

# Permitting decisions

## Variation

---

We have decided to grant the variation for Hollins Lane Poultry Unit operated by International Energy Crops Limited.

The variation number is EPR/NP3930JP/V005.

The variation is to increase bird numbers from 260,000 to 464,000 broilers, add four new poultry houses, install a ground source heating system and extend the installation boundary. Air scrubber units will also be installed on poultry houses 3 to 8.

We consider in reaching that decision we have taken into account all relevant considerations and legal requirements and that the permit will ensure that the appropriate level of environmental protection is provided.

## Purpose of this document

This decision document provides a record of the decision-making process. It:

- highlights [key issues](#) in the determination
- summarises the decision-making process in the [decision checklist](#) to show how all relevant factors have been taken into account
- shows how we have considered the [consultation responses](#)

Unless the decision document specifies otherwise we have accepted the applicant's proposals.

Read the permitting decisions in conjunction with the environmental permit and the variation notice. The introductory note summarises what the variation covers.

# Key issues of the decision

## New Intensive Rearing of Poultry or Pigs BAT Conclusions document

The new Best Available Techniques (BAT) Reference Document (BREF) for the Intensive Rearing of poultry or pigs (IRPP) was published on 21st February 2017. There is now a separate BAT Conclusions document which will set out the standards that permitted farms will have to meet.

The BAT Conclusions document is as per the following link:

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32017D0302&from=EN>

Now the BAT Conclusions are published **all new housing within variation applications** issued after 21<sup>st</sup> February 2017 must be compliant in full from the first day of operation.

There are some new requirements for permit holders. The conclusions include BAT Associated Emission Levels for ammonia emissions which will apply to the majority of permits, as well as BAT associated levels for nitrogen and phosphorous excretion.

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

We have reviewed the new housing introduced with the permit variation for this installation against the best available techniques (BAT) conclusions as defined in the intensive rearing of poultry or pigs (IRPP) BAT conclusions document, dated 21/02/17. The permit conditions and schedules ensure the compliance of the new housing with this BAT conclusions document. In addition, we have reviewed existing housing, permitted before 21/02/17, to ensure compliance.

### **New BAT conclusions review**

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

We have sent out a Schedule 5 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 document reference 'Appendix 10: Best Available Techniques', received 12/07/24.

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

<b>BAT measure</b>	<b>Operator compliance measure</b>
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 by an estimation using manure analysis for total Nitrogen content.
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 <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> /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 measure	Operator compliance measure
BAT 26 - Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Odour emissions	<p>The approved OMP includes the following details for odour monitoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An independent third party will carry out pro-active monitoring of odours in the area around the site to help detect any off-site odours and identify the cause or causes if present. This monitoring will be based on static “sniffing” at various locations around the site using a standard format.</li> <li>• The site will be monitored routinely (daily initially and then weekly after the first three months operations, if odours are not detected) using sniff testing.</li> <li>• Monitoring of operations at close receptor points will be undertaken routinely to check that odour is not an issue for neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• Further sniff testing and observations will be conducted around the various operations on site to identify potential odour risks and sources.</li> <li>• Should elevated levels of odour be detected during the sniff testing then a full investigation will be undertaken by the site operator, with assistance from the independent third party, until the odour problem is identified. A review will then take place to eliminate the odour source.</li> </ul>
BAT 27 - Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Dust emissions	<p>Table S3.3 of the Permit concerning process monitoring requires the Operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT conclusions.</p> <p>The 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 28 - Monitoring of emissions and process parameters linked to Ammonia, Odour and Dust emissions	<p>Table S3.3 of the Permit concerning process monitoring requires the operator either to pursue Ammonia, Odour and Dust emission monitoring in line with BAT 25, 26 and 27 criteria as detailed above or operational parameters for abatement control.</p> <p>The Operator has confirmed that key operational parameters will be continuously monitored to ensure effective abatement, in accordance with BAT 28b.</p>
BAT 32 - Ammonia emissions from poultry houses - Broilers	<p>The BAT-AELs to be complied with are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broilers in houses with fan ventilation (houses 1 and 2) - 0.08 kg NH<sub>3</sub>/animal place/year.</li> <li>• Broilers in houses with an air abatement treatment facility (houses 3 to 8) - 0.025 kg NH<sub>3</sub>/animal place/year.</li> </ul> <p>The Installation will meet the standard BAT-AEL of 0.08 kg NH<sub>3</sub>/animal place/year as the emission factor for broilers is 0.034 kg NH<sub>3</sub>/animal place/year.</p> <p>The Installation will also meet the tighter BAT-AEL of 0.025 kg NH<sub>3</sub>/animal place/year as, in accordance with the ammonia modelling report reference ‘Hollins Lane, Woodseaves Ammonia Emissions: Impact Assessment’, dated January 2023 and submitted 15/03/24, ammonia emissions from the scrubbers will be reduced by a minimum of 90%, and overall ammonia emissions from the houses fitted with scrubbers will be reduced by a minimum of 81.3%.</p>

