Permitting Decisions - Bespoke Permit

We have decided to grant the permit for Barn Farm operated by Lincolnshire Poultry Limited.

The permit number is EPR/DP3927LU.

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 intensive farming poultry installation, comprising six poultry houses, which provide a combined capacity for 236,842 broiler places.

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.

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 document received 13/11/2025, 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 0.6 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 0.25 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.

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 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 32 Ammonia emissions from poultry houses - Broilers

The BAT AEL to be complied with is 0.08 kg NH_3/animal place/year. The Applicant will meet this as the emission factor for broilers is 0.024 kg NH_3/animal place/year.

The installation does not include an air abatement treatment facility; hence the standard emission factor complies with the BAT AEL.

Detailed assessment of specific BAT measures

Ammonia emission controls

Ammonia emission controls – BAT Conclusion 32

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 broilers.

All new bespoke applications issued after 21st February 2017, including those where there is a mixture of old and new housing, 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 Barn Farm, dated 27/11/2025, 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.

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:

- Manufacture and selection of feed
- Feed delivery and storage
- Ventilation
- Litter management
- Carcass storage and disposal
- Poultry house clean out

There are no relevant sensitive receptors within 400 metres of the installation boundary and therefore an OMP was not required.

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 birds, equipment used to clean houses, litter and dirty water removal
- Feed transfer from lorry to bins
- Ventilation fans
- Alarm system and standby generator
- Chickens – including catching and removal from site
- Personnel
- Building work and repairs

There are no relevant sensitive receptors within 400 metres of the installation boundary and therefore a NMP was not required.

Dust and bioaerosols management

There are no relevant receptors within 100 metres of the installation boundary and therefore a dust management plan was not required.

Standby generator

There is one standby generator, with a net thermal rated input of 0.909MWth, for use in the event of mains power failure. The generator will not be tested for more than 50 hours per annum and will not be used for more than 500 hours per annum, averaged over a 3-year period. The generator falls outside of the requirements of the Medium Combustion Plant Directive.

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 four other nature conservation sites within 2km comprising three Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) and one Ancient Woodland (AW).

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.

Initial screening using the ammonia screening tool version 4.6, dated 22/10/2025, has indicated that emissions from Barn Farm will only have a potential impact on SSSI with a precautionary CLe of 1 μg/m^3 if they are within 930 metres of the emission source.

Beyond 930m, the PC is less than 0.2 μg/m^3 (i.e. less than 20% of the precautionary 1 μg/m^3 CLe) and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case, all SSSI are beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

Where the precautionary level of 1 μg/m^3 is used and the PC is assessed to be less than 20%, the site automatically screens out as insignificant and no further assessment of CLo is necessary. In this case the 1 μg/m^3 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)
Bardney Limewoods, Lincolnshire	3,335
Gosling's Corner	3,815
Little Scrubbs Meadow	4,825

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 (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 22/10/2025, has indicated that emissions from Barn Farm will only have a potential impact on the LWS / AW sites with a precautionary CLe of 1 µg/m^3 if they are within 319 metres of the emission source.

Beyond 319m the PC is less than 1 µg/m^3 and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case, all LWS / AW sites are beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

Table 2 – LWS / AW Assessment

Site	Distance from site (m)
West Torrington Grassland and Orchard LWS	710
Badgermoor Wood LWS	2,159*
Goltho Pond and Meadow LWS	2,166*
Badgermoor Wood AW	2,159*

*These sites are included at > 2km because the screening is based on an approximate centre point of the emissions and includes a buffer distance calculated from this point to the furthest point of the boundary to ensure all nature conservation sites within the threshold distance from the installation boundary have been included in the assessment.

No further assessment is required.

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.

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 Lindsey District Council
- 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.

Emission limits

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

- Ammonia
- Nitrogen
- Phosphorus

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 **03/12/2025** and ended on **05/01/2026**.

