

## Permitting Decisions - Bespoke Permit

We have decided to grant the permit for **Land to the West of Bryn y Plentyn Farm** operated by **Dave Woollam and Lucy Woollam**.

The permit number is **EPR/KP3122LH**

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.

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.

### Installation Summary

This is a new installation for a 120,000 pullet farm within a single poultry house served by high velocity extraction fans.

The clean and lightly contaminated surface waters are discharged to a soak away within the installation boundary.

There are no directly associated activities linked to the main intensive farming scheduled activity.

## 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.

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 21<sup>st</sup> 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 21<sup>st</sup> 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.

### BAT Conclusions review

There are 34 BAT Conclusion measures in total within the BAT Conclusion document dated 21<sup>st</sup> 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 installation in their BAT conclusions document reference received 01/12/25, which has been referenced in Table S1.2 - Operating Techniques, of the permit.

For pullets there are no manure excretion nitrogen and phosphorous emission limit values and no associated monitoring requirements.

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

### 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 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.
- Visual (and nasal) inspections of potentially odorous activities will be carried out.
- 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 31 Ammonia emissions from poultry houses - pullets**

There are no BAT AELs for pullets

BAT 31 Narrative BAT is complied with via BAT 31b4 i.e.

*BAT 31 b 4. Manure belts (in case of aviary).*

**Note:** As there is no Nitrogen and Phosphorous excreted manure limits for pullets there is no requirement for associated manure BAT monitoring.

## **Industrial Emissions Directive (IED)**

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

## **Groundwater and soil monitoring**

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

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

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

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

The site condition report (SCR) for this farm dated 09/07/25, 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 with relevant control measures.

### Odour Management Plan Review

There are five sensitive receptors located within 400m of the installation boundary. The closest receptors are two residences actually on the installation boundary and to the south of the installation. The installation area is large and in practice these receptors are a reasonable distance from the poultry house. The receptors are respectively 190 and 208 metres approximately from the single poultry house.

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

The Operator has provided an OMP (submitted 01/2/25) 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 Applicant has provided an additional contingency plan to address abnormal operating scenario and relevant control measures. In addition, the plan includes a commitment to provide an action plan for improvements in event of substantiated odour complaints.

The Operator is required to manage activities at the Installation in accordance with condition 3.3.1 of the Permit and its OMP. The OMP includes odour control measures and procedural measures. The Operator has identified the potential sources of odour as well as the potential risks and problems, and detailed actions taken to minimise odour including contingencies for abnormal operations.

The 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 Operator has provided a NMP as part of the application supporting documentation, and further details are provided below.

The risk assessment for the installation provided within the NMP for the application lists key potential risks of noise pollution beyond the installation boundary and 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 01/12/25.

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](http://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 01/12/25.

There are four sensitive receptors within 100m of the installation boundary, the nearest two sensitive receptors (the nearest point of their assumed property boundary) are both approximately on the actual installation boundary to the south of the installation.

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 risks listed in the management plan.

### **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**

The installation has a single standby generator and a thermal input of 267kw.

Generator will not be tested more than 50 hours per annum.

Generator will not be operated more than 500 hours per annum averaged over 3 years, as backup for mains interruption, including testing.

Therefore, this generator is not a Medium Combustion Plant, and this is classed as a low-risk generator.

## **Ammonia**

There are no relevant NH<sub>3</sub> BAT AEL for pullets. The relevant emission factor has been confirmed as 0.006 kg NH<sub>3</sub>/animal place/year, for multi-tier rearing with litter removal once per week and on-belt drying.

The Applicant has met the relevant BAT 31 narrative BAT requirements.

There are no Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), no Special Protection Areas (SPA) and no Ramsars within 5 km of the installation. In addition, there are three Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) within 5 km of the installation, and two

other nature conservation sites within 2 km comprising of one Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and one Ancient Woodlands.

## 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<sub>e</sub>) or critical load (CL<sub>o</sub>) 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 04/08/25) has indicated that emissions from this installation alone will only have a potential impact on SSSIs with a precautionary CL<sub>e</sub> of 1 µg/m<sup>3</sup> if they are within **250m** of the emission source.

Beyond **250m** the PC is less than 0.2 µg/m<sup>3</sup> (i.e. less than 20% of the precautionary 1 µg/m<sup>3</sup> CL<sub>e</sub>) 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<sup>3</sup> 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<sub>o</sub> is necessary. In this case the 1 µg/m<sup>3</sup> level used has not been confirmed by Natural England, but it is precautionary. It is therefore possible to conclude no likely damage to these sites.

**Table 1 – SSSI Assessment**

Name of SSSI	Distance from site (m)
Montgomery Canal, Aston Locks - Keeper's Bridge	2,515
Fernhill Pastures	3,639
Crofts Mill Pasture	4,834

**No further assessment is required.**

## Ammonia assessment – LWS / AW

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<sub>e</sub>) or critical load (CL<sub>o</sub>) then the farm can be permitted with no further assessment.

Initial screening using ammonia screening tool version 4.6 (dated 04/08/25) has indicated that emissions from this installation alone will only have a potential impact on the LWS / AW sites with a precautionary CLe of 1 µg/m<sup>3</sup> if they are within **250m** of the emission source.

Beyond **250m** the PC is less than 1 µg/m<sup>3</sup> and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case all LWS / AWs beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

**Table 2 – LWS / AW Assessment**

Site	Distance from site (m)
Halston Hall LWS	1,624
Gravenall AW	1,629

**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.

### **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
- UKHSA/Department of Public Health
- Shropshire Council Environmental Health Department

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 site**

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

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

The plan is included in the permit.

## **Site condition report**

The Operator has provided a description of the condition of the site, which we consider is satisfactory. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on site condition reports

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

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

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

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

There are no European/Ramsar Sites linked to this installation and hence no requirement for an HRA.

See Ammonia section in the Key Issues above for more details.

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.

## **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'.

While we consider that the applicant's proposals represent the appropriate measures to prevent/ minimise odour from the permitted activities, we also consider that it is appropriate to include a specific Emission Limit Value (ELV) in respect of odour emissions to provide additional environmental protection.

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**

No Emission Limit Values (ELVs) have been added as there are no relevant values for pullets in the Intensive Farming sector BAT Conclusions document dated 21/02/2017.

## **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 **28/08/25** and ended on **25/09/25**. The consultation was extended for the UKHSA response.

## Responses from organisations listed in the consultation section

### Response received from UKHSA on 30/09/25

**Brief summary of issues raised:** The responses summarised key environmental issues linked to intensive farming installations including risk of odour pollution and dust emissions.

However, no specific concerns were raised and response included following summary based on installation being compliant with relevant BAT standards:

“Based upon the submitted application, and providing it is well managed and maintained, the proposed installation is not considered to present any obvious cause for concern”.

**Summary of actions taken:** No further actions required as we are satisfied installation is compliant with relevant BAT conclusions standard as summarised in key issues section of this document.

## Responses from organisations listed in the consultation section

### Response received from Health and Safety Executive 17/09/25

**Brief summary of issues raised:** Generic response stating view that their role is limited to higher risk applications and they have no comment on this application.

**Summary of actions taken:** None.

## Conclusion

There were no other consultee responses and no public responses.