



Permitting decisions

Partial Surrender and Variation

We have decided to grant the partial surrender and variation for **Collingsford (Thwaite) Farm by 2 Agriculture Growing Limited**

The partial surrender number is **EPR/FP3036WQ/S007**

The variation number is **EPR/FP3036WQ/V008**

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.

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 checklist](#) to show how all relevant factors have been taken into account

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. The introductory note summarises what the variation covers.

Overview

This partial surrender and variation authorises the following changes:

- Low risk part surrender of the permit boundary to the remove two of ten poultry houses
- The installation bird numbers are reduced from 395,000 to 374,000 broilers.
- There are no changes to eight remaining broiler houses
- Drainage improvements including lightly contaminated yard all complete with attenuation.

Key issues of the decision

Partial surrender/Variation

Partial surrender

We have agreed to the low-risk surrender of an area of land linked to two poultry houses (Houses 9 and 10) which have been demolished.

The partial surrender involved decreasing the installation boundary area to remove such land.

We have confirmed all houses, and associated facilities were cleared by the end of January 2024.

The operator has provided an updated site condition report linked to these changes and our compliance officer has confirmed that the application can be classed as a low-risk partial surrender.

Variation

The installation will now consist of eight poultry houses with a reduced broiler capacity of 374,000.

New Intensive Rearing of Poultry or Pigs BAT Conclusions document

The new Best Available Techniques (BAT) Reference Document (BREF) for the Intensive Rearing of poultry or pigs (IRPP) was published on the 21st February 2017. There is now a separate BAT Conclusions document which will set out the standards that permitted farms will have to meet.

The BAT Conclusions document is as per the following link

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32017D0302&from=EN>

Now the BAT Conclusions are published **all new housing within variation applications** issued after the 21st February 2017 must be compliant in full from the first day of operation.

There are no new poultry housing/associated facilities linked to BAT conclusions added with this variation.

The following are clarifications of how existing housing /installation will comply with BAT requirements:

BAT 24

The applicant has confirmed that the BAT 24 Nitrogen and Phosphorous Excreted Manure will be met via mass balance calculation.

BAT 26

Odour monitoring will be carried out weekly with an odour tour and sniff testing as per the odour management plan.

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 installation (received with part surrender and variation application 11/11/25) 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 linked to the partial surrender.

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.

Partial surrender

This has been assessed as a low risk surrender due to no contamination of land and groundwater within area to be surrendered; this has been confirmed by our area team.

Further the operator has confirmed that the buildings/facilities to be surrendered were decommissioned and cleaned out by January 2024.

Odour

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 (http://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/297084/geho0110brsb-e-e.pdf).

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 operator has provided an OMP dated 11/11/25 confirming there are two relevant residential receptors within 400 metres of installation boundary. The closest is 360 metres to the east of the installation boundary.

There are no new receptors linked to this partial surrender and the distance from the installation boundary to the existing receptors is not reduced with this partial surrender and variation. In fact, for one of the receptors the distance from the installation is increased.

Our area team have confirmed that are no odour complaints linked to this installation.

Conclusion

We have assessed the OMP provided by the operator. We conclude that the risk of odour pollution at sensitive receptors beyond the installation boundary is not considered significant and that the proposed mitigation measures will minimise the risk of odour pollution / nuisance.

Noise

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. Under section 3.4 of this guidance a Noise Management Plan (NMP) must be approved as part of the permitting determination, if there are sensitive receptors within 400m of the Installation boundary.

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.

The operator has provided an NMP dated 11/11/25 confirming there are two relevant receptors within 400 metres of installation boundary. The closest receptor is detailed in odour section above.

There are no new receptors linked to this partial surrender and the distance from the installation boundary to the existing receptors is not reduced with this partial surrender and variation. In fact, for one of the receptors the distance from the installation is increased.

Our area team have confirmed that are no noise complaints linked to this installation.

Conclusion

We have assessed the NMP provided by the operator.

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. The risk of noise pollution at sensitive receptors beyond the Installation boundary is therefore not considered significant.

Dust

There are three receptors within 100 m of the installation boundary and hence a Dust and Bioaerosol Management Plan (DBMP) is required. The closest is 10 metres to the south of the installation boundary. The total mass emissions of dust from the installation has reduced with change from ten to eight poultry houses and there are no changes in poultry houses locations.

The operator DBMP is dated 11/11/25.

Conclusion

We have assessed the DBMP provided by the operator.

