Permitting Decisions - Variation

We have decided to grant the variation for Park Farm Poultry Unit operated by Park Farm Poultry Ltd.

The variation number is EPR/SP3435UV/V005.

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.

This variation is to increase the broiler places from 150,000 to 240,000 with the addition of two new poultry houses, giving a total of six poultry houses. This includes an increase in the installation boundary to accommodate the two new poultry houses.

Purpose of this document

This decision document provides a record of the decision-making process. It

- highlights key issues in the determination
- summarises the decision making process in the decision considerations section to show how the main relevant factors have been taken into account
- shows how we have considered the consultation responses.

Unless the decision document specifies otherwise, we have accepted the applicant's proposals.

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

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 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 21st February 2017.

We sent out a not duly made request for information requiring the Applicant to confirm that the new installation complies in full with all the BAT Conclusions measures.

The Applicant has confirmed their compliance with all BAT conditions for the new housing in their document reference BAT compliance and received 21/09/2025, 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 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 – BAT Conclusion 32 broilers

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.

‘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.

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 Park Farm Poultry Unit received 27/01/2026, 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:

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

There are no relevant receptors within 400 metres of the installation boundary therefore an OMP was not submitted with this application. We have added condition 3.3.2 to the permit that requires an OMP to be submitted if any odour problems outside of the site occur.

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.

The risk assessment for the installation provided with the application lists key potential risks of noise pollution beyond the installation boundary. These activities are as follows:

- Noise issues from large vehicles and delivering/collecting from site
- Small vehicle movements
- Feed transfer from lorry to bins
- Ventilation fans
- Alarm system/standby generator
- Chickens
- Personnel
- Repairs and servicing

There are no relevant receptors within 400 metres of the installation boundary therefore an NMP was not submitted with this application. We have added condition 3.4.2 to the permit that requires an NMP to be submitted if any noise problems outside of the site occur.

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.

As there is a sensitive receptor 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 10/09/2025.

There is one sensitive receptor within the installation boundary, the nearest sensitive receptor (the nearest point of their assumed property boundary) is approximately 49 metres to the east of the installation boundary, and approximately 51 metres from the nearest poultry house. This sensitive receptor is the Operators residence.

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:

- Feed delivery and storage
- Manufacture and selection of feed
- Bedding selection/material
- Ventilation and heating systems
- Litter management
- Carcass disposal
- House clean out
- Used litter
- Fugitive emissions

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 0.85 MWth and it will not be tested more than 50 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_3 BAT AEL.

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

A revised pre-application screening was completed 27/01/2026 to ensure there were no other habitat sites to consider.

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 05/09/2025) has indicated that emissions from Park Farm Poultry Unit will only have a potential impact on SSSIs with a precautionary CLe of 1 $\mu g/m^3$ if they are within 938 metres of the emission source.

Beyond 938 m 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 SSSIs 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)
Pocklington Canal SSSI	4,124
White Carr Meadow SSSI	5,171*

* This site is included at >5km because the screening is based on an approximate centre point of the emissions and includes a buffer distance calculated from this centre point to the furthest point of the boundary to ensure all SSSI's within the threshold distance from the installation boundary have been included in the assessment.

No further assessment is required.

Ammonia assessment – LWS

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 05/09/2025) has indicated that emissions from Park Farm Poultry Unit will only have a potential impact on the LWS sites with a precautionary CLe of 1 µg/m^3 if they are within 322 m of the emission source.

Beyond 322 m the PC is less than 1 µg/m^3 and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case all LWS are beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

Table 2 - LWS Assessment

Site	Distance from site (m)
Everingham LWS	1,531
Bubwith-Holme-on-Spalding-Moor Disused Railway Line LWS	1,794

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.

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 Control – East Riding of Yorkshire Council
- Health and Safety Executive
- UK Health Security Agency
- Director of Public Health

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 plans 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.

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.

Raw materials

We have specified limits and controls on the use of raw materials and fuels.

Improvement programme

Based on the information on the application, we consider that we need to include an improvement programme.

There are historic improvement programmes carried over from the previous permits and are now confirmed to be completed.

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.

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 25/09/2025 and ended on 23/10/2025.

Responses from organisations listed in the consultation section

Response received from UK Health Security Agency (14/10/2025)

Brief summary of issues raised:

The main emissions of potential public health significance from these installations are emissions to air of bioaerosols, dust, including particulate matter and ammonia. It is assumed by UKHSA that the installation will comply in all respects with the requirements of the permit, including the application of BAT. This should ensure that emissions present a low risk to human health.

Summary of actions taken:

There is no reason to believe that the Operator will not comply with the permit. The Applicant has confirmed their compliance with all BAT conditions for the new installation in their BAT document reference ‘Park Farm Poultry Unit’ received 21/09/2025, which has been referenced in Table S1.2 - Operating Techniques, of the permit. We are satisfied with the dust and bioaerosol management plan submitted as part of this application, which is also referenced in table S1.2 Operating Techniques table within the permit.

Response received from East Riding of Yorkshire Council Environmental Control (26/09/2025)

Brief summary of issues raised:

No comments

Summary of actions taken:

N/A

The Health and Safety Executive and Director of Public Health were also consulted but no responses were received.

