

# Permitting decisions

## Bespoke permit

---

We have decided to grant the permit for **Carkin Moor Farm Poultry Unit** operated by **Carkin Moor Farm Eggs Limited**

The permit number is **EPR/ZP3024SH**

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; and
- 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. The introductory note summarises what the permit covers.

# Key issues of the decision

## Introduction

This is a poultry free range layer intensive farm new installation under the EPR regulations.

The farm is existing and prior to this application has operated as a single poultry house farm. It has previously operated just under the 40,000 bird places EPR threshold for an installation.

Going forward the new installation will have a capacity of 64,000 free range layer bird places with the addition of a second poultry house.

Both poultry houses are operated as aviary systems. The free-range birds themselves generate sufficient heat to negate the need for any additional heating system.

## 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 sets 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 installation farming permits issued after 21<sup>st</sup> February 2017 must be compliant in full from the first day of operation.

There are some new requirements for permit holders. The Conclusions include BAT-Associated Emission Levels (BAT-AELs) for ammonia emissions, which will apply to the majority of permits, as well as BAT-AELs for nitrogen and phosphorus excretion.

For some types of rearing practices, stricter standards will apply to farms and housing permitted after the new BAT Conclusions were published.

### New BAT Conclusions review

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

The Applicant has confirmed their compliance with all BAT conditions for the new installations in their referenced BAT document received 14/03/24 and a final response dated 02/05/24. These responses are included in Table S1.2 Operating Techniques of the permit.

The following review below is a more specific assessment of measures the Applicant has applied to ensure compliance with the key BAT measures:

<b>BAT measure</b>	<b>Applicant compliance measure</b>
BAT 3 Nutritional management - Nitrogen excretion	The Applicant has confirmed they will demonstrate that the installation achieves levels of nitrogen excretion below the required BAT-AEL of 0.8 kg N/animal place/year by an estimation using manure analysis for total nitrogen content.

BAT measure	Applicant compliance measure
BAT 4 Nutritional management - Phosphorus excretion	The Applicant has confirmed they will demonstrate that the installation achieves levels of phosphorus excretion below the required BAT-AEL of 0.45 kg P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> /animal place/year by an estimation using manure analysis for total phosphorus content.
BAT 24 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Total nitrogen and phosphorus excretion	Table S3.3 of the permit concerning process monitoring requires the Applicant to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT Conclusions. The Applicant has confirmed this will be complied with via their usage of manure analysis.
BAT 25 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Ammonia emissions	Table S3.3 of the permit concerning process monitoring requires the Applicant to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT Conclusions.  The Applicant has confirmed they will report the ammonia emissions to the Environment Agency annually by multiplying the ammonia emissions factor for free range layers by the number of birds on site.
BAT 26 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Odour emissions	The OMP response dated 19.1.24 includes the following details for on farm monitoring and continual improvement:  On a daily basis, odour levels at the installation will be monitored for high housekeeping odours.
BAT 27 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Dust emissions	Table S3.3 of the permit concerning process monitoring requires the Applicant to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT Conclusions.  The Applicant has confirmed they will report the dust emissions to the Environment Agency annually by multiplying the dust emissions factor for free range layers by the number of birds on site.
BAT 31 Ammonia emissions from poultry houses - Layers	The BAT-AEL to be complied with is 0.13 kg NH <sub>3</sub> /animal place/year. The Applicant will meet this as the emission factor for free range layers using an aviary system is 0.08 kg NH <sub>3</sub> /animal place/year. The standard emission factor therefore complies with the BAT-AEL.  The narrative BAT is based on BAT 31 b4 - manure belts in case of aviary.