Representations from community and other organisations

Response received from: Coalition Against Factory Farming (CAFF) on 04/01/2026.

Brief summary of issues raised and actions taken:

1. **Requirement for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).**
An EIA is required as part of any planning application. The applicant did not submit an EIA as part of the Environmental Permitting Regulations (EPR) application. We are satisfied we have sufficient information to determine the Application and have carried out an assessment of the environmental impact of the installation as part of the Permit determination.

2. **Twin-tracking of EPR Permit and Planning Permission.**
The decision whether to twin-track the applications is a matter for the Applicant. We have a legal duty to determine applications made to us under the EPR and we are satisfied that we have sufficient information to do so and to complete the determination.

3. **Greenhouse gas assessment calculation required for EIA.**
As discussed above, an EIA is required as part of any planning application. A Greenhouse gas assessment is not required as part of the EPR permit application.

4. **Requirement for an abstraction license.**
Water abstraction licencing is outside the scope of the determination of this intensive farming EPR Application.

5. **Cumulative impacts of multiple intensive agricultural developments in one river catchment.**
Scale, location and land use are matters for consideration during the planning process and do not form part of the Permit decision. The density of farms within a given area is not normally a relevant consideration under the EPR unless our risk assessment process requires an in-combination ammonia assessment; in this circumstance this was not required as the ammonia impact screened out based on impacts from this installation alone, in accordance with our guidance. Where

planning permission is required the local planning authority is responsible for determining land use.

6. Intensive poultry production represents an inefficient use of grain protein.

This is not an issue under the Environment Agency's regulatory responsibility. It does not therefore fall within the scope of the Permit determination. The Environment Agency is responsible for ensuring that the activities at the Installation do not have an unacceptable impact on the environment or human health.

7. Assessment of impacts on groundwater and nearby watercourses.

An assessment of the site drainage, including the risk to groundwater and surface water from potential pollutants from the Installation, has been undertaken and the Applicant's Site Condition Report, covering protection of land and ground water, has been reviewed. We are satisfied that the risk to ground and surface waters is low.

Roof water from the poultry houses and water draining from the yard (excluding periods of washout when water from the yard drains to the underground tanks) is directed to a soakaway to the south-east of the poultry houses via an unlined attenuation pond, therefore there is no discharge direct to ground or surface waters from the installation.

Water from the wash out of poultry houses (slurry) is channelled to underground collection tanks close to the houses to await export off site for spreading on land owned by third parties. The collection tanks are built to conform to specifications in EPR 6.09 'How to comply with your environmental permit for intensive farming', and specifically to meet the requirements of The Water Resources (Control of Pollution) (Silage, Slurry and Agricultural Fuel Oil) (England) Regulations 2010 (as amended 2013). Diverter bungs will be used during wash down periods to prevent the contamination of surface water systems and to divert the wash water to the dirty water tank. Clean drainage systems will not be contaminated.

Wash water applied to land must be spread in accordance with the Reduction and Prevention of Agricultural Diffuse Pollution (England) Regulations 2018 (Farming Rules for Water), and, in designated areas, the Nitrate Pollution Prevention Regulations 2015 which were further amended in 2016, a manure management plan (in accordance with the Nitrate Vulnerable Zone (NVZ) rules) and Condition 2.3.5 of the Permit, which requires that all appropriate measures are used to prevent or where that is not practicable minimise pollution.

The Applicant has proposed appropriate measures to manage fugitive emissions (emissions not controlled by an emission limit). We are satisfied that these measures will mitigate emissions to prevent a significant impact from the site. These measures are listed in Table S1.2 of the Permit and the Operator is required to comply with them as stipulated in Condition 2.3.1 of the Permit.

Standard conditions 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 concerning fugitive emissions are also included in the permit.

We conclude that the measures in place will ensure that any contaminated water will be contained, and potentially lightly contaminated water has sufficient mitigation in place. Therefore, no pollution of groundwater or surface water should occur as a result of operations at the Installation.

