Permitting Decisions - Variation

We have decided to grant the variation for Manor Farm operated by J A Fry Limited.

The variation number is EPR/UP3037FQ/V005.

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

This variation is to increase the permitted number of pig places from 5,500 to 9,800 production pigs (>30kg), add additional pig sheds and increase the installation boundary.

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

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

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.

The Applicant has confirmed their compliance with all BAT conditions for all housing in their document reference 'Non-technical summary', submitted 23/10/2025, 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 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 or by means of using a mass balance calculation of nitrogen and phosphorus based on the feed intake, dietary content of crude protein and animal performance 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

As there are no sensitive receptors within 400m of the installation boundary an odour management plan was not requested.

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 NH_3/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.

'New plant' is defined as plant first permitted at the site of the farm following the publication of the BAT Conclusions.

For variations all new housing on existing farms will need to meet the BAT AEL. Existing housing BAT compliance 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.

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 Manor Farm, submitted 30/10/2025, 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, 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
- Ventilation
- Manure and slurry management
- Carcass storage and disposal
- Shed clean out

There are no relevant receptors within 400 metres of the installation boundary and in-line with our guidance, the Applicant was not required to submit an odour management plan.

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, 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.

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 sheds, litter and dirty water removal
- Feed transfer from lorry to bins
- Ventilation fans
- Alarm system and standby generator
- Pigs
- Personnel
- Building work and repairs

There are no relevant receptors within 400 metres of the installation boundary and in-line with our guidance, the Applicant was not required to submit a noise management plan.

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 23/10/2025.

There is one sensitive receptor within 100m of the installation boundary, the nearest point of their assumed property boundary is approximately 22 metres to the south of the installation boundary and nearest pig shed.

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, delivery and 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 portable standby generator for use in the event of mains power failure, with a net thermal rated input <1 MWth. Testing is carried out once monthly and the usage is less 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. There is a fuel tank on site (bunded and in compliance with SSAFO regulations) but the pig unit is not the primary user, so this has been removed from Table S3.1 of the permit. The operator will currently be responsible for any land/groundwater contamination resulting from this tank and this would need to be considered in any future surrender application.

Ammonia

There are no Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Areas (SPA) or Ramsars within 5km of the installation. There is one Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) within 5km of the installation, and one other nature conservation site within 2km comprising of a Local Wildlife Site (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 (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.

Screening using the ammonia screening tool version 4.6 (dated 27/03/2025) has indicated that the PC for River Hull Headwaters SSSI is predicted to be less than 20% of the CLo 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 1 – Acid deposition

Site	Critical load keq/ha/yr *	PC keq/ha/yr	PC % critical load
River Hull Headwaters SSSI	1.166	0.181	15.5

* Critical load values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) – 27/03/2025

No further assessment is required.

Screening using the ammonia screening tool version 4.6 (dated 27/03/2025) 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 five 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 River Hull Headwaters SSSI.

Table 2 – In combination Assessment for Ammonia emissions

Name of Farm	PC µg/m^3	Critical Level µg/m^3	PC as % of Critical level
Manor Farm	**0.489**	**1**	**48.9**
Southlands Pig Unit	0.14	1	14.0
Rickle Pits Farm	0.143	1	14.3
Bellmills Farm Poultry Unit	0.141	1	14.1
Church Farm Poultry Unit	0.077	1	7.70
Kirkburn Grange Farm	0.035	1	3.50
Total			**48.9**

* Critical level values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) – 27/03/2025

Table 3 – In combination Assessment for nitrogen deposition

Name of Farm	PC µg/m^3	Critical load kg N/ha/yr *	PC as % of Critical load
Manor Farm	**2.539**	**10**	**25.40**
Southlands Pig Unit	0.727	10	7.27
Rickle Pits Farm	0.743	10	7.43
Bellmills Farm Poultry Unit	0.733	10	7.33
Church Farm Poultry Unit	0.398	10	3.98
Kirkburn Grange Farm	0.183	10	1.83
Total			**25.4**

* Critical load values taken from APIS website (www.apis.ac.uk) – 27/03/2025

Tables 2 and 3 show that the total PC at River Hull Headwaters SSSI from all farms is 48.9% for ammonia emissions and 25.4% 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 and therefore we have concluded no likely damage from in combination impacts at the SSSI.

No further assessment is required.

Ammonia assessment – LWS

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

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

Initial screening using ammonia screening tool version 4.6 (dated 27/03/2025) has indicated that emissions from Manor Farm will only have a potential impact on the LWS site with a precautionary CLe of 1 µg/m^3 if it is within 1,612 m of the emission source.

Beyond 1,612 m, the PC is less than 1 µg/m^3 and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case the LWS is beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screens out of any further assessment.

Table 4 – LWS Assessment

Site	Distance from site (m)
Corpslanding Road LWS	1,913

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.

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 section 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.

Dust and bioaerosol management

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

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

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

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

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

Updating permit conditions during consolidation

We have updated permit conditions to those in the current generic permit template as part of permit consolidation. The conditions will provide the same level of protection as those in the previous permit(s).

Emission limits

The Emission Limit Value (ELV) for ammonia has been amended in line with the Intensive Farming sector BAT Conclusions document dated 21/02/2017. This limit is 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.

We have decided that monitoring should be added for sheds 5 to 9 for the following parameters, using the methods detailed and to the frequencies specified:

Ammonia, nitrogen and phosphorus.

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

Reporting

Reporting has not changed as a result of this variation.

Management system

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

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

Growth duty

We have considered our duty to have regard to the desirability of promoting economic growth set out in section 108(1) of the Deregulation Act 2015 and the guidance issued under section 110 of that Act in deciding whether to grant this permit variation.

Paragraph 1.3 of the guidance says:

“The primary role of regulators, in delivering regulation, is to achieve the regulatory outcomes for which they are responsible. For a number of regulators, these regulatory outcomes include an explicit reference to development or growth. The growth duty establishes economic growth as a factor that all specified regulators should have regard to, alongside the delivery of the protections set out in the relevant legislation.”

We have addressed the legislative requirements and environmental standards to be set for this operation in the body of the decision document above. The guidance is clear at paragraph 1.5 that the growth duty does not legitimise non-compliance and its purpose is not to achieve or pursue economic growth at the expense of necessary protections.

We consider the requirements and standards we have set in this permit are reasonable and necessary to avoid a risk of an unacceptable level of pollution. This also promotes growth amongst legitimate operators because the standards

applied to the Operator are consistent across businesses in this sector and have been set to achieve the required legislative standards.

Consultation Responses

The following summarises the responses to consultation with other organisations, our notice on GOV.UK for the public and the way in which we have considered these in the determination process.

The consultation commenced on 02/06/2025 and ended on 30/06/2025.

Responses from organisations listed in the consultation section

Response received from: UKHSA.

Brief summary of issues raised: The main emissions of potential public health significance are emissions to air of bioaerosols, dust (including particulate matter), odour and ammonia. The application is accompanied by a Bioaerosol & Dust Management Plan for the installation, in addition to controls and mitigations, which result in a residual risk for all these hazards, assessed as being not significant. 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: The applicant submitted an environment risk assessment and DMP, as outlined in the key issues section above. Measures to mitigate the potential risks from odour and fugitive emissions have been identified in the assessment and plan. The use of Best Available Techniques and good practice will ensure minimisation of emissions. Furthermore, standard conditions 3.2.1 and 3.3.1 concerning fugitive emissions and odour have been included in the permit.

The Health and Safety Executive, Director of Public Health and East Riding of Yorkshire Council Environmental Protection were also consulted but no responses were received.

There were no public responses to this consultation.