

Permitting Decisions - Bespoke

We have decided to grant the permit for Goodmanham Lodge Farm operated by Mr David Hiles and Mr Alan Hiles.

The permit number is EPR/NP3329LG.

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 permit is for operation of a new finisher unit comprising two pig sheds, which operate a solid floor straw system for production pigs (pigs >30kg). The two sheds provide a combined capacity for 3,400 pig places, with rearing from 30 to 40kg to a 100kg finishing weight. The pig enterprise is run on a B&B contract.

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 revised document, reference 'Appendix 2 - Non-technical summary', received 13/02/2025, 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 13.0 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 5.4 kg P₂O₅/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 on farm monitoring and continual improvement:

- Odour is assessed daily by the Operator at a downwind position on the installation boundary according to the wind direction.
- If two or more odour complaints linked to the installation have occurred during any given cycle, and are unresolved at the end of that cycle, the Operator will submit to the Environment Agency an action plan for additional measures to rectify the problems and reduce the risk of odour pollution.

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 (solid floor – straw system): 5.65 kg NH₃/animal place/year.

Detailed assessment of specific BAT measures

Ammonia emission controls – BAT Conclusion 30

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 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 revised site condition report (SCR) for Goodmanham Lodge Farm, submitted 29/08/2025, 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:

- Selection of feed
- Feed delivery and storage
- Ventilation
- Litter management
- Carcass storage and disposal
- Pig shed clean out

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):

1. Residential property – approximately 380m northwest of the Installation boundary.

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

The Applicant has provided a revised OMP (submitted 29/08/2025) 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 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 Applicant 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 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 are sensitive receptors within 400 metres of the installation boundary as stated under the 'Odour' section. The Applicant 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:

- Large and small vehicles travelling to and from the farm
- Large vehicle movement on site – including delivery of feed, transporting livestock, equipment used to clean houses, litter and dirty water removal
- Feed transfer from lorry to bins
- Ventilation fans
- Alarm system and standby generator
- Pigs – including loading and removal from site
- Personnel
- Building work and repairs

Noise Management Plan Review

The final NMP provided by the applicant and assessed below was received on 04/08/2025.

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.

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 06/08/2025.

There are two sensitive receptors within 100m of the installation boundary, the nearest sensitive receptor (the nearest point of their assumed property boundary) is approximately 20 metres to the west southwest of the installation boundary, and approximately 50 metres from the nearest pig house.

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) for the following potential risks:

- Feed type and delivery/storage
- Bedding materials
- House cleaning operations
- Litter management

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 for use in the event of mains power failure, with a net thermal rated input of 0.289MWth. The generator will not be tested for more than 52 hours per annum and will not be used for more than 500 hours per annum (emergency use and testing), averaged over a 3-year period. The generator falls outside of the requirements of the Medium Combustion Plant Directive. No fuel is stored within the installation boundary.

Ammonia

There are no Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Areas (SPA) or Ramsars within 5km of the installation. There are three Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) within 5km of the installation, and five other nature

conservation sites within 2km comprising of one Local Nature Reserve (LNR) and four Local Wildlife Sites (LWS).

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 27/02/2025) has indicated that emissions from Goodmanham Lodge Farm will only have a potential impact on SSSI with a precautionary CL_e of 1 µg/m³ if they are within 1,093 metres of the emission source.

Beyond 1,093 m, the PC is less than 0.2 µg/m³ (i.e. less than 20% of the precautionary 1 µg/m³ CL_e) and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case, the SSSI are beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

Where the precautionary level of 1 µg/m³ is used and the PC is assessed to be less than 20%, the site automatically screens out as insignificant and no further assessment of CL_o is necessary. In this case, the 1 µg/m³ 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

| Site | Distance from site (m) |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Rifle Butts Quarry SSSI | 2,588 |
| Enthorpe Railway Cutting SSSI | 2,603 |

No further assessment is required.

Screening using the ammonia screening tool version 4.6 (dated 27/02/2025) has indicated that the PC for Kiplingcotes Chalk Pit SSSI is predicted to be less than 20% of the CL_e for acid deposition therefore it is possible to conclude no damage. The results of the ammonia screening tool version 4.6 are given in the table below.

Table 2 – Acid deposition

| Site | Critical load keq/ha/yr * | PC keq/ha/yr | PC % critical load |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| Kiplingcotes Chalk Pit SSSI | 4.856 | 0.163 | 3.4 |

* Critical load values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) – 27/02/2025

No further assessment is required.

Screening using the ammonia screening tool version 4.6 (dated 27/02/2025) has determined that the process contributions of ammonia emissions/nitrogen deposition from the application site are over the 20% threshold and therefore may cause damage to features of the SSSI. An in-combination assessment has therefore been carried out. There are three other farms acting in combination with this application. A detailed assessment has been carried out as shown below.

