Permitting decisions- Surrender

We have decided to accept the part surrender of the permit for West Farm Pig Unit operated by Yorkwold Pigpro Limited.

The permit number is EPR/MP3501PD.

The permit application number is EPR/MP3501PD/S005.

The decision was issued on 13/01/2026.

We are satisfied that the necessary measures have been taken to avoid any pollution risk and to return the site to a satisfactory state. We consider in reaching this decision that we have taken into account all relevant considerations and legal requirements.

Purpose of this document

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

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 decisions considerations section to show how all relevant factors have been taken into account

Unless the decision document specifies otherwise we have accepted the applicant's proposals for part surrender.

The partial surrender and variation authorise the following changes:

- Removal of two slurry lagoons, the water reservoir and associated pipework and land.
- Revised installation boundary as indicated in schedule 7 of the consolidated permit.

Read the permitting decisions in conjunction with the environmental permit and the surrender notice.

Key issues of the decision

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 West Farm Pig Unit (dated 06/11/2025, received with part surrender application, duly made 14/11/2025) 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.**

<u>Partial surrender</u>

This has been assessed as a low risk partial surrender of a slurry lagoon and associated pipework and land.

The revised site condition report (received 22/12/2025) confirms that during the life of the permit inspections have taken place annually by the Environment Agency and no contamination of land has been recorded or reported.

Completion of improvement conditions

The Area inspector has confirmed that historic Improvement Conditions IC6 and IC7 have been completed and the consolidated permit reflects this in table S1.3

Historic improvement conditions IC1 – IC5 have previously been confirmed as completed in variation EPR/MP3501PD/V004 issued 16/08/2023 and have now been removed from table S1.3 with this partial surrender application.

Decision considerations

Confidential information

A claim for commercial or industrial confidentiality has not been made.

Identifying confidential information

We have not identified information provided as part of the application that we consider to be confidential.

The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on confidentiality.

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 permitted regulated facilities have changed as a result of the partial surrender.

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 in schedule 7 of the permit also indicates the areas that have been surrendered.

The site

The extent of the facility has changed as a result of the partial surrender.

The operator has provided a plan which we consider to be satisfactory.

The plan shows the extent of the site of the facility.

The plan is included in the permit.

Extent of the surrender application

The operator has provided a plan showing the extent of the site of the facility that is to be surrendered.

We consider this plan to be satisfactory.

Pollution risk

We are satisfied that the necessary measures have been taken to avoid a pollution risk resulting from the operation of the regulated facility.

Satisfactory state

We are satisfied that the necessary measures have been taken to return the site of the regulated facility to a satisfactory state, having regard to the state of the site before the facility was put into operation.

Changes to permit conditions as a consequence of the surrender

The permit conditions have not changed as a result of the partial surrender.

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 accept this partial permit surrender.

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.