## 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 Applicant 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 Applicant** 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 revised site condition report (SCR) for Carkin Moor Farm Poultry Unit (received 03/11/23) demonstrates that there are no hazards or likely pathway to land or groundwater and no historic contamination on site that may present a hazard from the same contaminants. **Therefore, on the basis of the risk assessment presented in the SCR, we accept that they have not provided base line reference data for the soil and groundwater at the site at this stage and although condition 3.1.3 is included in the permit no groundwater monitoring will be required.**

## Odour

Intensive farming is by its nature a potentially odorous activity. This is recognised in our 'How to Comply with your Environmental Permit for Intensive Farming' EPR 6.09 guidance: ([http://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/297084/geho0110brsb-e-e.pdf](http://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/297084/geho0110brsb-e-e.pdf)).

Condition 3.3 of the environmental permit reads as follows:

“Emissions from the activities shall be free from odour at levels likely to cause pollution outside the site, as perceived by an authorised officer of the Environment Agency, unless the Applicant 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:

- Odour emissions from feed selection.
- Odour emissions from feed delivery and storage.
- Odour emissions from poultry litter removal.
- Odour emissions from yard areas.
- Odour emissions from housing.
- Odour emissions caused by drinking water systems.
- Odour emissions from poultry house ventilation.
- Odour emissions from bird depletion.
- Odour emissions from dirty water generation and storage (washout).
- Odour emissions from carcass storage and disposal.

### Odour Management Plan Review

A revised odour management plan (OMP) has been provided by the Applicant as part of the application supporting documentation (final version received 14/03/24)

There are three receptors located within 400m of the installation boundary. Of these, two are farm owned properties and so the nearest non-applicant owned property is approximately 175 metres from the installation boundary (to the south of the installation boundary).

The OMP has been assessed against the requirements of 'How to Comply with your Environmental Permit for Intensive Farming' EPR 6.09 (version 2), Appendix 4 guidance 'Odour Management at Intensive Livestock Installations' and our Top Tips Guidance and Poultry Industry Good Practice Checklist (August 2013) as well as the site-specific circumstances at the Installation. We consider that the OMP is acceptable.

The Applicant is required to manage activities at the Installation in accordance with condition 3.3.1 of the Permit and its OMP. The OMP includes odour control measures for normal and abnormal operations and contingency measures, including manufacture and selection of feed, feed delivery and storage, ventilation and dust, carcass management, poultry house clean out, litter removal, washing operations including vehicles, fugitive emissions, dirty water management, abnormal operations, waste storage and materials storage.

The OMP provides complaints form template to be used in the event that complaints are made to the Applicant.

**The current farm has not been the subject of any odour complaints to the Environment Agency.**

The Environment Agency has reviewed the OMP and considers it acceptable. 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 Applicant.

Conclusion

Although there is the potential for odour pollution from the Installation, the Applicant's compliance with its OMP and permit conditions will minimise the risk of odour pollution beyond the Installation boundary. This is supported by lack of odour complaints from current operations. The risk of odour pollution at sensitive receptors beyond the Installation boundary is therefore not considered significant.

**Noise**

Intensive farming by its nature involves activities that have the potential to cause noise pollution. This is recognised in our 'How to Comply with your Environmental Permit for Intensive Farming' EPR 6.09 guidance. Under section 3.4 of this guidance, a Noise Management Plan (NMP) must be approved as part of the permitting determination if there are sensitive receptors within 400m of the installation boundary.

Condition 3.4 of the permit reads as follows:

"Emissions from the activities shall be free from noise and vibration at levels likely to cause pollution outside the site, as perceived by an authorised officer of the Environment Agency, unless the Applicant 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 three receptors located within 400m of the installation boundary. Of these two are farm owned properties and so the nearest non-applicant owned property is approximately 175 metres from the installation boundary (to the south of the installation boundary).

The Applicant has provided an NMP as part of the application supporting documentation, and further details are provided below.

**The current farm has not been the subject of any noise complaints to the Environment Agency.**

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:

- Noise arising from vehicle movements into and around the site.
- Noise arising from ventilation systems and operations.

- Noise arising from de-populating birds.
- Noise arising from cleanout (machines and loading of trailers).
- Noise arising from standby generator (only used as backup)
- Noise from deliveries of feed and materials.
- Noise from waste removal/recovery.
- Alarm noises.

