

Permitting Decisions - Bespoke Permit

We have decided to grant the permit for **Pear Tree Lane Poultry Farm** operated by **Rollfields Limited**.

The permit number is **EPR/SP3920MG**

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.

Overview

Greenfield site for a new broiler farm installation. Eight poultry houses and total capacity of **390,000 broiler places**. Heating of houses via LPG heaters. No directly associated activities. No human receptors within 100 metres of the installation boundary and no habitat sites located within relevant screening distances.

Purpose of this document

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

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

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

Read the permitting decisions in conjunction with the environmental permit. The introductory note summarises what the permit covers.

Key issues of the decision

Intensive Rearing of Poultry or Pigs BAT Conclusions document

The Best Available Techniques (BAT) Reference document (BREF) for the Intensive Rearing of Poultry or Pigs (IRPP) was published on 21st February 2017. There is now a separate BAT Conclusions document which sets out the standards that permitted farms will have to meet.

All new installation farming permits issued after 21st February 2017 must be compliant in full from the first day of operation.

There are some additional requirements for permit holders. The BAT Conclusions include BAT-Associated Emission Levels (BAT-AELs) for ammonia emissions, which will apply to the majority of permits, as well as BAT-AELs for nitrogen and phosphorus excretion. For some types of rearing practices, stricter standards apply to farms and housing permitted after the BAT Conclusions were published.

BAT Conclusions review

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

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 installation in their revised BAT document submitted on 24/12/2025, 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** kgP₂O₅/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 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:

- The staff will perform a weekly boundary walk to check the surrounding area for high levels of odour. Checks will also be performed on the surrounding area by persons who do not regularly work on the farm.
- Visual (and nasal) inspections of potentially odorous activities will be carried out.
- In the event of odour complaints being received the Operator will notify the Environment Agency and make a record of the complaint. The Operator 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 32 Ammonia emissions from poultry houses - Broilers

The BAT AEL to be complied with is **0.08 kg NH₃/animal place/year**. The Applicant will meet this as the emission factor for broilers is 0.024 kg NH₃/animal place/year. The installation does not include an air abatement treatment facility; hence the standard emission factor complies with the BAT AEL.

Industrial Emissions Directive (IED)

This permit implements the requirements of the European Union Directive on Industrial Emissions.

Groundwater and soil monitoring

As a result of the requirements of the Industrial Emissions Directive, all permits are now required to contain a condition relating to protection of soil, groundwater and groundwater monitoring. However, the Environment Agency's H5 Guidance states that it is only necessary for the Operator to take samples of soil or groundwater and measure levels of contamination where there is evidence that there is, or could be existing contamination and:

- The environmental risk assessment has identified that the same contaminants are a particular hazard; or
- The environmental risk assessment has identified that the same contaminants are a hazard and the risk assessment has identified a possible pathway to land or groundwater.

H5 Guidance further states that it is **not essential for the Operator** to take samples of soil or groundwater and measure levels of contamination where:

- The environmental risk assessment identifies no hazards to land or groundwater; or
- Where the environmental risk assessment identifies only limited hazards to land and groundwater and there is no reason to believe that there could be historic contamination by those substances that present the hazard; or
- Where the environmental risk assessment identifies hazards to land and groundwater but there is evidence that there is no historic contamination by those substances that pose the hazard.

The revised site condition report (SCR) for this installation received on 30/03/26, 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 and control measures for each risk are listed within the OMP.

Odour Management Plan Review

There are two sensitive receptors located within 400m of the installation boundary. The closest is 360 metres to the north of the installation boundary.

The Operator has provided an OMP (submitted 24/12/25) 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.

This is a greenfield site so there is **no** complaint history for this installation.

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 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 with relevant control measures.

Noise Management Plan Review

The final NMP provided by applicant and assessed below was received as part of the application supporting documentation on 24/12/25.

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.

This is a greenfield site so there is **no** complaint history for this installation.

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 bioaerosol management

There are no receptors within 100 metres of the installation boundary and therefore there is no requirement for a Dust and bioaerosol management plan.

No further assessment is required.

Standby generator

There is one standby generator with a net thermal rated input of 0.97 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. The generator falls outside of the requirements of the Medium Combustion Plant Directive.

Ammonia

There are no Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Areas (SPA), Ramsars or Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) within 5km of the installation. There are no other nature conservation sites within 2km of the installation.

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:

- Health and Safety Executive
- East Lindsey District Council Environmental Health Department.

The comments and our responses are summarised in the [consultation responses](#) section.

Operator

We are satisfied that the applicant (now the Operator) is the person who will have control over the operation of the facility after the grant of the permit. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on legal operator for environmental permits.

