Permitting Decisions - Variation

We have decided to grant the variation for Bryn-y-Groes Poultry Unit operated by Mr David Wigley and Mrs Gwyneth Wigley.

The variation number is EPR/VP3237WY/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 broiler numbers from 120,000 to 180,000 places, add a new poultry house, number 3, and a new dirty water tank within the existing installation boundary.

An Environment Agency initiated variation has also been carried out to correct a number of errors in the Permit.

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
- explains why we have also made an Environment Agency initiated variation
- shows how we have considered the consultation responses

Unless the decision document specifies otherwise, we have accepted the Operator'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 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 request for information requiring the Operator to confirm that the installation complies in full with all the BAT Conclusions measures.

The Operator has confirmed their compliance with all BAT conditions for the new and existing housing in their document reference ‘BAT’, dated 16/01/2026 and submitted 21/01/2026, which has been referenced in Table S1.2 - Operating Techniques, of the permit.

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

BAT 3 Nutritional management - Nitrogen excretion

The Operator 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 Operator 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 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 Operator has confirmed they will report the ammonia emissions to the Environment Agency annually by using a mass balance based on the excretion and the total (or total ammoniacal) nitrogen present at each manure management stage.

BAT 26 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Odour

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

- Minimum weekly perimeter fence odour sniff checks by a person not directly involved with the poultry.

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 Operator has confirmed they will report the dust emissions to the Environment Agency annually by calculation by measuring the dust concentration and the ventilation rate using EN standard methods or other methods (ISO, national or international) ensuring data of an equivalent scientific quality.

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 Operator 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

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.

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

Odour Management Plan Review

There are 20 sensitive receptors located within 400m of the installation boundary; the nearest sensitive receptor is located approximately 90m to the south of the installation boundary (please note, the distance stated is only an approximation from the Installation boundary to the assumed boundary of the property).

The sensitive receptors that have been considered under odour and noise, do 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 (dated 21/01/2026 and submitted 26/01/2026) 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 Top Tips Guidance and Poultry 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 the Local Authority and our local area compliance team (see consultation section below), 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 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 Operator 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:

- 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

Noise Management Plan Review

The final NMP provided by the Operator and assessed below was received as part of the application supporting documentation on 28/01/2026.

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 the Local Authority and our local area compliance team (see consultation section below), 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 Operator 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.

As there are receptors within 100m of the installation, the Operator was required to submit a dust and bioaerosol management plan in this format. The final dust and bioaerosol management plan provided by the Operator and assessed below was received on 26/01/2026.

There are 5 sensitive receptors within 100m of the installation boundary, the nearest sensitive receptor (the nearest point of their assumed property boundary) is approximately 90m to the south of the installation boundary, and approximately 170m from the nearest poultry house.

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 Operator has confirmed measures in their dust and bioaerosol management plan to reduce dust (which will inherently reduce bioaerosols) for the following potential risks:

- Feed type and delivery
- Bedding materials
- House cleaning operations
- Litter management
- Ventilation

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

Standby generator and back up boiler

There is one existing standby generator, with a net thermal rated input of 0.316 MWth, for use in the event of mains power failure, which 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. There is one existing natural gas fired back-up boiler, with a net thermal rated input 0.517 Mwth, for emergencies or breakdown within the ground source heat pump system, which 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. Both fall outside the scope of the Medium Combustion Plant Directive (MCPD).

Ammonia

There is one Special Area of Conservation (SAC) within 5km of the installation. In addition, there are seven Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) within 5km of the installation, and nineteen other nature conservation sites within 2km comprising thirteen Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) and six ancient woodlands.

Ammonia assessment – SAC

The following trigger thresholds have been designated for the assessment of European sites:

- If, using the Ammonia Screening Tool (AST v4.6) the process contribution (PC) is below 4% 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, detailed ammonia modelling is required, and, if the PC from such modelling is below 1% of the relevant critical level (CLe) or critical loads (CLo) then the farm can be permitted with no further assessment.
- Where the PC (after modelling) exceeds 1%, further detailed assessment is required, taking into consideration the ammonia and nitrogen background concentrations and may also require an in-combination assessment.

- Where an in-combination assessment is required, the combined PC for all relevant existing permitted installations identified within 5 km of the SAC/SPA/Ramsar will be considered, together with impacts from other local plans, projects, and non-permitted farms which could act in-combination. The in-combination assessment is limited to those impacts not already included in the relevant background emission baseline.

