

## Permitting Decisions – Variation and partial surrender

---

We have decided to grant the variation and partial surrender for Sowerby House Farm operated by Mr Timothy Charlton and Susan Charlton.

The variation number is [EPR/MP3738EX/V003](#).

The partial surrender number is [EPR/MP3738EX/S004](#).

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.

Production pig numbers are reducing from 4,000 to 3,432 places with a reduction in pig sheds from 11 to 4. There is an addition of a new 243m<sup>2</sup> concrete panelled slurry storage system, with a plastic tile floating cover. The pig housing ventilation is changing to all high velocity roof fans and the existing generator and associated fuel storage has been added to the permit. The site boundary is increasing slightly to the northeast to accommodate the redeveloped pig sheds, and the partial surrender removes the pig sheds and associated land to the east that are no longer in use.

### 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

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

# Key issues of the decision

## Partial surrender

We have agreed to the partial surrender of Sowerby House Farm to remove the pig sheds and associated land to the east that are no longer in use, formerly named pig sheds 1 to 8 and 10.

The site condition report shows there are no recorded pollution incidents, nor any use of the land which may have led to significant ground contamination issues. A recent site visit from an Environment Agency Compliance Officer confirmed this was a low risk surrender with no concerns in relation to the partial surrender of this land. The site infrastructure has been decommissioned and cleaned down in line with the sites bio-security policy to remove any risk of potential pollution.

## 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.

All new and redeveloped housing applied for in a permit variation must be compliant with the BAT Conclusions from the first day of operation. The BAT compliance of any existing housing has been subject to a sector review, however, for some reviewed permits, only generic limits have been included and individual housing should now be considered. Any existing housing that undergoes redevelopment with changes to housing location or expansion beyond the existing footprint is classed as new plant.

There are some additional requirements for permit holders. The BAT Conclusions include BAT-Associated Emission Levels (BAT AELs) for ammonia emissions, which will apply to the majority of permits, as well as BAT AELs for nitrogen and phosphorus excretion.

For some types of rearing practices, stricter standards apply to farms and housing permitted after the BAT Conclusions were published.

## **BAT Conclusions review**

There are 34 BAT Conclusion measures in total within the BAT Conclusion document dated 21<sup>st</sup> February 2017.

The Applicant has confirmed their compliance with all BAT conditions for the new housing in their document reference BAT assessment and Technical Standards and received 04/09/2025, which has been referenced in Table S1.2 - Operating Techniques, of the permit.

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

### **BAT 3 Nutritional management - Nitrogen excretion**

The Applicant has confirmed it will demonstrate that the installation can achieve levels of nitrogen excretion below the required BAT AEL of 13.0 kg N/animal place/year. The diet formulation and nutritional strategy of the feed takes into consideration ammonia emissions associated with the operation to reduce the crude protein content.

### **BAT 4 Nutritional management - Phosphorus excretion**

The Applicant has confirmed it will demonstrate that the installation can achieve levels of phosphorus excretion below the required BAT AEL of 5.4 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/animal place/year. The diet formulation and nutritional strategy of the feed takes into consideration phosphorus emissions associated with the operation to reduce the phosphorus 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 using a mass balance calculation of nitrogen and phosphorus based on the feed intake, dietary content of crude protein and animal performance and reported annually.

### **BAT 25 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters – Ammonia emissions**

Table S3.3 of the permit concerning process monitoring requires the Operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT Conclusions.

The Applicant has confirmed they will report the ammonia emissions to the Environment Agency annually by utilising estimation by using emission factors.

## **BAT 26 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Odour emissions**

The approved odour management plan (OMP) includes the following details for on farm monitoring and continual improvement:

- Visual (and nasal) inspections of potentially odorous activities will be carried out. They will monitor odour levels daily at the site boundary.
- Odour complaints will be reported to the Site Manager who will log and investigate causes of odour complaints. The Operator/Site Manager will notify the Environment Agency and make a record of the complaint. The Operator/Site Manager 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 30 Ammonia emissions from pig houses**

The Applicant has confirmed it will demonstrate that the installation achieves levels of ammonia below the required BAT AEL for Pigs > 30kg: 2.6 kg NH<sub>3</sub>/animal place/year.

## **Detailed assessment of specific BAT measures**

### **Ammonia emission controls – BAT Conclusion 30 (pigs)**

A BAT Associated Emission Level (AEL) provides us with a performance benchmark to determine whether an activity is BAT. The BAT Conclusions include a set of BAT AELs for ammonia emissions to air from animal housing for pigs.

