Permitting Decisions - Variation

We have decided to grant the variation for **Southfield Pig Farm** operated by **Cattle (Holderness) Limited**

The variation number is **EPR/AP3531FB/V004.**

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.

Application Overview:

This application is to vary the permitted pig places from 1,050 sow places and 3,500 >30kg production pig places (with a Directly Associated Activity of 3100 pigs <30kg places) to 2,761 sow places (including pre-weaning piglets) and 6 breeding boars. The installation going forward will have no pig places < 30 kg.

There is no increase in the installation boundary to allow such changes.

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 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 now

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 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 non-technical summary received 31/07/2025 which has been referenced in Table S1.2 - Operating Techniques, of the permit.

There is a single new house (sow service shed) for sows only.

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 **30.0 kg** N/animal place/year 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 **15.0 kg** P_2O_5/animal place/year 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

The approved odour management plan (OMP) includes the following details for

• The staff will perform a weekly boundary walk to check the surrounding area for high levels of odour. Checks will also be performed on the surrounding area by persons who do not regularly work on the farm.

• In the event of odour complaints being received the Operator will notify the Environment Agency 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:

- Sows: 2.7 kg NH_3/animal place/year for slatted floor

The Applicant has confirmed < 800 mm shallow pit and 10-week slurry removal frequency, the standard sow emission factor for this scenario is 2.94 kg NH_3/animal place/year for fully slatted floor.
The operator has provided diets sheets dated 21/05/2025 confirming average crude protein of diets is 13.98 % relative to standard emission factor based on crude protein levels of 15.8 %.

Therefore, the reduction is 1.82 % from standard crude protein level, Based on 10 % ammonia reduction for each 1 % reduction in crude protein (up to a maximum of 20 % ammonia reduction) the ammonia reduction here is 18.2 %.

Hence the installation ammonia emission factor for the new sow building is 2.94 *0.818 = 2.405 kg NH_3/animal place/year for slatted floor

Industrial Emissions Directive (IED)

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

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 and relevant control measures are listed in the OMP.

Odour Management Plan Review

There is one 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):

- Residential property Spring Farm Bungalow– approximately 357m north of the Installation boundary.

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

The Operator has provided an OMP (submitted 17/05/2024) 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.

It should also be noted that for this existing farm, having consulted with our local area compliance team, there are no known historical odour complaints linked to this installation.

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

Conclusion

We have assessed the OMP and conclude that the Applicant has followed the guidance set out in EPR 6.09 Appendix 4 'Odour 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 odour pollution/nuisance.

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 sensitive receptor within 400 metres of the installation boundary as stated under the 'Odour' section.

The NMP lists key potential risks of noise pollution beyond the installation boundary. , along with relevant control measures.

Noise Management Plan Review
The final NMP provided by applicant and assessed below was received as part of the application supporting documentation on 17/05/2024.

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.

It should also be noted that for this existing farm, having consulted with our local area compliance team, there are no known historical noise complaints linked to this installation.

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

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 workers' houses. Details can be found via the link below:

www.gov.uk/guidance/intensive-farming-risk-assessment-for-your-environmental-permit#air-emissions-dust-and-bioaerosols.

As there are receptors within 100m of the installation, the Applicant was required to submit a dust and bioaerosol management plan in this format. The final dust and bioaerosol management plan provided by the applicant and assessed below was received on 17/05/2024.

There is one sensitive receptor within 100m of the installation boundary, the nearest sensitive receptor (the nearest point of their assumed property boundary) is actually on southern tip of the installation boundary.

In the guidance mentioned above it states that particulate concentrations fall off rapidly with distance from the emitting source. This fact, together with the proposed good management of the installation (such as keeping areas clean from build-up of dust and other measures in place to reduce dust and the risk of spillages e.g. litter and feed management/delivery procedures) all reduce the potential for emissions impacting the nearest receptors. The Applicant has confirmed measures in their dust and bioaerosol management plan to reduce dust (which will inherently reduce bioaerosols) , these are listed in the DBMP.

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 one standby generator with a net thermal rated input of 0.24 MWth and it will not be tested more than 50 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 NH_3 BAT AEL.

For all the sows the crude protein data presented (21/05/2025) has been applied with a reduction of the standard emission factor by 18,2%.

There is one Special Area of Conservation (SAC), two Special Protection Areas (SPA) and one Ramsar within 5 km of the installation boundary. In addition, there are three Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) within 5km of the installation boundary, and one other nature conservation sites within 2km of the installation boundary comprising of one Local Wildlife Site (LWS) .

Ammonia assessment – SAC/SPA/Ramsar

The following trigger thresholds have been designated for the assessment of European sites:

- If, using the Ammonia Screening Tool (AST v4.6) the process contribution (PC) is below 4% 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, detailed ammonia modelling is required, and, if the PC from such modelling is below 1% of the relevant critical level (CLe) or critical loads (CLo) then the farm can be permitted with no further assessment.
- Where the PC (after modelling) exceeds 1%, further detailed assessment is required, taking into consideration the ammonia and nitrogen background concentrations and may also require an in-combination assessment.
- Where an in-combination assessment is required, the combined PC for all relevant existing permitted installations identified within 5 km of the SAC/SPA/Ramsar will be considered, together with impacts from other local plans, projects, and non-permitted farms which could act in-combination. The in-combination assessment is limited to those impacts not already included in the relevant background emission baseline.