8. Meat consumption.
This is not an issue under the Environment Agency's regulatory responsibility. It does not therefore fall within the scope of the Permit determination.

9. Risk of zoonotic disease.
The birds will be kept indoors at all times so therefore it is extremely unlikely that they will contract Avian flu. Effective biosecurity measures will also ensure that the likelihood of disease will be low. We are satisfied that the risk of pollution of the environment or harm to human health from the activities at the site are not likely to be significant. Our compliance team will ensure all relevant precautions are actioned in the event of any cases of Avian flu.

10. Impact on nearby habitat receptors.
We have carried out an assessment of the impact from this proposal on nearby habitat sites from ammonia emissions. This has considered any Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas, Ramsar sites and Sites of Special Scientific Interest within 5km of the Installation boundary and any other nature conservation sites, including National Nature Reserves, Local Nature Reserves, Ancient Woodlands and Local Wildlife Sites, within 2km of the Installation boundary. Screening using the ammonia screening tool version 4.6, has concluded that all ammonia emissions from the site are insignificant. The key issues section of this document summarises our ammonia assessment.

11. Animal welfare.
Animal welfare is not within the regulatory responsibility of the Environment Agency. It does not form part of the Permit decision making process. The Environment Agency is responsible for ensuring that the activities at the Installation do not have an unacceptable impact on the environment or human health.

The principal regulator for animal health is the Animal and Plant Health Agency (APHA), whose main purpose is to safeguard animal and plant health for the benefit of people, the environment and the economy.

12. Odour impact.
There are no sensitive receptors within 400m of the Installation boundary and so the Applicant was not required to submit an odour management plan (OMP) as part of the application. In accordance with the guidance, the Applicant submitted an odour risk assessment, as outlined in the key issues section above. Measures to mitigate the potential risks from odour emissions have been identified in the

assessment. The use of BAT and good practice will ensure emissions of odour are minimised. Furthermore, standard condition 3.3.1 concerning odour has been included in the permit. An OMP can be requested in future if deemed necessary.

Based upon the information in the Application we are satisfied that the appropriate measures will be in place to prevent or where that is not practicable to minimise odour and to prevent pollution from odour beyond the Installation boundary and that activities will not give rise to significant pollution or harm to human health.

13. Dust impact.

There are no sensitive receptors within 100m of the Installation boundary. Guidance on our website concludes that applicants need to produce and submit a dust and bioaerosol management plan with their application only if there are relevant receptors within 100 metres of their farm, including the farmhouse or farm worker's houses. As there are no receptors within 100 metres of the Installation boundary, the Applicant was not required to submit a dust and bioaerosol management plan.

The Applicant submitted a fugitive emissions risk assessment detailing measures to prevent significant emissions from the site, in accordance with our technical guidance note for intensive farming and the BAT Conclusions document. These measures include the use of appropriate ventilation systems, appropriate housing design and management, containment of feedstuff and management of poultry litter. We are satisfied that these measures will mitigate emissions to prevent a significant impact from the site. Furthermore, standard condition 3.2.1 concerning fugitive emissions has been included in the permit.

We are satisfied, following a review of the information provided by the Applicant and the conditions present within the Permit, that emissions from the Installation will not have a significant impact on the health of local residents.

14. Traffic.

Consideration of traffic is not within the regulatory responsibility of the Environment Agency. It is a matter for the Local Planning Authority to consider in relation to any planning application.

15. Manure storage and spreading.

No manure is stored within the Installation boundary; all manure is exported from the Installation for spreading on land owned by third parties.

The land where manure may be stored or spread does not form part of the installation and so manure exported from the installation for storage and spreading outside the installation is outside the scope of our determination. The EPR scope of regulation is limited to preventing significant pollution from emissions from the installation. Emissions are substances released from the installation whilst something exported in a controlled manner for subsequent use

elsewhere is not considered an emission. The latter includes manure and litter removed as part of poultry house cleanouts.

