

Permitting Decisions - Bespoke Permit

We have decided to grant the permit for South View Farm operated by Belmont Farms Limited.

The permit number is EPR/EP3122SF.

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.

The application is for a new farm installation, currently operating 1,850 pigs above 30kg and 1,850 pigs below 30kg, proposing to expand to 6,000 production pigs above 30kg reared in eleven pig houses. No other pig types will be stocked. Slurry is stored on site in two slurry tanks with a total surface area of 683.5m² and total storage capacity 4,041m³ for each tank, which confirm to the 'Water resources control of pollution (silage, slurry and agricultural fuel oil) regulations 2010 (England) and as amended 2013' (SSAFO).

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 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. The introductory note summarises what the permit covers.

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 now a separate BAT Conclusions document which sets out the standards that permitted farms will have to meet.

Now the BAT Conclusions are published, all new installation farming permits issued after 21st February 2017 must be compliant in full from the first day of operation.

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.

The Applicant has confirmed their compliance with all BAT conditions for the new installation in their document reference 'Establishing Best Available Techniques' and dated 09/10/2024 which has been referenced in Table S1.2 Operating Techniques of the permit.

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 and will use BAT 3a technique reducing the crude protein content.

Table S3.3 of the permit concerning process monitoring requires the Operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT Conclusions.

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 P₂O₅/animal place/year and will use BAT 4a technique reducing the crude protein content.

Table S3.3 of the permit concerning process monitoring requires the Operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT Conclusions.

BAT 16 Emissions from slurry management

The Applicant has confirmed that the slurry lagoons within the installation boundary will have a rigid cover prior to permit issue and meet the requirements of BAT.

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

The approved odour management plan (OMP) includes the following details for on farm monitoring and continual improvement:

- The staff will perform a daily boundary walk to check the surrounding area for high levels of odour by means of sniff testing.
- In the event of odour complaints being received the Operator will notify the Environment Agency within 24 hours of receiving a complaint and make a record of the complaint. The Operator will undertake the necessary odour contingency as required.

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 NH₃/animal place/year. Pigs housed in sheds with fully slatted flooring.

The emission factor for production pigs on fully slatted flooring based on crude protein content of animal diet of 18% is 2.813 NH₃/animal place/year, which is above the required BAT-AEL 2.6 kg NH₃/animal place/year. The installation will operate a reduced crude protein diet of 16%, hence, a reduction of 20% has been applied to the baseline emission rate. Therefore, the installation will achieve emission factor 2.25 NH₃/animal place/year, which is below the required BAT-AEL 2.6 kg NH₃/animal place/year.

Detailed assessment of specific BAT measures

Ammonia emission controls – BAT Conclusion 30 (pigs)

A BAT Associated Emission Level (AEL) provides us with a performance benchmark to determine whether an activity is BAT. The BAT Conclusions include a set of BAT AELs for ammonia emissions to air from animal housing for pigs.

All new bespoke applications issued after the 21st February 2017, including those where there is a mixture of old and new housing, will now need to meet the BAT AEL.

Industrial Emissions Directive (IED)

This permit implements the requirements of the European Union Directive on Industrial Emissions.

Groundwater and soil monitoring

As a result of the requirements of the Industrial Emissions Directive, all permits are now required to contain a condition relating to protection of soil, groundwater and groundwater monitoring. However, the Environment Agency's H5 Guidance states that it is only necessary for the Operator to take samples of soil or

groundwater and measure levels of contamination where there is evidence that there is, or could be existing contamination and:

- The environmental risk assessment has identified that the same contaminants are a particular hazard; or
- The environmental risk assessment has identified that the same contaminants are a hazard and the risk assessment has identified a possible pathway to land or groundwater.

H5 Guidance further states that it is **not essential for the Operator** to take samples of soil or groundwater and measure levels of contamination where:

- The environmental risk assessment identifies no hazards to land or groundwater; or
- Where the environmental risk assessment identifies only limited hazards to land and groundwater and there is no reason to believe that there could be historic contamination by those substances that present the hazard; or
- Where the environmental risk assessment identifies hazards to land and groundwater but there is evidence that there is no historic contamination by those substances that pose the hazard.

The site condition report (SCR) for South View Farm (dated 24/04/2024) demonstrates that there are no hazards or likely pathway to land or groundwater and no historic contamination on site that may present a hazard from the same contaminants. Therefore, on the basis of the risk assessment presented in the SCR, we accept that they have not provided base line reference data for the soil and groundwater at the site at this stage and although condition 3.1.3 is included in the permit no groundwater monitoring will be required.

Odour 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. These activities are as follows:

- Feed delivery and storage
- Odour from pig rearing
- Ventilation
- Slurry management
- Carcass storage and disposal
- Yard areas (pig movement between buildings)
- Buildings (housing and cleanout operations)
- Dust buildup and disinfectant use

Odour Management Plan Review

There is a single sensitive receptor located within 400m of the installation boundary, as listed below (please note, the distance stated is only an approximation from the Installation boundary to the assumed boundary of the property):

- Private dwelling – approximately 361m east/ southeast of the Installation boundary.