### Noise Management Plan Review

A final revised noise management plan (NMP) has been provided by the Applicant as part of the application supporting documentation (final version received 02/5/24)

Potential sources of noise have been included as identified in the risk assessment and listed above, and mitigation measures have been put in place.

The NMP also contains a noise complaint form to record complaints received. The Applicant has confirmed in their NMP that it will be reviewed at least annually or sooner following a substantiated noise complaint or relevant changes to operation or infrastructure. The site has no history of substantiated noise complaints.

The final version added time restrictions to minimise noise impacts from vehicle movements.

We are satisfied that the manner in which operations are carried out on the installation will minimise the risk of noise pollution.

### Conclusion

We have assessed the NMP and the H1 risk assessment for noise and conclude that the Applicant has followed the guidance set out in EPR 6.09 Appendix 5 'Noise management at intensive livestock installations'. We are satisfied that all sources and receptors have been identified, and that the proposed mitigation measures will minimise the risk of noise pollution / nuisance.

## **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 Applicant 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.

In addition, guidance on our website concludes that Applicants need to produce and submit a dust and bioaerosol management plan beyond the requirement of the initial 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](http://www.gov.uk/guidance/intensive-farming-risk-assessment-for-your-environmental-permit#air-emissions-dust-and-bioaerosols).

There are two sensitive receptors within 100m of the installation boundary, the nearest sensitive receptor (the nearest point of their assumed property boundary) is approximately 16 metres from the installation boundary which is a dwelling for farm staff.

As there are receptors within 100m of the installation, the Applicant was required to submit a dust and bioaerosol management plan as detailed above. A revised dust and bioaerosol management plan have been provided by the Applicant as part of the application supporting documentation (final version received 14/03/24).

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 the risk of spillages) all reduce the potential for emissions impacting the nearest receptors.

The Applicant has included measures in their dust and bioaerosol management plan to reduce dust, which will inherently reduce bioaerosols, for the following sources:

- Bioaerosol/dust emissions from feed selection.
- Bioaerosol /dust emissions from feed delivery and storage.
- Bioaerosol/dust emissions from poultry litter removal.
- Bioaerosol/dust emissions from yard areas.
- Bioaerosol/dust emissions from housing.
- Bioaerosol/dust emissions from drinking water systems.
- Bioaerosol/dust emissions from ventilation.
- Bioaerosol/dust emissions from bird depletion.
- Bioaerosol/dust emissions from dirty water generation and storage (washout).
- Bioaerosol/dust emissions from carcass storage and disposal.
- Bioaerosol/dust emissions from general dust build up throughout installation.

### Conclusion

We are satisfied that the measures outlined in the application will minimise the potential for dust and bioaerosol emissions from the installation on local receptors.

### **Standby Generator**

There is one standby generator with a net thermal rated input of < 1MWth which is operated for a maximum of 1 hour per week for testing purposes. The generator is used only as a backup for mains interruption and will not be used for more than 500 hours per annum, including testing periods.

**Hence in conclusion the Medium Combustion Directive does not apply to this generator.**

### **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 no Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) located within 5 km of the installation. There are 2 Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) and one Ancient Woodland (AW) within 2 km of the installation.

On the basis that all the habitat sites are more than 1500 metres from the centre of the emissions, the pre-application ammonia assessment has been completed assuming 100 % of the time the birds are within the poultry houses

The pre-application has been rechecked as dated 24/03/24. The pre-application was carried out under reference EPR/KP3002LX.

### **Ammonia assessment - LWS and 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 (CL<sub>e</sub>) or critical load (CL<sub>o</sub>) then the farm can be permitted with no further assessment.

A screening using AST v4.6, dated 24/03/24, has indicated that emissions from the revised proposal for this installation will only have a potential impact on the LWS and AW sites with a precautionary CL<sub>e</sub> of 1µg/m<sup>3</sup> if they are within **895** metres of the emission source.