Greater Wash SPA assessment

Screening using detailed modelling report entitled "*Report on the Modelling of the Dispersion and Deposition of Ammonia from the Piggeries at Southfield Pig Farm, near Out Newton in East Riding of Yorkshire"* dated 08/05/2025 are all lower for the proposal relative to the baseline at all the modelled receptors.

The worst-case modelled process contributions are summarised in tables below:

Ammonia emissions
APIS does not give a critical level for this habitat site, it states "not sensitive" under ammonia critical level; reviewed 28/07/2025.

Table 1 – Nitrogen deposition

Site	Critical load kg N/ha/yr*	Predicted PC kg N/ha/yr	PC % of critical load
Greater Wash SPA Baseline	5*	1.44	28.8
Greater Wash SPA Proposal	5*	0.89	17.8

* Critical load values taken from Air Pollution Information System (APIS) website (www.apis.ac.uk) – [28/07/2025]

The Applicant did not complete acid deposition impact modelling. We have therefore applied our standard approach of using the nitrogen deposition values and dividing by 14. The values for the highest impacts are summarised below

Table 2 – Acid deposition

Site	Critical load keq/ha/yr *	Predicted PC keq/ha/yr	PC % of critical load
Greater Wash SPA Baseline	4.856	0.103	2.12
Greater Wash SPA Proposal	4.856	0.0604	1.31

* Critical load values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) – 28/07/2025

Conclusion

All the impacts on the Greater Wash SPA for nitrogen deposition and acid deposition from the proposed application site are lower than the baseline.

No further assessment is necessary.

Humber Estuary SPA/SAC/Ramsar assessment

Screening using detailed modelling report entitled "*Report on the Modelling of the Dispersion and Deposition of Ammonia from the Piggeries at Southfield Pig Farm, near Out Newton in East Riding of Yorkshire"* dated 08/05/2025 are all lower for the proposal relative to the baseline at all the modelled receptors.

The worst-case modelled process contributions are summarised in tables below:

Table 3 – Ammonia emissions

For the Humber Estuary SPA and Ramsar site APIS does not give a critical level, it states "not sensitive" under ammonia critical level. Checked 28/07/2025.

Site	Critical level ammonia µg/m^3	Predicted process contribution µg/m^3	% of critical level
Humber Estuary SAC Baseline	1*	0.027	2.70
Humber Estuary SAC Proposal	1*	0.016	1.60

*A precautionary CLe of 1 µg/m^3 has been assigned to this site.

Table 4 – Nitrogen deposition

Site	Critical load kg N/ha/yr *	Predicted PC kg N/ha/yr	PC % of critical load
Humber Estuary SAC Baseline	5	0.14	2.80
Humber Estuary SAC Proposal	5	0.08	1.60
Humber Estuary SPA Baseline	5	0.14	2.80
Humber Estuary SPA Proposal	5	0.08	1.60
Humber Estuary Ramsar Baseline	5	0.14	2.80
Humber Estuary Ramsar Proposal	5	0.08	1.60

*Critical load values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) – 28/07/2025

The Applicant did not complete acid deposition impact modelling. We have therefore applied our standard approach of using the nitrogen deposition values and dividing by 14. The values for the highest impacts are summarised below

Table 5 – Acid deposition

Site	Critical load keq/ha/yr *	Predicted PC keq/ha/yr	PC % of critical load
Humber Estuary SAC Baseline	1.312	0.01	0.76
Humber Estuary SAC Proposal	1.312	0.0057	0.44
Humber Estuary SPA Baseline	1.312	0.01	0.76
Humber Estuary SPA Proposal	1.312	0.0057	0.44
Humber Estuary Ramsar Baseline	1.312	0.01	0.76
Humber Estuary Ramsar Proposal	1.312	0.0057	0.44

*Critical load values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) - 28/07/2025

Conclusion

All the proposal impacts for ammonia emissions, nitrogen deposition and acid deposition from the application site are lower than the baseline impacts.

In addition, for acid deposition all impacts for the proposal are lower than the 1 % threshold.

No further assessment is required.

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 28/07/2025) has indicated that emissions from Southfield Pig Farm will only have a potential impact on SSSIs with a precautionary CLe of 1 μg/m^3 if they are within **2,036 metres** of the emission source.

Beyond **2,036 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 6 – SSSI Assessment

Name of SSSI	Distance from site (m)
Humber Estuary	2,867
The Lagoons	3,821

No further assessment is required.

Dimlington Cliff SSSI

This SSSI has been confirmed as a geological site. Hence in line with our guidance this has been excluded from further assessment.

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.

Out Newton - Skeffling LWS

Screening using detailed modelling report entitled "*Report on the Modelling of the Dispersion and Deposition of Ammonia from the Piggeries at Southfield Pig Farm, near Out Newton in East Riding of Yorkshire"* dated 08/05/2025 has determined that the PC on the LWS for ammonia emissions, nitrogen deposition and acid deposition from the application site are under the 100% significance threshold except for impacts at one receptor.