### **More detailed assessment of BAT-AEL's**

#### **Broilers**

The installation includes air scrubber units on poultry houses 3 to 8. Each scrubber will treat air flows up to 120,000m<sup>3</sup>/hour per house (70% of the installed maximum summer housing air flow rate), with additional air exhausted through the ridge fans. A BAT-AEL of 0.025 kg NH<sub>3</sub>/animal place/year has been set for the houses fitted with air scrubber units.

The ammonia modelling report demonstrates that ammonia emissions from the houses fitted with air scrubber units will be reduced by a minimum of 81.3%. The baseline is the standard broiler emission factor of 0.034 kg NH<sub>3</sub>/animal place/year. With an 81.3% reduction from this figure the emission level is well below the BAT-AEL of 0.025 kgNH<sub>3</sub>/animal place/year, and hence the BAT-AEL is complied with.

## 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 Hollins Lane Poultry Unit (dated 10/07/24) demonstrates that there are no hazards or likely pathway to land or groundwater and no historic contamination on site that may present a hazard from the same contaminants. **Therefore, on the basis of the risk assessment presented in the SCR, we accept that they have not provided base line reference data for the soil and groundwater at the site at this stage and although condition 3.1.3 is included in the permit no groundwater monitoring will be required.**

### Odour

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

Condition 3.3 of the environmental permit reads as follows:

"Emissions from the activities shall be free from odour at levels likely to cause pollution outside the site, as perceived by an authorised officer of the Environment Agency, unless the operator has used appropriate measures, including, but not limited to, those specified in any approved odour management plan, to prevent or where that is not practicable to minimise the odour."

Under section 3.3 of the guidance an Odour Management Plan (OMP) is required to be approved as part of the permitting process, if as is the case here, sensitive receptors (sensitive receptors in this instance excludes properties associated with the farm) are within 400m of the Installation boundary. It is appropriate to require an OMP when such sensitive receptors have been identified within 400m of the installation to prevent, or where that is not practicable, to minimise the risk of pollution from odour emissions.

The risk assessment for the Installation provided with the application lists key potential risks of odour pollution beyond the Installation boundary. These activities are as follows:

- Manufacture and selection of feed

- Feed delivery and storage
- Ventilation system
- Carcass disposal
- Litter management
- House clean out
- Dirty water management

There are a number of sensitive receptors located within 400m of the installation boundary for Hollins Lane Poultry Unit, the nearest receptor is located approximately 190m to the south-west of the installation boundary.

The Operator has provided a revised odour management plan (OMP), submitted 02/08/24, 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 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. 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.

### Conclusion

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".

There are sensitive receptors within 400 metres of the installation boundary, as stated above.

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:

- Ventilation system
- Feed deliveries
- Fuel deliveries
- Feeding systems
- Alarm systems

- Bird catching
- Clean out operations
- Maintenance and repair
- Set up and placement
- Standby generators
- Personnel/staff/contractors

The Operator has provided a revised noise management plan (NMP) (submitted 12/07/24), 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 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 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.

Guidance on our website concludes that applicants need to produce and submit a dust and bioaerosol management plan 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).

As there are no relevant receptors within 100m of the Installation, the Operator was not required to submit a dust and bioaerosol management plan.

## **Heat exchangers**

Heat exchangers will be fitted on poultry houses 5 to 8. Condensate from the heat exchangers is directed to the underground dirty water tanks, for disposal with the dirty water. As there was no evidence provided by the operator for overall ammonia percentage reduction for combined use of the air scrubber units and heat exchangers, the ammonia percentage reduction utilised for the ammonia assessment was linked to the air scrubber unit performance evidence alone.

## **Air scrubbers**

In accordance with the ammonia modelling report, air scrubber units will be fitted on poultry houses 3 to 8; the scrubbers will treat air flows up to 120,000m<sup>3</sup>/hour per house (70% of the installed maximum summer housing air flow rate) with additional air exhausted via roof mounted fans. Ammonia emissions from the air scrubber units will be reduced by a minimum of 90%, with overall ammonia emissions from the houses fitted with scrubbers reduced by a minimum of 81.3%.

Acid for the scrubber system will be stored in the scrubber control room, in an IBC located within a chemical bund, providing 110% capacity of the material stored on it, to prevent pollution of ground or surface waters. The control room is lockable to prevent unauthorised access. The pipes in the system are plastic welded to prevent leaks. The wastewater storage system is a dual wall system providing protection against chemical leaks. Wastewater from the scrubbing process will be disposed of via a licensed waste collector.