The installation boundary for permitted farms typically includes the livestock housing, any yard and ranging areas and associated infrastructure but does not routinely include wider adjacent land. Whilst on farm slurry and manure management, yard run off and drainage are regulated by the permit, the spreading of manures and slurry to land (and the associated potential for water quality impacts) is primarily regulated through separate regulatory regimes namely the Reduction and Prevention of Agricultural Diffuse Pollution (England) Regulations (Farming Rules for Water), and, in designated areas, the Nitrate Pollution Prevention Regulations.

The Applicant has confirmed that the receiver of the manure will confirm it is spread to land in accordance with the Code of Good Agricultural Practice, or in accordance with the manure management plan for the receiving land.

16. Public health and amenity.
As outlined in the key issues section of this document there are no sensitive receptors within the relevant screening distances, linked to odour, noise and dust impacts. We have selected these distances on a precautionary basis.

We are satisfied following a review of the information provided by the Applicant, and the conditions present within the Permit, that on-site operations will not have a significant impact on the health or amenity of local residents.

Representations from individual members of the public

Forty-three responses were received from individual members of the public. These raised many of the same issues as previously addressed. Only those issues additional to those already considered are listed below:

Brief summary of issues raised and actions taken:

1. Requirement for a Climate Assessment.
Assessment of a climate change risk assessment is outside the scope of the determination of the Application however the Operator will be required to complete one as part of ongoing compliance, which our compliance team will assess.

2. Requirement for a Nutrient Management plan.
Assessment of a nutrient management plan is outside the scope of the determination of the Application. Where organic manures (including poultry manure and wash water) are applied to land owned and managed by the Operator, it must be spread in accordance with a manure management plan.

As outlined above, the Applicant has confirmed that all manure and wash water is exported from the Installation for spreading on land owned by third parties and

that the receiver will confirm it is spread to land in accordance with the manure management plan for the receiving land.

We are satisfied, following a review of the information provided by the Applicant and the conditions present within the Permit, that emissions from the Installation will not cause significant pollution of the environment.

3. Requirement for an Ecological Impact Assessment.

Assessment of an Ecological Impact Assessment is outside the scope of the determination of the Application. However, we are satisfied, following a review of the information provided by the Applicant and the conditions present within the Permit, that emissions from the Installation will not cause significant pollution of the environment.

4. Decline in wild bird numbers.

Given the nature of the proposed activity, there is the potential for atmospheric ammonia to be released into the environment and impact nearby sensitive habitats and species. For this reason, we have carried out an assessment of the risk and concluded that all ammonia emissions from the site are insignificant. This has been discussed under point 10 above. The key issues section of this document summarises our ammonia assessment.

5. Impact of particulate matter on local residents.

As discussed above, there are no sensitive receptors within 100m of the Installation boundary.

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 risk of spillages (e.g. litter and feed management/delivery procedures) all reduce the potential for emissions impacting the nearest receptors.

With regards to particulate matter, our approach to dust and bioaerosol control (to require a dust and bioaerosol management plan for intensive farming installations with receptors within 100 metres of the installation boundary) will reduce total overall dust levels which will subsequently reduce PM10 and PM2.5 particle size dust, with most of the measures focusing on reducing creation of dust at source. This is an agreed approach with former Public Health England (now UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA)) and ourselves.

We are satisfied that the measures outlined in the Application will prevent, and where that is not practicable minimise, dust and bioaerosol emissions from the Installation and prevent significant pollution or harm to human health. We are also satisfied that we have sufficient controls within the permit conditions to enable further measures to be implemented should these be required.

6. Use of antibiotics.

The use of antibiotics does not fall within the regulatory responsibility of the Environment Agency.

7. Mortalities.

Mortalities are collected daily and stored in a secure container on site for removal under the National Fallen Stock Scheme.

The Health and Safety Executive and East Lindsey District Council Environmental Protection were also consulted but no responses were received.