The Applicant has carried out a comparison between the existing baseline using the most conservative of the old and new emission factors and the proposal using the new emission factors published in November 2024.

Detailed modelling provided by the Applicant has been audited by our air quality specialist and we have confidence that we can agree with the report conclusions.

It should be noted that our assessment team have confirmed the receptors modelled are in the correct locations for the relevant Out Newton - Skeffling LWS baseline. However, the operator has named this LWS "Roadside Verge LWS".

The following details the impact for the baseline and the proposal for this one specific modelled receptor (receptor 2 as listed in modelling report), where the proposal impacts are > 100 % of the relevant critical levels and loads

Table 7- Ammonia emissions

Site	Critical level ammonia µg/m^3	Predicted PC µg/m^3	PC % of critical level
Out Newton - Skeffling LWS baseline	3*	7.610	253.7
Out Newton - Skeffling LWS proposal	3*	5.906	196.9

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

Table 8 – Nitrogen deposition

Site	Critical load kg N/ha/yr *	Predicted PC kg N/ha/yr	PC % of critical load
Out Newton - Skeffling LWS baseline	10	39.53	395.3
Out Newton - Skeffling LWS proposal	10	30.68	306.8

* Critical load values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) - 28/07/2025

The Applicant did not complete acid deposition impact modelling. We have therefore applied our standard approach of using the nitrogen deposition values and dividing by 14. The values for the highest impacts are summarised below

Table 9 – Acid deposition

Site	Critical load keq/ha/yr *	Predicted PC keq/ha/yr	PC % of critical load
Out Newton - Skeffling LWS baseline	10.804	2.824	26.1
Out Newton - Skeffling LWS proposal	10.804	2.191	20.3

* Critical load values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) - 28/07/2025

For all the receptors modelled within the applicant's report the proposal impacts for ammonia emissions, nitrogen deposition and acid deposition from the application site are lower than the baseline for this specific LWS.

In addition to the modelling report, as the applicant hadn't modelled the closest point of Out Newton – Skeffling LWS to the installation, we completed checks at an additional receptor point closest to the installation to address this and also considered the special distribution of PCs in this area.

Our analysis of spatial distribution of predictions indicates that the area of exceedance is similar between the baseline and proposal scenarios. Considering modelling uncertainties, we cannot confidently conclude that the results indicate a clear reduction in impacts at this LWS for this area only.

Our internal assessment has shown that any potential increase for the proposal is only around 1 % more than the baseline PC at the maximum point of exceedance and in addition, areas of exceedance are limited to approximately 1.5 % of the total area of the LWS, and the PC increase is likely to be lower than 1% at other points within this 1.5 % area of the nature conservation site.

We have concluded that overall, the proposal has reduced impacts on this LWS and the increase at the small area mentioned above is insignificant.

Conclusion

We have therefore concluded the impacts of the proposal are satisfactory.

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.

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.

We consulted the following organisations:

- Health and Safety Executive (HSE)
- UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA)
- Director of Public Health, East Riding of Yorkshire Council
- East Riding of Yorkshire Council Environmental Health Department

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

The regulated facility

We considered the extent and nature of the facilities at the site in accordance with RGN2 ‘Understanding the meaning of regulated facility’.

The extent of the facilities 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.

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 with Natural England or sent a HRA1 for information only as impacts on all relevant European/Ramsar sites have not increased.

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.

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.

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.

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

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 permits.

Improvement programme

There is a historic improvement programme carried over from the previous permits and it is now confirmed to be completed.

Emission limits

Emission Limit Values (ELVs) or technical measures based on Best Available Techniques (BAT)] have been amended as following:

- All < 30 kg BAT emission limit values have been removed, as such pigs are no longer present within installation.
- All production pigs >30 kg BAT emission limit values have been removed, as such pigs are no longer present within installation.

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 amended for the following parameters, using the methods detailed and to the frequencies specified:

Removal of monitoring requirements for < 30 kg pigs and all production pig > 30 kg relevant emission limit values

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 have amended reporting in the permit for the following parameters:

Removal of reporting linked to monitoring for < 30 kg pigs and > 30 kg production pigs (with exception of boars) for confirmation of compliance with relevant emission limit values

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.

A full review of the management system is undertaken during compliance checks.

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 **01/08/2025** and ended on **30/08/2025**

Responses from organisations listed in the consultation section

Response received from UKHSA (dated 29/08/2024)

Brief summary of issues raised:

Three areas were raised for the Environment Agency to check as follows:

- Non-technical summary accuracy with respect to pig numbers
- Borehole: confirmation water not for human consumption
- Odour Management Plan sufficiency with regard to monitoring

Summary of actions taken:

- Non-technical summary: updated non-technical summary dated 31/07/2025 gives final accurate pig numbers
- Borehole: confirmation that borehole not used for human consumption
- Odour Management Plan review: The BAT update received 31/07/2025 within their non-technical summary confirmed detail of odour monitoring to be carried out at the site and we are satisfied with the response

Conclusion

No further actions required

There were no other consultee or general public responses.