A search of all existing active intensive agriculture installations permitted by the Environment Agency has identified the following farms within 5 km of the maximum concentration point for Kiplingcotes Chalk Pit SSSI.

Table 3 – In combination Assessment for Ammonia emissions

| Name of Farm | PC µg/m ³ | Critical Level µg/m ³ | PC as % of Critical level |
|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Goodmanham Lodge Farm | 0.44 | 1 | 44 |
| Enthorpe House Farm | 0.053 | 1 | 5.3 |
| Weighton Wold Farm | 0.084 | 1 | 8.4 |
| Lund Warren Pig Unit | 0.032 | 1 | 3.2 |
| Total PC | | | 44 |

* Critical level values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) – 27/02/2025

Table 4 – In combination Assessment for nitrogen deposition

| Name of Farm | PC µg/m ³ | Critical load kg N/ha/yr * | PC as % of Critical load |
|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Goodmanham Lodge Farm | 2.283 | 10 | 22.8 |
| Enthorpe House Farm | 0.274 | 10 | 2.74 |
| Weighton Wold Farm | 0.435 | 10 | 4.35 |
| Lund Warren Pig Unit | 0.168 | 10 | 1.68 |
| Total PC | | | 22.8 |

* Critical load values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) – 27/02/2025

Tables 3 and 4 show that the total PC at Kiplingcotes Chalk Pit SSSI from all farms is 44% for ammonia emissions and 22.8% for nitrogen deposition. In line with Environment Agency guidelines, where the total PC is less than 50% of the critical level/load, in-combination impacts can be considered as not being likely to damage the features of the SSSI for which it has been designated. Therefore, we have concluded no likely damage from in combination impacts at the SSSI.

No further assessment is required.

Ammonia assessment – LWS / LNR

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 27/02/2025) has indicated that emissions from Goodmanham Lodge Farm will only have a potential impact on the LWS with a precautionary CL_e of 1 µg/m³ if they are within 387 m of the emission source.

Beyond 387 m, the PC is less than 1 µg/m³ and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case the LWS are beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

Table 5 – LWS Assessment

| Site | Distance from site (m) |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Kiplingcotes Road Earthworks LWS | 440 |
| Granny's Attic Railway LWS | 746 |
| Etton - Gardham Disused Railway LWS | 1,071 |
| Etton Wold, West of Crossroads LWS | 1,404 |

No further assessment is required.

Screening using the ammonia screening tool version 4.6 (dated 27/02/2025) has determined that the PC on the LNR for ammonia emissions / nitrogen deposition / acid deposition from the application site are under the 100% significance threshold and can be screened out as having no likely significant effect. See results below.

Table 6 - Ammonia emissions

| Site | Critical level ammonia µg/m ³ | Predicted PC µg/m ³ | PC % of critical level |
|------------------|--|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| Hudson's Way LNR | 3* | 1.143 | 38.1 |

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

Table 7 – Nitrogen deposition

| Site | Critical load kg N/ha/yr * | Predicted PC kg N/ha/yr | PC % of critical load |
|------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Hudson's Way LNR | 6 | 5.939 | 99.0 |

* Critical load values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) – 27/02/2025

Table 8 – Acid deposition

| Site | Critical load keq/ha/yr * | Predicted PC keq/ha/yr | PC % of critical load |
|------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Hudson's Way LNR | 4.283 | 0.432 | 10.1 |

* Critical load values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) – 27/02/2025

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.

We consulted the following organisations:

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

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

The plan is included in the permit.

Site condition report

The Operator has provided a description of the condition of the site, which we consider is satisfactory. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on site condition reports and baseline reporting under the Industrial Emissions Directive.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Emission limits

Emission Limit Values (ELVs) based on Best Available Techniques (BAT) have been added for the following substances:

- Ammonia
- Nitrogen
- Phosphorus

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.

No relevant convictions were found.

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 13/03/2025 and ended on 10/04/2025.

Responses from organisations listed in the consultation section

Response received from: East Riding of Yorkshire Council on 19/03/2025.

Brief summary of issues raised: The Public Protection Team are not aware of any noise or other amenity issues at this site, or any enforcement action. The applicant should adhere to all the elements of the bespoke Environmental Management System (EMS) for Goodmanham Lodge Farm.

Summary of actions taken: No further action required.

Response received from: UKHSA on 02/04/2025

Brief summary of issues raised: The proposed installation is not considered to present any obvious cause for concern. It is assumed by UKHSA that the installation will comply in all respects with the requirements of the permit, including the application of Best Available Techniques (BAT). This should ensure that emissions present a low risk to human health.

Summary of actions taken: No further action required.

The Health and Safety Executive and Director of Public were also consulted but no responses were received.

There were no public responses to this consultation.