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

For variations all new housing on existing farms will need to meet the BAT AEL. Existing housing BAT compliance has been subject to a sector review.

## Detailed assessment of BAT AELs

### Pig housing

The emission factor for pigs > 30kg on fully slatted floor is 2.813 kg NH<sub>3</sub>/animal place/year. There is a 20% crude protein reduction at this site, evidence was provided in the form of a diet sheet, which reduces the emission factor to 2.2504 kg NH<sub>3</sub>/animal place/year. This is below the BAT AEL 2.6 kg NH<sub>3</sub>/animal place/year so is compliant.

## 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 Sowerby House Farm received 06/02/2026, 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. These activities are as follows:

- Selection of feed
- Slurry storage
- Cleanliness of yard
- All housing and management
- Fully slatted floors
- Cleaning out
- Ventilation
- Animal carcasses
- Feed delivery and storage
- Dust
- Out loading of pigs

## Odour Management Plan Review

There are two sensitive receptors located within 400m of the installation boundary, as listed below (please note, the distance stated is only an approximation from the Installation boundary to the assumed boundary of the property):

1. Residential property – approximately 390m northwest of the Installation boundary.
2. Commercial property – approximately 380m northwest of the Installation boundary.

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 19/01/2026) 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 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 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.

It should also be noted that for existing farms, having consulted with our local area compliance team, there are no known historical odour complaints at this site.

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. These activities are as follows:

- Feeding pigs
- Feed delivery
- Pig moving
- Pig loading (in and out)
- Slurry loading transport and spreading
- Delivery of supplies and materials
- Ventilation fans
- Vehicles operating within installation boundary
- Alarm systems/standby generator
- Farm staff/contractors
- Maintenance

### Noise Management Plan Review

The final NMP provided by applicant and assessed below was received as part of the application supporting documentation on 19/01/2026.

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.

It should also be noted that for existing farms, having consulted with our local area compliance team, there are no known historical noise complaints at this site.

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](https://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 19/01/2026.

There is one sensitive receptor within 100m of the installation boundary, this sensitive receptor (the nearest point of their assumed property boundary) is approximately 70 metres to the northwest of the installation boundary, and approximately 105 metres from the nearest pig shed.

In the guidance mentioned above it states that particulate concentrations fall off rapidly with distance from the emitting source. This fact, together with the proposed good management of the installation (such as keeping areas clean from build-up of dust and other measures in place to reduce dust and the risk of spillages e.g. litter and feed management/delivery procedures) all reduce the potential for emissions impacting the nearest receptors. The Applicant has confirmed measures in their dust and bioaerosol management plan to reduce dust (which will inherently reduce bioaerosols) for the following potential risks:

- General
- Pig Feed and delivery
- Ventilation
- House Cleaning
- Building layout and design
- Manure systems

We are satisfied that the measures outlined in the application will minimise the potential for dust and bioaerosol emissions from the installation.

## **Standby generator**

There is one standby generator with a net thermal rated input of 0.25 MWth and it will not be tested more than 52 hours per year, or operated (including testing) for more than 500 hours per year (averaged over 3 years) for emergency use only as a temporary power source if there is a mains power failure.

## **Ammonia**

The Applicant has demonstrated that the housing will meet the relevant NH<sub>3</sub> BAT AEL.

There are no Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Areas (SPA), Ramsar sites or Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) located within 5 km of the installation boundary. There are three Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) and two Ancient Woodlands (AW) within 2 km of the installation boundary.

## **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 26/09/2025) has indicated that emissions from Sowerby House Farm will only have a potential impact on the LWS and AW sites with a precautionary CL<sub>e</sub> of 1 µg/m<sup>3</sup> if they are within 411m of the emission source.

Beyond 411m 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 and AW are beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

**Table 1 – LWS / AW Assessment**

<b>Site</b>	<b>Distance from site (m)</b>
Landmoth, Cotcliffe and Sigston Woods LWS	1,492
Sigston Castle & Old Thompson's Plantations LWS	1,787
Foxton Wood LWS	2,051
Sigston Wood AW	1,492
Foxton Wood AW	2,051

No further assessment is required.

## **Decision considerations**

### **Confidential information**

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

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

### **Identifying confidential information**

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

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

### **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.

## **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.

## **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'.

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.

## **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.

## **Emission limits**

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 21/02/2017. 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.

## **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.