## **Pre-operational condition**

PO1 has been included in Table S1.4 of the permit.

PO1 part a) requires the operator to submit a site-specific protocol (measurement plan) for measuring ammonia emissions from the air scrubber units associated with poultry houses 3 to 8. The plan must be submitted at least 1 calendar month prior to the installation of the monitoring equipment. PO1 part b) requires the operator to submit evidence that the proposed air scrubber units have been installed and commissioned. The operator cannot stock above the current permitted level of 260,000 bird places until PO1 has been approved by the EA.

## **Improvement conditions**

IC1 has been included in Table S1.3.

IC1a) requires the operator to undertake monitoring of the efficiency of the air scrubber units over a period of 12 months.

IC1b) requires the operator to submit a report assessing the effectiveness of the air scrubber units and providing evidence that air flows up to 120,000m<sup>3</sup>/hour per house (70% of the installed maximum summer housing air flow rate) are treated via the scrubbers.

IC1c) requires the operator to submit a report with proposals for further improvements, including timescales, and proposals for further monitoring to demonstrate compliance, if the report submitted for IC1b) does not show compliance with the expected reduction of ammonia emissions from the air scrubber units by 90% as a minimum, and evidence that air flows up to 120,000m<sup>3</sup>/hour per house (70% of the installed maximum summer housing air flow rate) are being treated by the scrubber system.

IC1d) requires the operator to complete the measures proposed in IC1c) if needed.

## **Standby generator**

There is one standby generator with a net thermal rated input of 0.6MWth for use in the event of mains power failure. The generator will not be tested for more than 52 hours per annum and will not be used for more than 500 hours per annum, including testing hours, averaged over a 3-year period. The generator falls outside of the requirements of the Medium Combustion Plant Directive.

## **Ammonia**

There are no European/Ramsar Sites within 5km of the installation.

There are two Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) within 5km of the installation, and six other nature conservation sites within 2km comprising of three Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) and three ancient woodlands.

### **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<sub>e</sub>) or critical load (CL<sub>o</sub>) 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 (dated 14/03/24) has indicated that emissions from Hollins Lane Poultry Unit will only have a potential impact on SSSI sites with a precautionary critical level of 1µg/m<sup>3</sup> if they are within 2,609 metres of the emission source.

Beyond 2,609m, the PC is less than 0.2µg/m<sup>3</sup> (i.e. less than 20% of the precautionary 1µg/m<sup>3</sup> critical level) and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case the SSSI is beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screens out of any further assessment.

Where the precautionary level of  $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  is used, and the process contribution is assessed to be less than 20% the site automatically screens out as insignificant and no further assessment of critical load is necessary. In this case the  $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  level used has not been confirmed by Natural England, but it is precautionary. It is therefore possible to conclude no likely damage to these sites.

**Table 1 – SSSI Assessment**

Name of SSSI	Distance from site (m)
Burnt Wood	5,080

Tyrley Canal Cutting SSSI is located within 608 metres of the emission source. However, the APIS website ([www.apis.ac.uk](http://www.apis.ac.uk)) states that the site is assigned only for geological features and therefore no further assessment is required.

**Ammonia assessment - LWS/AW**

The following trigger thresholds have been applied for the assessment of these sites:

- If the process contribution (PC) is below 100% of the relevant critical level (CLe) or critical load (CLo) then the farm can be permitted with no further assessment.

Initial screening using ammonia screening tool version 4.6 (dated 14/03/24) has indicated that emissions from Hollins Lane Poultry Unit will only have a potential impact on the LWS/AW sites with a precautionary critical level of  $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  if they are within 942 metres of the emission source.

Beyond 942m, the PC is less than  $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case, the LWS/AWs are beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

**Table 2 – LWS/AW Assessment**

Name of LWS/AW	Distance from site (m)
The Sydnall LWS	1,278
Old Springs Farm LWS	1,916
Unknown AW	1,492
Colehurst Wood AW	2,193
Chipnall Wood AW	2,224

**Tyrley Spoil Banks LWS ammonia impact assessment**

The operator submitted detailed modelling [Reference Hollins Lane, Woodseaves Ammonia Emissions: Impact Assessment] comparing the impact of emissions on Tyrley Spoil Banks LWS from the current scenario, 232,000 broiler chickens across 4 houses, with the proposed scenario, 464,000 broilers across 8 houses. However, the modelling did not consider the permitted scenario, 260,000 broilers across 4 houses.