We are satisfied that all sources and receptors have been identified, and that the proposed mitigation measures will minimise the risk of dust pollution / nuisance.

We have reviewed the DBMP which includes dust in the fugitive emissions section and confirm that the proposed measures will minimise the risk of dust pollution linked to the installation. The risk of dust pollution at sensitive receptors beyond the Installation boundary is therefore not considered significant.

Ammonia

There are no European/Ramsar sites within 5 km of the installation boundary. There is one Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) within 5 km of the installation boundary plus one Local Wildlife Site within 2 km of the installation boundary.

This partial surrender and variation are linked to the reduction of poultry houses from ten to eight; there are no changes to operation, location and ventilation of the remaining eight poultry houses.

This partial surrender and variation lead to an ammonia emission reduction with a reduction in bird numbers as follows:

- The remaining installation is to include eight poultry houses and change in broilers numbers reduced from 395,000 to 374,000
- The change in the centre point of the installation is negligible moving from TM 12298 68109 to TM 12258 68133.

Therefore, no further assessment is required.

Standby Generator

The thermal input for the single standby generator linked to this installation is less than 1MW and hence MCP Directive does not apply. The applicant confirmed the standby generator operates no more than 1 hour per week for testing and no more than a total of 500 hours per annum for combined testing/standby by usage.

Decision checklist

Aspect considered	Decision
Receipt of application	
Confidential information	A claim for commercial or industrial confidentiality has not been made.
Identifying confidential information	We have not identified information provided as part of the application that we consider to be confidential. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on confidentiality.
The facility	
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 plan also indicates the areas that have been surrendered.
The site	
Extent of the site of the facility	The Operator has provided a plan which we consider is satisfactory, showing the extent of the site of the facility. 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. We have concluded that partial surrender can be satisfactorily accepted based on area of land being surrendered having not been contaminated and returned to a satisfactory state. There is no new increase in the installation boundary introduced within this partial surrender/variation.
Biodiversity, heritage, landscape and nature conservation	The application is within the relevant distance criteria of a site of heritage, landscape or nature conservation, and/or protected species or habitat. We have assessed the application and its potential to affect all known sites of nature conservation, landscape and heritage and/or protected species or habitats identified in the nature conservation screening report as part of the permitting process. We consider that the application will not affect any sites of nature conservation, landscape and heritage, and/or protected species or habitats identified. See Ammonia section in Key Issues above for more details. We have not consulted Natural England or sent a Habitat Risk Assessment to Natural England for information only, as this variation reduces the impacts on local European/Ramsar sites within the relevant screening distance of this installation. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance.
Environmental risk assessment	
Environmental risk	We have reviewed the operator's assessment of the environmental risk from the facility. The operator's risk assessment is satisfactory.

Aspect considered	Decision
Operating techniques	
General operating techniques	<p>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.</p> <p>The operating techniques are as summarised in the introduction to the new variation/partial surrender notice EPR/AP3632YP/V004 and EPR/AP3632YP/S003</p>
Odour management	<p>We have reviewed the odour management plan in accordance with our guidance on odour management.</p> <p>We consider that the odour management plan is satisfactory.</p>
Noise management	<p>We have reviewed the noise management plan in accordance with our guidance on noise assessment and control.</p> <p>We consider that the noise management plan is satisfactory.</p>
Permit conditions	
Updating permit conditions during consolidation	We have updated permit conditions to those in the current generic permit template as part of permit consolidation. The conditions will provide the same level of protection as those in the previous permits.
Pre-operational condition	One new pre-operational condition. This is to ensure clean water attenuation proposed in the variation application is installed and operational before next new poultry cycle /bird placement.
Emission limits	<p>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 21/02/17. These limits are included in permit table S3.3.</p> <p>There are no changes to emission limits linked to this partial surrender and variation.</p>
Monitoring	<p>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.</p> <p>These monitoring requirements have been imposed in order to ensure compliance with Intensive Farming BAT conclusions document dated 21/02/17.</p>
Reporting	<p>We have specified reporting in the permit.</p> <p>We made these decisions in order to ensure compliance with Intensive Farming BAT conclusions document dated 21/02/17.</p> <p>There are no changes to reporting requirements linked to this partial surrender and variation.</p>
Operator competence	
Management system	There is no known reason to consider that the operator will not have the management system to enable it to comply with the permit conditions.
Growth Duty	
Section 108 Deregulation Act 2015 – Growth duty	<p>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.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.3 of the guidance says:</p> <p>“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.”</p>

Aspect considered	Decision
	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>