Permitting Decisions - Variation

We have decided to grant the variation for **Tranmere Farm** operated by **Boarcross Limited**

The variation number is **EPR/VP3036CR/V003**

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

This variation authorises the following changes:

- Increase of production pig numbers (> 30 kg) from 2520 to 4560
- Addition of two new pig buildings.
- Increase in installation area to allow for the above changes
- Updating site drainage to current operation.
- Removal of carcass incinerator

Purpose of this document

We have assessed the aspects that are changing as part of this variation, we have not revisited any other sections of the permit.

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 considerations section to show how the main 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.

Key issues of the decision

Intensive Rearing of Poultry or Pigs BAT Conclusions document

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

All new and redeveloped housing applied for in a permit variation must be compliant with the BAT Conclusions from the first day of operation. The BAT compliance of any existing housing has been subject to a sector review, however, for some reviewed permits, only generic limits have been included, and individual housing should now be considered. Any existing housing that undergoes redevelopment with changes to housing location or expansion beyond the existing footprint is classed as new plant.

There are some additional requirements for permit holders. The BAT 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 apply to farms and housing permitted after the BAT Conclusions were published.

BAT Conclusions review

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

We sent out a not duly made request for information, requiring the Applicant to confirm that the new installation complies in full with all the BAT Conclusions measures.

The Applicant has confirmed their compliance with all BAT conditions for the new housing in their response dated 02/10/24 which has been referenced in Table S1.2 - Operating Techniques, of the permit.

This application includes the addition of two new pig houses (Warcup 1 extended and Warcup 2 building totally new building).

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

BAT 3 Nutritional management - Nitrogen excretion

The Applicant has confirmed it will demonstrate that the installation can achieve levels of nitrogen excretion below the required BAT AEL of **13 kg N/animal place/year** for fattening pigs (> 30 kg) and will use BAT 3a technique reducing the crude protein content.

BAT 4 Nutritional management - Phosphorus excretion

The Applicant has confirmed it will demonstrate that the installation can achieve levels of phosphorus excretion below the required BAT AEL of **5.4 kg P_2O_5/animal place/year for** fattening pigs (> 30 kg) and will use BAT 4a technique reducing the crude protein 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 Operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT Conclusions.

This will be verified by means of manure analysis and reported annually.

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.

The Applicant has confirmed they will report the ammonia emissions to the Environment Agency annually by utilising estimation by using emission factors.

BAT 26 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters – Odour emissions

There is no requirement for compliance with this BAT criteria as no Odour Management Plan is required as there are no relevant receptors within 400m of the installation boundary.

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 Applicant has confirmed they will report the dust emissions to the Environment Agency annually by utilising estimation by using emission factors.

BAT 30 Ammonia emissions from pig houses

The Applicant has confirmed it will demonstrate that the installation achieves levels of ammonia below the required BAT AEL for the following pig types:

- Pigs > 30kg: 2.6 kg NH_3/animal place/year (new housing, slatted floor).

The standard emission factor for fattening pigs on slatted floors (shallow pit < 800 mm depth) and slurry removal frequency less than weekly is 2.813 kg NH_3/animal place/year.

The operator has confirmed crude protein levels of 15.2% average of diets on sheet provided (09/06/25).

The standard crude protein for > 30 kg pigs is 18 %.

Hence applying maximum standard reduction of 2 % leads to a bespoke installation emission factor of 2.25 kg NH_3/animal place/year.

Therefore, this ensures compliance with BAT AEL for > 30 kgs on slats with shallow pits of **2.6 kg NH3/animal place/year.**

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 Tranmere Farm (dated 01/10/24) 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 management

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.

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.

Conclusion

The operator has confirmed there are no relevant receptors within 400 metres of the installation boundary and hence an Odour Management Plan is not required.

The current farm has not been the subject of any odour complaints.

The risk of odour pollution at sensitive receptors beyond the Installation boundary is therefore not considered significant.

Noise management

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.

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".

Under section 3.4 of the guidance, a Noise Management Plan (NMP) 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 a NMP 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 noise emissions.

Conclusion

The operator has confirmed there are no relevant receptors within 400 metres of the installation boundary and hence a Noise Management Plan is not required.

The current farm has not been the subject of any noise complaints.

The risk of noise pollution at sensitive receptors beyond the Installation boundary is therefore not considered significant.

Dust and Bioaerosols management

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.

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 including 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.

The applicant initially submitted a dust and bioaerosol management plan and then has confirmed (response received 27/06/25) there are no relevant receptors within 100 metres of the installation boundary.

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 is a single standby generator linked to the installation with a net thermal rated input of 0.18 MWth and it will not be tested more than 52 hours per year, or operated (including testing) for more than 500 hours per year (averaged over 3 years) for emergency use only as a temporary power source if there is a mains power failure.

Slurry Management

The Operator does not store slurry within the installation in above ground facilities.

The installation is located in a NVZ area and as such there is requirement for the installation to have a minimum of 6 months slurry storage capacity

The Operator has provided evidence of such storage at another one of their local farms (Ling Farm).The evidence is provided in response dated 23/06/25

Ammonia

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

There are no Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) / Special Protection Areas (SPA) / Ramsar sites located within 5 kilometres of the installation boundary. There are two Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) located within 5 km of the installation boundary. There are also two Local Wildlife Sites within 2 km of the installation boundary.

Ammonia assessment – SSSI

The following trigger thresholds have been applied for assessment of SSSIs:

- If the process contribution (PC) is below 20% of the relevant critical level (CLe) or critical load (CLo) then the farm can be permitted with no further assessment.
- Where this threshold is exceeded an assessment alone and in combination is required. An in-combination assessment will be completed to establish the combined PC for all existing farms identified within 5 km of the SSSI.