Screening using the ammonia screening tool version 4.6 (dated 18/12/2025) has determined that the PC on the SAC for ammonia emissions from the application site is under the 4% significance threshold and can be screened out as having no likely significant effect. See results below.

Table 1 – Ammonia emissions

Site	Critical level ammonia µg/m^3	Predicted PC µg/m^3	PC % of Critical level
Montgomery Canal SAC (Wales)	3*	0.046	1.5

* Critical level value taken from Air Pollution Information System (APIS) website (www.apis.ac.uk) – 18/12/2025

There was no information available on APIS for nitrogen deposition or acid deposition at the Montgomery Canal SAC. Natural Resource Wales were contacted in May 2025 and we were advised to follow previous advice provided in February 2023 that nitrogen deposition and acid deposition did not need assessing for the SAC.

No further assessment is necessary.

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 18/12/2025) has indicated that emissions from Bryn-y-Groes Poultry Unit will only have a potential impact on SSSI with a precautionary CLe of 1 µg/m^3 if they are within 1,149 metres of the emission source.

Beyond 1,149 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 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 2 – SSSI Assessment

Name of SSSI	Distance from site (m)
Llanymynech and Llynclys Hills (England)	1,879
Blodwel Marsh (England)	1,886
Craig Sychtyn (England)	2,478
Trefonen Marshes (England)	3,105
Sweeney Fen (England)	3,456
Llanymynech and Llynclys Hills (Wales)	1,882
Montgomery Canal (Wales)	2,928

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 18/12/2025) has indicated that emissions from Bryn-y-Groes Poultry Unit will only have a potential impact on the LWS / AW with a precautionary CLe of 1 µg/m^3 if they are within 415 m of the emission source.

Beyond 415 m the PC is less than 1 µg/m^3 and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case all LWS / AW are beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

Table 3 – LWS / AW Assessment

Site	Distance from site (m)
Blodwel Quarry LWS	910
Cefn Lane LWS	1,209
Nant Mawr Meadows LWS	1,255
Nant Mawr LWS	1,374
Mount Zion LWS	1,488
Jones Rough Reserve LWS	1,497
Porth-y-Waen Meadow LWS	1,523
Globe Flower Field-Nant Mawr LWS	1,538
Moelydd LWS	1,543
Steetley Fields LWS	1,685
Offa's Dyke - Nant Mawr LWS	1,890
Porth-y-Waen Bird Site LWS	1,924
Gallt-Y-Rhin LWS	2,123*
Blodwell Hall Wood AW	1,871
Llanymynech Hill Wood AW	1,879
Llynclys Hill Wood AW	2,050*
Ancient Semi Natural Woodland AW	1,434
Restored Ancient Woodland Site AW	1,585
Plantation on Ancient Woodland Site AW	1,882

*This site is included at >2km 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 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 – Shropshire Council
- Health and Safety Executive
- UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA)
- Director of Public Health

The comments and our responses are summarised in the consultation responses section.

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.

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.

A Stage 1 Habitats Regulations Assessment was sent to Natural Resources Wales on 29/01/2026 ‘For information only’.

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 Operator 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 Operator 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 Operator 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 Operator 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 Operator 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’.

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 Operator 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 Operator 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.

Changes to the permit conditions due to an Environment Agency initiated variation

We have varied the permit as stated in the variation notice.

We have updated the permit to correct errors from the previous determination (EPR/VP3237WY/V004) as follows:

- Table S1.1 of the Permit has been amended to remove the ground source heat pump system and back-up boiler as Directly Associated Activities (DAAs).
- Table S3.1 of the Permit is amended to correct ventilation details, remove reference to the back-up gas tanks (LPG tanks) and add the existing standby generator previously omitted in error.
- Table S3.2 of the Permit is amended to include the discharge of uncontaminated surface water to French drains, open trenches and stone trenches previously omitted in error.
- The site plan in schedule 7 of the Permit is amended to correctly show the Installation boundary.
- The introductory note is amended to correct details of the heating system, and to reference the ground source heat pump previously omitted in error.

Emission limits

No emission limits have been added, amended or deleted as a result of this variation.

Monitoring

Monitoring has not changed as a result of this variation.

Reporting

Reporting has not changed as a result of this variation.

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 03/10/2025 and ended on 31/10/2025.

Responses from organisations listed in the consultation section

Response received from: UKHSA on 20/11/2025.