Beyond **895** metres, the PC is less than 1µg/m<sup>3</sup> and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case the following LWSs and AW are beyond this distance (see table 1 below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

**Table 1 – LWS and AW Assessment**

Name of LWS/AW	Distance from site (m)
Forcett Quarry LWS	2,140
Aske Estate Woodlands LWS	2,155
Hartforth Wood AW	2,154

**Overall conclusion**

No further assessment is required.

**Decision checklist**

Aspect considered	Decision
<b>Receipt of application</b>	
Confidential information	A claim for commercial or industrial confidentiality has not been made.
Identifying confidential information	We have not identified information provided as part of the application that we consider to be confidential.  The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on confidentiality.
<b>Consultation</b>	
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"> <li>• Health and Safety Executive (HSE)</li> <li>• North Yorkshire Council Environmental Health</li> <li>• UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA)</li> <li>• Director of Public Health, Herefordshire Council</li> </ul> The comments and our responses are summarised in the <a href="#">consultation section</a> .
<b>Applicant</b>	
Control of the facility	We are satisfied that the Applicant (now the Operator) is the person who will have control over the operation of the facility after the grant of the permit. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on legal Applicant for environmental permits.
<b>The facility</b>	
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.
<b>The site</b>	
Extent of the site of the facility	The Applicant 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.



<b>Aspect considered</b>	<b>Decision</b>
Site condition report	The Applicant 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.
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>There is no requirement for a HRA to be sent to Natural England, as there are no European/Ramsar sites within 5 km of the installation.</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 of itself have a negative effect on any sites of nature conservation, landscape and heritage, and/or protected species or habitats identified.</p>
<b>Environmental risk assessment</b>	
Environmental risk	We have reviewed the Applicant's assessment of the environmental risk from the facility. The Applicant's risk assessment is satisfactory.
<b>Operating techniques</b>	
General operating techniques	<p>We have reviewed the techniques used by the Applicant 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 new Operator must use are specified in table S1.2 in the environmental permit.</p> <p>The operating techniques are summarised in the introduction of the permit EPR/ZP3024SA.</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>
<b>Permit conditions</b>	
Use of conditions other than those from the template	Based on the information in the application, we consider that we do not need to impose conditions other than those in our permit template.
Emission limits	We have decided that emission limits are required in the permit. BAT-AELs have been added in-line with the Intensive Farming BAT conclusions document dated 21/02/17. These limits are included in permit table S3.3.
Monitoring	<p>We have decided that monitoring should be carried out for the parameters listed in the permit, using the methods detailed and to the frequencies specified.</p> <p>These monitoring requirements have been imposed in order to ensure compliance with the Intensive Farming BAT conclusions document dated 21/02/17.</p>
Reporting	<p>We have specified reporting in the permit.</p> <p>We made these decisions in accordance with the Intensive Farming BAT conclusions document dated 21/02/17.</p>

Aspect considered	Decision
<b>Applicant competence</b>	
Management system	<p>There is no known reason to consider that the Applicant will not have the management system to enable it to comply with the permit conditions.</p> <p>The decision was taken in accordance with the guidance on Applicant competence and how to develop a management system for environmental permits.</p>
Relevant convictions	<p>The Case Management System has been checked to ensure that all relevant convictions have been declared.</p> <p>No relevant convictions were found. The Applicant satisfies the criteria in our guidance on Applicant competence.</p>
Financial competence	<p>There is no known reason to consider that the Applicant will not be financially able to comply with the permit conditions</p>
<b>Growth Duty</b>	
Section 108 Deregulation Act 2015 – Growth duty	<p>We have considered our duty to have regard to the desirability of promoting economic growth set out in section 108(1) of the Deregulation Act 2015 and the guidance issued under section 110 of that Act in deciding whether to vary 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 Applicants because the standards applied to the Applicant 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, our notice on GOV.UK for the public, and the way in which we have considered these in the determination process.

The consultation period ended **25/04/24**, an extension was granted until **01/05/24** for UKHSA response.