The sensitive receptors that have been considered under odour and noise, does not include the operator's property and other people associated with the farm operations as odour and noise are amenity issues.

The Operator has provided an OMP (submitted 01/07/2025) 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) or Pig Industry Good Practice Checklist (August 2013) as well as the site-specific circumstances at the Installation. 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 at the Installation in accordance with condition 3.3.1 of the Permit and its OMP. The OMP includes odour control measures and procedural measures. The Operator has identified the potential sources of odour as well as the potential risks and problems, and detailed actions taken to minimise odour including contingencies for abnormal operations.

The Odour Management Plan sets out the preventative measures that will be taken at the installation as part of the daily management of odour risk at the site. These mitigation measures include but are not limited to the following odour-reducing procedures:

- Daily odour monitoring is carried out by a member of staff by means of sniff testing.
- High velocity roof fans on all buildings.
- No milling or mixing of feed on site.
- Mostly wet feed system. The diets fed to all the pigs throughout all stages are balanced nutritionally and formulated in such a way to minimise the production and emissions of ammonia, odours, dust and the overall environmental impact of the farming activities. The unit operates a reduced crude protein diet.
- All feed delivery systems are sealed to minimise atmospheric dust. Most feed is in liquid form which minimises dust emissions.
- All houses operate a fully slatted system. The buildings have a slurry slat depth of 800 mm and slurry is removed at least every 12 weeks directly to the slurry tank.
- The two concrete slurry stores are covered with a rigid cover. No manure is produced.
- Slurry store is only agitated prior to emptying.
- Slurry is exported from the site. Records are kept of the arrangements in place when slurry is exported from the site. Slurry is spread in accordance with the Defra Code of Good Agricultural Practice and a manure management plan for the receiving land.
- Before slurry export off site wind direction is observed to ensure minimal disturbance to residents.
- Odorous spillages (feed, slurry etc.) cleaned up promptly. Yard areas kept clean. All dirty water from cleaning out and dirty yard water is directed to the slurry stores.
- Building clean-out takes place within normal working hours. No ponding of effluents during wash down periods.
- Carcasses are stored in lockable and bunded vermin proof deadstock compound. Deadstock bin location is kept in partial shade. Fallen stock is disposed of in accordance with the Animal-By-Products Regulations.

It should also be noted that for existing farms, having consulted with the Local Authority and our local area compliance team (please see consultation response below), there have been odour complaints linked to the site, however, there have not been any odour complaints for at least 2 years. Odour issues on the site were linked to poor slurry storage and site management under the previous owners of the site. The operator is now in new ownership and the proposal is to install two new concrete slurry tanks to enable proper slurry management and storage which will address the historic odour issues on site.

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 (as committed to in the OMP) and/or after a complaint is received, and/or after any changes to operations at the installation, whichever is the sooner. 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 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.

Although there is the potential for odour pollution from the Installation, the Operator's compliance with its OMP and permit conditions will minimise the risk of odour pollution beyond the Installation boundary. 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.

There is a single sensitive receptor within 400 metres of the installation boundary as stated under the 'Odour' section. The Operator has provided a NMP as part of the application supporting documentation, and further details are provided below.

The risk assessment for the installation provided within the NMP for the application lists key potential risks of noise pollution beyond the installation boundary. These activities are as follows:

- Feeding pigs
- Feed delivery
- Movement of livestock including pig loading in and out
- Delivery of supplies and materials
- Filling and emptying of the slurry tank
- Vehicles operating within the installation boundary
- Ventilation fans
- Alarm systems
- Clean down operation
- Standby generator testing

Noise Management Plan Review

The final NMP provided by applicant and assessed below was received as part of the application supporting documentation on 01/07/2025.

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 (as committed to in the NMP), however the Operator has confirmed that it will be reviewed if a complaint is received, whichever is sooner. The NMP includes noise control measures and procedural measures.

Operations with the most potential to cause noise nuisance have been assessed and control measures put in place.

It should also be noted that for existing farms, having consulted with the Local Authority and our local area compliance team (please see consultation response below), there are no known historical noise complaints at this site.

We have included our standard noise and vibration condition, condition 3.4.1, in the Permit, which requires that 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 NMP (which is captured through condition 2.3 and Table S1.2 of the Permit), to prevent or where that is not practicable to minimise the noise and vibration.

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 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 management

There are no relevant receptors within 100 metres of the installation boundary.

Hence there is no formal requirement for a Dust and Bioaerosol Management Plan.

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 one standby generator with a net thermal rated input of 0.1 MWth and it will not be tested more than 12 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.

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) or Ramsar sites located within 5 kilometres of the installation boundary. There are four Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) located within 5 km of the installation boundary. There are also two Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) 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 (CL_e) or critical load (CL_o) then the farm can be permitted with no further assessment.
- Where this threshold is exceeded an assessment alone and in combination is required. An in-combination assessment will be completed to establish the combined PC for all existing farms identified within 5 km of the SSSI.