Brief summary of issues raised: The main emissions of potential public health significance are emissions to air of bioaerosols, dust including particulate matter, odour and ammonia.

It is unclear if the operator is currently permitted for 100,000 (as stated in the Site Condition Report) or 120,000 (as stated in the Non-Technical Summary) broiler places across two houses.

Clarification is needed regarding the location of sensitive receptors and appropriate bioaerosol assessment should be undertaken if any residential properties are located within 100m.

No information has been provided on the predicted environmental concentrations of ammonia in air, and the Environment Agency may therefore wish to ensure concentrations at nearby residential receptors will not exceed health-based Environmental Assessment Levels.

Amendments needed to odour management plan, as requested by the Environment Agency.

It is assumed by UKHSA that the installation will comply in all respects with the requirements of the permit, including the application of Best Available Techniques (BAT). This should ensure that emissions present a low risk to human health.

Summary of actions taken: The Operator submitted an odour risk assessment and a fugitive emissions risk assessment (including dust and bioaerosols and ammonia) in-line with guidance. The Operator submitted a revised odour management plan on 26/01/2026, as outlined in the key issues section above, in-line with guidance. As there are sensitive receptors located within 100m of the installation boundary, the Operator submitted a revised dust and bioaerosol management plan on 26/01/2026, as outlined in the key issues section above, in-line with guidance. Appropriate measures to mitigate the potential risks from emissions have been identified in the plans. The use of Best Available

Techniques and good practice will ensure minimisation of emissions. Furthermore, standard conditions 3.2.1 and 3.3.1 concerning fugitive emissions and odour have been included in the permit.

The Operator was previously permitted to stock 120,000 broilers in two poultry houses in accordance with the variation issued on 04/07/2024 (application EPR/VP3237WY/V004).

Ammonia impacts on human health from intensive farming installations has not been considered a significant risk and the focus has been on such installation ammonia impacts on local habitat sites where we have formal robust procedures for relevant assessments. On the limited occasions where intensive farming installation ammonia human health impact assessments have been carried out, they have concluded no significant impact.

Representations from community and other organisations

Response received from: Coalition Against Factory Farming (CAFF) on 29/10/2025 and 30/10/2025.

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 Operator 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. **Change of use under section 55 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.**

Consideration of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is a matter for consideration during the planning process and does not form part of the Permit decision.

4. **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 under EPR. 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.

5. Assessment of impacts on groundwater and nearby watercourses.

An assessment of the site drainage, including the risk to surface water from potential pollutants from the Installation, has been undertaken. We are satisfied that the risk to ground water and surface water is low.

Roof water from the poultry houses and water draining from the yard (excluding all times yards are contaminated e.g. catching, mucking out or washing) discharges to an unnamed tributary of the River Tanat, to the north of the installation, via French drains, open trenches and stone trenches, therefore there is no discharge direct to ground water or surface water from the installation.

All wash waters and drainage from contaminated yards is contained in sealed underground tanks, before being exported off site for use in an Anaerobic Digestor plant. 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 tanks. Clean drainage systems will not be contaminated. Spent disinfectants and heat exchanger condensate is also added to the dirty water tanks. The wash water tanks confirm to specifications in SGN EPR6.09 ‘How to comply with your environmental permit for intensive farming’.

The Operator 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, we are satisfied that the risk of pollution of ground water or surface water from this Installation is minimised to an acceptable level.

6. Granting of planning permission

We do not have to wait for planning permission to be granted before we can issue the EPR permit. 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.

7. Planning consultation process
This 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.

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

Representations from individual members of the public

123 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. Risk of zoonotic disease.
The birds will be kept indoors at all times so therefore it is extremely unlikely that they will contract zoonotic diseases. 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.

2. Production of chicken feed contributes to pollution.
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.

3. Ammonia emissions.
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 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.

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

5. Loss of wildlife and wild birds.
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.

6. Traffic.
Consideration of traffic beyond the installation boundary 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.

7. Climate problems.
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.

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

9. Physical and mental health of the staff.
Consideration of the health of the staff is not within the regulatory responsibility of the Environment Agency. It is covered under Health and Safety legislation.

10. Land use.
Land use is a matter for consideration during the planning process and does not form part of the Permit decision.

11. Running of the business.
This is not an issue under the Environment Agency's regulatory responsibility. It does not therefore fall within the scope of the EPR 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.

The Health and Safety Executive, Director of Public Health and Shropshire Council Environmental Protection were also consulted but no responses were received.