The modelling has been audited in detail by our air quality modelling specialists, including additional sensitivity checks carried out to consider the permitted scenario, and whilst we don't agree with the absolute numerical predictions in the report, we agree that the proposed changes in operations at this site will represent an emission reduction of ammonia emitted. The check modelling predicts exceedances of the 100% threshold for nutrient nitrogen deposition at Tyrley Spoil Banks LWS under the permitted, current and proposed scenarios. However, assuming a total reduction of ammonia emissions of 81.3% from house 3 to 8, with use of the wet acid air scrubbers, in accordance with the detailed ammonia modelling, submitted 15/03/24, we agree with the consultant's conclusions that this proposal represents an emissions reduction.

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	<p>The consultation requirements were identified in accordance with the Environmental Permitting Regulations and our public participation statement.</p> <p>The application was publicised on the GOV.UK website.</p> <p>We consulted the following organisations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Authority Environmental Health – Shropshire Council</li> <li>• Health and Safety Executive</li> </ul> <p>No responses were received.</p>
<b>The facility</b>	
The regulated facility	<p>We considered the extent and nature of the facility at the site in accordance with RGN2 'Understanding the meaning of regulated facility'.</p> <p>The extent of the facility is defined in the site plan and in the permit. The activities are defined in table S1.1 of the permit.</p>
<b>The site</b>	
Extent of the site of the facility	The operator has provided a plan which we consider is satisfactory, showing the extent of the site of the facility. The plan is included in the permit.
Site condition report	The operator has provided a description of the condition of the site, which we consider is satisfactory. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on site condition reports and baseline reporting under the Industrial Emissions Directive.
Biodiversity, heritage, landscape and nature conservation	<p>The application is within the relevant distance criteria of a site of heritage, landscape or nature conservation, and/or protected species or habitat.</p> <p>We have assessed the application and its potential to affect all known sites of nature conservation, landscape and heritage and/or protected species or habitats identified in the nature conservation screening report as part of the permitting process.</p> <p>We consider that the application will not affect any sites of nature conservation, landscape and heritage, and/or protected species or habitats identified.</p> <p>Exceedances of the 100% threshold for nutrient nitrogen deposition are predicted at one LWS under the permitted, current and proposed scenarios, however a reduction of these impacts is predicted as a result of the proposed installation.</p> <p>We have not consulted Natural England on the application. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance.</p>

Aspect considered	Decision
<b>Environmental risk assessment</b>	
Environmental risk	<p>We have reviewed the operator's assessment of the environmental risk from the facility.</p> <p>The operator's risk assessment is satisfactory.</p>
<b>Operating techniques</b>	
General operating techniques	<p>We have reviewed the techniques used by the operator and compared these with the relevant guidance notes and we consider them to represent appropriate techniques for the facility.</p> <p>The operating techniques that the applicant must use are specified in table S1.2 in the environmental permit.</p>
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>	
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>
Pre-operational conditions	<p>Based on the information in the application, we consider that we need to impose pre-operational conditions.</p> <p>See Key Issues section.</p>
Improvement programme	<p>Based on the information in the application, we consider that we need to impose an improvement programme.</p> <p>See Key Issues section.</p>
Emission limits	<p>ELVs based on BAT have been set for the following substances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ammonia</li> <li>• Nitrogen</li> <li>• Phosphorus</li> </ul> <p>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.</p>
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>

Aspect considered	Decision
	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.
<b>Operator competence</b>	
Management system	There is no known reason to consider that the operator will not have the management system to enable it to comply with the permit conditions.
<b>Growth Duty</b>	
Section 108 Deregulation Act 2015 – Growth duty	<p>We have considered our duty to have regard to the desirability of promoting economic growth set out in section 108(1) of the Deregulation Act 2015 and the guidance issued under section 110 of that Act in deciding whether to grant this permit.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.3 of the guidance says:</p> <p>“The primary role of regulators, in delivering regulation, is to achieve the regulatory outcomes for which they are responsible. For a number of regulators, these regulatory outcomes include an explicit reference to development or growth. The growth duty establishes economic growth as a factor that all specified regulators should have regard to, alongside the delivery of the protections set out in the relevant legislation.”</p> <p>We have addressed the legislative requirements and environmental standards to be set for this operation in the body of the decision document above. The guidance is clear at paragraph 1.5 that the growth duty does not legitimise non-compliance and its purpose is not to achieve or pursue economic growth at the expense of necessary protections.</p> <p>We consider the requirements and standards we have set in this permit are reasonable and necessary to avoid a risk of an unacceptable level of pollution. This also promotes growth amongst legitimate operators because the standards applied to the operator are consistent across businesses in this sector and have been set to achieve the required legislative standards.</p>

## Consultation

No public responses or consultation responses were received.