Initial screening using the ammonia screening tool version 4.6 dated 20/05/2025 has indicated that emissions from South View Farm will only have a potential impact on SSSIs with a precautionary CLe of 1 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ if they are within 1,957 metres of the emission source.

Beyond 1,957 m the PC is less than 0.2 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (i.e. less than 20% of the precautionary 1 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ CLe) and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case the following SSSIs are beyond this distance (see table 1 below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

Where the precautionary level of 1 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ 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 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ 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)
Keal Carr SSSI	2,222
Hundleby Clay Pit SSSI	3,484
Mavis Enderby Valley SSSI	4,289

Further other conservation site assessment – SSSI

Screening using the detailed modelling ‘A Report on the Modelling of the Dispersion and Deposition of Ammonia from the Piggery at South View Farm, Fen Lane, near East Keal in Lincolnshire’ dated 19/10/2024 and revised on 07/04/2025 has indicated that the PC for Jenkins Carr SSSI is predicted to be less than 20% of the CLe for ammonia emissions, nitrogen deposition and acid deposition therefore it is possible to conclude no damage. The results of the ammonia modelling report are given in the tables 2, 3 and 4 below.

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

Table 2 – Ammonia emissions

Site	Ammonia CLe ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	PC ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	PC % critical level
Jenkins Carr SSSI	1*	0.112	11.2

*A precautionary CLe of 1 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ has been assigned to this site. Where the precautionary level of 1 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ is used and the PC is assessed to be less than the 20% insignificance threshold it is not necessary to further consider nitrogen deposition or acid deposition CLo values. In these cases, the 1 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ level used has not been confirmed, but it is precautionary.

Table 3 – Nitrogen deposition

Site	Critical load kg N/ha/yr *	PC kg N/ha/yr	PC % critical load
Jenkins Carr SSSI	10	0.870	8.7

* Critical load values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) – 20/05/2025.

Table 4 – Acid deposition

Site	Critical load keq/ha/yr *	PC keq/ha/yr	PC % critical load
Jenkins Carr SSSI	1.08	0.062	5.7

* Critical load values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) – 20/05/2025.

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 (CL_e) or critical load (CL_o) then the farm can be permitted with no further assessment.

Initial screening using ammonia screening tool version 4.6 dated 20/05/2025 has indicated that emissions from South View Farm will only have a potential impact on the LWS sites with a precautionary CL_e of 1 µg/m³ if they are within 694 m of the emission source.

Beyond 694 m the PC is less than 1 µg/m³ and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case all LWSs are beyond this distance (see table 5 below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

Table 5 – LWS Assessment

Site	Distance from site (m)
East Keal Clay Pit	1,816
Keal Carr South	2,109

No further assessment is required.

Decision considerations

Confidential information

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

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

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.

The application was publicised on the GOV.UK website. No responses were received.

We consulted the following organisations:

- Health and Safety Executive
- Local Authority Environmental Protection – Lincolnshire Borough Council

The comments and our responses are summarised in the [consultation responses](#) section.

Operator

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 operator for environmental permits.

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 plans which we consider to be satisfactory, showing the extent of the site facilities.

The site layout and drainage plan are 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 Natural England.

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.

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.

Odour management

We have reviewed the odour management plan in accordance with our guidance on odour management.

We consider that the odour management plan is satisfactory, and we approve this plan.

We have approved the odour 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 table S1.2.

Noise management

We have reviewed the noise management plan in accordance with our guidance on noise assessment and control.

We consider that the noise management plan is satisfactory, and we approve this plan.

We have approved the noise 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 table S1.2.

Emission limits

We have decided that emission limits are required in the permit. BAT AELs have been added 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

We have decided that monitoring should be carried out for the parameters listed in the permit, using the methods detailed and to the frequencies specified.

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

Reporting

We have specified reporting in the permit, using the methods detailed and to the frequencies specified.

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.

Previous performance

We have checked our systems to ensure that all relevant convictions have been declared.

Relevant convictions were found and declared in the application. We considered relevant convictions as part of the determination process.

Financial competence

There is no known reason to consider that the Operator will not be financially able to comply with the permit conditions.

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 25/10/2024 and ended on 22/11/2024.

Responses from organisations listed in the consultation section

Response received from
Health and Safety Executive (HSE) (response received 28/10/2024)
Brief summary of issues raised
<p>HSE explained that it does not have a role in the planning process other than as a statutory consultee for the criteria listed in the response. HSE explained its role and recommended what bodies to contact for advice on planning or environmental matters.</p> <p>No comments concerning this application were made.</p>
Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered
<p>Planning permissions fall outside of the Environment Agency's remit in reaching permitting decisions and are a matter for the Applicant to resolve directly with the Planning Authority.</p> <p>No action required.</p>

Local Authority Environmental Protection – Lincolnshire Borough Council
Environmental Protection were also consulted but no responses were received.

There were no public responses to this consultation.