Initial screening using the ammonia screening tool version 4.6 (dated 27/06/25) has indicated that emissions from Tranmere Farm will only have a potential impact on SSSIs with a precautionary CLe of 1 μg/m^3 if they are within **2053 metres** of the emission source.

Beyond **2053 m the** PC is less than 0.2 μg/m^3 (i.e. less than 20% of the precautionary 1 μg/m^3 CLe) and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case all SSSIs are beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

Where the precautionary level of 1 μg/m^3 is used and the PC is assessed to be less than 20%, the site automatically screens out as insignificant and no further assessment of CLo is necessary. In this case the 1 μg/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)
COTTAM WELL DALE	3,460
CINQUEFOIL BROW AND WOOD DALE	4,475

No further assessment is required.

Ammonia assessment – LWS

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 27/06/25) has indicated that emissions from Tranmere Farm will only have a potential impact on

the LWS sites with a precautionary CLe of 1 µg/m^3 if they are within **822 m** of the emission source.

Beyond **822 metres** the PC is less than 1 µg/m^3 and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case all LWSs are beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

Table 2 – LWS Assessment

Site	Distance from site (m)
Cottam Road LWS	1,267
York Road, Kilham LWS	1,342

No further assessment is required.

Decision considerations

Confidential information

A claim for commercial or industrial confidentiality has not been made.

Identifying confidential information

We have not identified information provided as part of the application that we consider to be confidential.

The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on confidentiality.

Consultation

The consultation requirements were identified in accordance with the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations (2016) and our public participation statement.

We consulted the following organisations:

- East Riding of Yorkshire Council Environmental Protection Department.
- UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA)
- Department of Public Health
- Health and Safety Executive

The comments and our responses are summarised in the consultation responses section.

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

The Operator has provided a plan which we consider to be satisfactory, showing the extent of the site facilities.

The plans show the location of the part of the installation to which this permit applies on that site.

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

Nature conservation, landscape, heritage and protected species and habitat designations

We have checked the location of the application to assess if it is within the screening distances, we consider relevant for impacts on nature conservation, landscape, heritage and protected species and habitat designations. The application is within our screening distances for these designations.

We have assessed the application and its potential to affect sites of nature conservation, landscape, heritage and protected species and habitat designations identified in the nature conservation screening report as part of the permitting process.

We consider that the application will not affect any site of nature conservation, landscape and heritage, and/or protected species or habitats identified.

See Ammonia section in the Key Issues above for more details

We have not consulted or sent habitat assessments for information only to Natural England as there are no European or Ramsar sites within 5 km of the installation boundary.

The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance.

Environmental risk

We have reviewed the Operator's assessment of the environmental risk from the facility.

The Operator’s risk assessment is satisfactory.

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.

The proposed techniques for priorities for control are in line with the benchmark levels contained in the Sector Guidance Note EPR6.09 and we consider them to represent appropriate techniques for the facility. The permit conditions ensure compliance with The Best Available Techniques (BAT) Reference document (BREF) for the Intensive Rearing of Poultry or Pigs (IRPP) published on 21st February 2017.

Dust and bioaerosol management

We have reviewed the dust and bioaerosol management plan in accordance with our guidance on emissions management plans for dust.

We consider that the dust and bioaerosol management plan is satisfactory and we approve this plan.

We have approved the dust and bioaerosol management plan as we consider it to be appropriate measures based on information available to us at the current time. The applicant should not take our approval of this plan to mean that the measures in the plan are considered to cover every circumstance throughout the life of the permit.

The applicant should keep the plans under constant review and revise them annually or if necessary, sooner if there have been complaints arising from operations on site or if circumstances change. This is in accordance with our guidance ‘Control and monitor emissions for your environmental permit.

The plan has been incorporated into the operating techniques S1.2.

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.

Emission limits

The Emission Limit Values (ELVs) have been updated to reflect only those required for fattening pigs (> 30 kg) i.e. ELVs linked to

- Ammonia emissions
- Nitrogen in manure excretion
- Phosphorous in manure excretion.

We have decided that emission limits are required in the permit. BAT AELs have been amended in line with the Intensive Farming sector BAT Conclusions document dated 21/02/2017. These limits are included in table S3.3 of the permit.

Monitoring

Monitoring requirements have not changed as a result of this variation.

This variation confirms the applicant will use the manure analysis option for nitrogen and phosphorous

These monitoring requirements have been imposed in order to ensure compliance with Intensive Farming BAT Conclusions document dated 21/02/2017.

Reporting

Reporting has not changed as a result of this variation.

We made these decisions in order to ensure compliance with the Intensive Farming sector BAT Conclusions document dated 21/02/2017.

Management system

We are not aware of any reason to consider that the Operator will not have the management system to enable it to comply with the permit conditions.

The decision was taken in accordance with the guidance on Operator competence and how to develop a management system for environmental permits.

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 variation.

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.

Consultation Responses

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 commenced on **09/10/24 and ended on 06/11/24.**

Responses from organisations listed in the consultation section

Response received from UKHSA dated 31/10/24

Brief summary of issues raised:

The response summarised key environmental issues for this application (dust, bioaerosols and ammonia atmospheric emissions).

Based on compliance with BAT requirements no specific concerns were raised.

Summary of actions taken:

BAT requirements complied with and summarised in the BAT conclusions review section of this decision document

No further actions required.

Response received from East Riding of Yorkshire Council dated 15/10/24

Brief summary of issues raised:

No comments or concerns raised

Summary of actions taken:

No further actions required.

Conclusion

There were no other consultee responses or responses from the general public or other organisations as a result of this consultation.