating techniques	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. The operating techniques that the applicant must use are specified in table S1.2 in the environmental permit.

Aspect considered	Decision
	The operating techniques include the following: • All sheds are ventilated by high velocity roof fans, with an emission point higher than 5.5 metres above ground level and an efflux speed of 11 metres per second, with additional gable end fans, although these are operated infrequently to maintain temperature, typically in the summer months. Sheds 1 to 6 also have additional side fans, operated infrequently to maintain temperature, typically in the summer months. • Water is provided via a nipple drinking system fitted with cups to reduce leakage. • Carcasses are stored in sealed and locked containers on site prior to removal by a licensed contractor every week. • Spent litter is removed for spreading on third party owned land. • Dirty water is removed off site by a registered contractor for water treatment. • Roof water from the sheds is directed to French drain soakaways running alongside the sheds. • Water draining from yard areas associated with sheds 7 to 11, along with excess roof water from these sheds, drains to an attenuation basin and soakaway within the installation boundary, with an overflow to ditch. Water draining from yard areas associated with sheds 1 to 6 drains to French drain soakaway or ditch via French drains.
Odour management	We have reviewed the odour management plan in accordance with our guidance on odour management. We consider that the odour management plan is satisfactory. See key issues section.
Noise management	We have reviewed the noise management plan in accordance with our guidance on noise assessment and control. We consider that the noise management plan is satisfactory. See key issues section.
Permit conditions	
Updating permit conditions during consolidation	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.
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	ELVs based on BAT have been set for the following substances. • Ammonia • Nitrogen • Phosphorus BAT-AELs have been added in-line with Intensive Farming BAT conclusions document dated 21/02/2017. These limits are included in table S3.3 of the permit.

Aspect considered	Decision
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	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. Paragraph 1.3 of the guidance says: "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." 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. 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.