### Responses from organisations listed in the consultation section

<b>Response received from</b>
UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) (response received 01/05/24)
<b>Brief summary of issues raised</b>
<p>They include the following:</p> <p>The main emissions of potential public health significance are emissions to air of bioaerosols, dust, including particulate matter, and ammonia.</p> <p>The Environment Agency uses a 100 m screening distance to trigger requirement for a Dust and Bioaerosol Management Plan.</p> <p>For this installation there are such receptors and hence a Dust and Bioaerosol Management Plan has been triggered and such a plan has been provided.</p> <p>They also included a section on bioaerosols and concluded:</p> <p><i>'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.'</i></p>
<b>Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered</b>
<p>As detailed in the section entitled 'Dust and Bioaerosols' of this document, we require a dust and bioaerosol management plan (DBMP) for intensive farming installations with receptors within 100 metres of the installation boundary. This is an agreed approach as part of formal working together agreement between UKHSA (formerly Public Health England) and ourselves.</p> <p>The Environmental Management System summary submitted by the Applicant details suitable reporting procedures in the event that complaints are made to the Applicant. The Applicant has provided a relevant DBMP which we have assessed and are satisfied suitable controls are in place to minimise dust and bioaerosols from the installation. See the 'Key issues' section of this document for a more detailed assessment of this plan.</p> <p>Any request for us to incorporate evidence from UKHSA into future permit reviews should be agreed outside of this permit determination and communicated via the appropriate channels.</p> <p>No further action required.</p>

<b>Response received from</b>
<b>North Yorkshire Council Environmental Health (received 17/04/2024)</b>
<b>Brief summary of issues raised</b>
<p>They include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. General concern about installation amenity impacts: odour, noise, dust and flies.</li> <li>2. Specific concern about vehicle movement and noise and request to include a time restriction in Noise Management Plan for such potentially noisy activities.</li> </ol>
<b>Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered</b>
<p>1. Amenity concerns</p> <p>The Applicant has provided relevant Odour, Noise and Dust and Bioaerosol Management Plans to ensure controls are in place to minimise impacts from the installation</p> <p>The details of our assessment and conclusions are included within the 'Key issues' section of this Decision document.</p> <p>In relation to the Noise Management Plan, please see below for our further actions to address the specific concern under point 2 raised above.</p> <p>We have concluded that we are satisfied with the applicant's management plans to minimise impacts linked to odour, noise and dust/bioaerosols.</p> <p>It should be further noted that the poultry farm currently exists as an under 40,000 bird facility. There have been no complaints linked to amenity issues from this farm reported to the council or the Environment Agency.</p> <p>In regard to flies, no complaints or concerns have been raised specifically by the council or the Environment Agency linked to the current farm.</p> <p>The permit condition under section 3.6 gives us as the regulator the ability to request a pest management plan if required.</p> <p>Overall, we are satisfied that we have sufficient controls within the permit conditions to enable further measures to be implemented should these be required.</p> <p>2.Noise Management Plan</p> <p>The applicant has provided a final updated NMP (received 02/05/24) to include time limits to reduce noise impact from such activities as vehicle movement.</p> <p>No further action required.</p>

The Health and Safety Executive were also consulted, with a deadline of 25/04/24 for responses, but no responses were received.

**Representations from individual members of the public.**

**One single response has been provided as follows:**

<b>Brief summary of issues raised</b>
<b>Single representation from an individual member of the public dated 15.04.24.</b>
<p>They include the following;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. General opposition to intensive farming, including welfare issues linked to farming on an "industrial scale".</li> <li>2. Installation emissions concerns without details of any specific concern linked to air and water emissions.</li> <li>3. General comment about preference for smaller scale traditional farming.</li> </ol>

**Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered**

1 & 3 Generic concern about welfare issues and generic opposition to intensive farming are outside our role as a regulator to implement the EPR regulations.

2. We have completed a full risk assessment of the proposal as detailed in the Key issues' section above. We have concluded that the air and water emissions impacts from the installation are satisfactory and no further assessment is required

In addition, the Applicant has complied with 2017 Intensive Farming BAT conclusions to ensure effective operating techniques are in place to minimise impact of air and water emissions from the installation.

No further action required.