Representations from community and other organisations

Three identical responses received from: Coalition Against Factory Farming (CAFF) on 22/10/2025.

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. Greenhouse gas emissions
The Environment Agency will carry out compliance visits to this installation once the farm is operational. If any concerns and issues are found during these compliance visits, appropriate enforcement action will be taken. Our compliance team will require the new operator to complete a climate change assessment, which we will then review. The Environmental Permitting Regulations (EPR) scope of regulation is limited to preventing significant pollution from emissions from the Installation. The Environment Agency does not operate under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. Twin-tracking of EPR permit and Planning Permission.
The decision whether to twin track the applications is a matter for the Operator. 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.

4. Broiler bird numbers discrepancies at this site with past applications.
The original permit (EPR/SP3435UV/A001) issued in 2007 was for 105,000 broilers in three poultry houses. The variation in 2016 (EPR/SP3435UV/V003) was for an increase in broilers to 150,000 in four poultry houses. This variation (EPR/SP3435UV/V005) is for an increase in broilers to 240,000 with the addition of two new poultry houses, giving six poultry houses in total. There are no discrepancies in broiler bird numbers.

5. Planning permission should be required
Scale, location and land use are matters for consideration during the planning process and do not form part of the Permit decision. Where planning permission is required the local planning authority is responsible.

6. Intensification and increased pollution concerns

The received representation states that the *application represents a significant intensification with serious consequences to the amenity of local people, public health, the environment, and the animals. Increases in odours, dust, ammonia, pollution, traffic, manure, waste, dirty water, greenhouse gas emissions, and the downstream direct and indirect impacts on people, Ancient Woodlands, SAC/SSSIs protected sites, the climate, rivers must all be assessed as part of the planning consultation process.*

This is not a planning consultation; we have assessed this permit application under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016.

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) or noise management plan (NMP) as part of the application. In accordance with the guidance, the Applicant submitted an odour and noise risk assessment, as outlined in the key issues section above. Measures to mitigate the potential risks from odour and noise emissions have been identified in the assessments. The use of BAT and good practice will ensure emissions of odour are minimised. Furthermore, standard condition 3.3.1 concerning odour and standard condition 3.4.1 concerning noise have been included in the permit. An OMP and NMP can be requested in future if deemed necessary.

Our approach to dust and bioaerosol environmental control is to require a dust and bioaerosol management plan for intensive farming installations with receptors within 100 metres of the Installation boundary. This is an agreed approach with UKHSA and the Environment Agency. This is a robust approach requiring the listing of both point and fugitive emissions and listing of controls to minimise impact on human health. The risk assessment criteria of 100 metres from the boundary is set out in our Intensive Farming risk assessment guidance at https://www.gov.uk/guidance/intensive-farming-risk-assessment-for-your-environmental-permit. There is one property (the Operators residence) within 100m of the installation boundary and the Applicant has supplied a satisfactory dust and bioaerosol management plan for this site.

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.

No manure is stored within the Installation boundary; all manure is exported from the Installation for spreading on Operator controlled land in accordance with a Manure Management Plan. 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 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.

We have carried out an assessment of the impact from this proposal on nearby habitat sites from ammonia emissions. There are no Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas or Ramsar sites within 5 km of the installation boundary. There are two Sites of Special Scientific Interest within 5 km of the installation boundary and two Local Wildlife Sites within 2 km 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.

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.

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

7. Cumulative impacts of multiple intensive agricultural developments in one river catchment

The 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 the case of the EPR application determination, 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.

8. Animal Welfare
The Environment Agency is not the relevant regulatory body covering animal welfare. The Environment Agency is responsible for ensuring that the emissions from 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.

9. Permit should not be issued before planning permission is granted
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.

Representations from individual members of the public

Thirty-two 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:

1. This is a major intensification, not a minor adjustment
This site already has a permit, and as this is an increase in poultry numbers more than 40,000, we have treated this application as a substantial variation. This means it is advertised and consulted externally in the same way as a new permit application would be. This in in accordance with our guidance.

2. Risks to public health and local amenity
As outlined in the key issues section of this document there are no sensitive receptors within the relevant screening distances, linked to odour and noise impacts. There is one property (the Operators residence) within 100m of the installation boundary and the Applicant has supplied a satisfactory dust and bioaerosol management plan for this site. 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.

3. Litter and manure management changes with increased birds and houses and if the manure management plan has been updated
At the end of the cycle the houses are depopulated, washed and disinfected ready for the next cycle. Litter is exported from the installation and spread on Operator controlled land in accordance with a manure management plan. Water from the wash out of poultry houses is channelled to the underground collection

tank (via a diverter valve) close to the poultry houses to await export off site and is spread on Operator controlled land outside of the installation boundary. We do not need to see the manure management plan at the permit application stage, this will be checked during future Environment Agency compliance visits, where a copy will be kept on site for inspection.

4. Risk of zoonotic disease and bird flu

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.

5. Use of antibiotics

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

6. 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. The key issues section of this document summarises our ammonia assessment.