The regulated facility

We considered the extent and nature of the facility at the site in accordance with RGN2 'Understanding the meaning of regulated facility'.

The extent of the facility is defined in the site plan and in the permit. The activities are defined in table S1.1 of the permit.

The site

The Operator has provided a plan which we consider to be satisfactory, showing the extent of the site facilities.

The plan is included in the permit.

Site condition report

The Operator has provided a description of the condition of the site, which we consider is satisfactory. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on site condition reports

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 not within our screening distances for these designations.

Environmental impact assessment

A planning application for this site has not been submitted as of the date of the permit application determination.

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.

Emission limits

We have decided that emission limits are required in the permit. Emission Limit Values (ELVs) based on Best Available Techniques (BAT) have been added for the following substances:

- Ammonia
- Nitrogen
- Phosphorus

BAT-AELs have been added in line with the Intensive Farming sector BAT Conclusions document dated 21/02/2017. These limits are included in table S3.3 of the permit.

Monitoring

We have decided that monitoring should be carried out for the parameters listed in the permit, using the methods detailed and to the frequencies specified.

These monitoring requirements have been imposed in order to ensure compliance with Intensive Farming BAT Conclusions document dated 21/02/2017.

Reporting

We have specified reporting in the permit, using the methods detailed and to the frequencies specified.

We made these decisions in order to ensure compliance with the Intensive Farming sector BAT Conclusions document dated 21/02/2017.

Management system

We are not aware of any reason to consider that the Operator will not have the management system to enable it to comply with the permit conditions.

The decision was taken in accordance with the guidance on Operator competence and how to develop a management system for environmental permits.

Previous performance

We have checked our systems to ensure that all relevant convictions have been declared.

No relevant convictions were found.

Financial competence

There is no known reason to consider that the Operator will not be financially able to comply with the permit conditions

Growth duty

We have considered our duty to have regard to the desirability of promoting economic growth set out in section 108(1) of the Deregulation Act 2015 and the guidance issued under section 110 of that Act in deciding whether to grant this permit variation.

Paragraph 1.3 of the guidance says:

“The primary role of regulators, in delivering regulation, is to achieve the regulatory outcomes for which they are responsible. For a number of regulators, these regulatory outcomes include an explicit reference to development or growth. The growth duty establishes economic growth as a factor that all specified regulators should have regard to, alongside the delivery of the protections set out in the relevant legislation.”

We have addressed the legislative requirements and environmental standards to be set for this operation in the body of the decision document above. The guidance is clear at paragraph 1.5 that the growth duty does not legitimise non-compliance, and its purpose is not to achieve or pursue economic growth at the expense of necessary protections.

We consider the requirements and standards we have set in this permit are reasonable and necessary to avoid a risk of an unacceptable level of pollution. This also promotes growth amongst legitimate operators because the standards applied to the Operator are consistent across businesses in this sector and have been set to achieve the required legislative standards.

Consultation Responses

The following summarises the responses to consultation with other organisations, our notice on GOV.UK for the public, and the way in which we have considered these in the determination process.

The consultation commenced on **12/01/2026** and ended on **09/02/2026**.

Overview

There were a total of 158 public consultation responses. These consisted of approximately 90 responses received via a standard Communities against Factory Farming (www.caff.org.uk) template response and the remaining 68 in the form of typically partial response in line with the Caff template plus additional comments.

The consultation responses below are grouped with template responses handled together followed by additional comments raised by members of the public.

Representations from community and other organisations

Response received from: Communities against Factory Farming (www.caff.org.uk)

A full list of issues and our responses are listed below:

1. 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 Environmental Permitting Regulations (EPR) and we are satisfied that we have sufficient information to do so and to complete the determination.

2. Finch vs Surrey County Council legal case and planning implications

This legal case is limited to impact on planning applications. The Environment Agency is not the legal regulator for such applications and hence this legal case has no bearing on our determination decision under the EPR regulations.

3. Bedrock Aquifer

The applicant has actioned a site condition report including measures to ensure ground water and land protection which we have assessed and concluded that satisfactory measures are in place for such protection.

The applicant has further updated their site drainage plan and provided a written summary of additional containment details (both documents received

30/03/2026) including details of lightly contaminated water attenuation and dedicated containment of dirty water created by the installation activities.

4. Feedstock

The sourcing of feedstock outside of the installation boundary for usage within the installation is outside of the Environment Agency regulatory responsibilities.

5. 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.

6. 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.

Representations from individual members of the public

1. Large scale operation

The application has been assessed on the full scale of the number of broilers (390,000 broiler places). We have carried out all relevant environmental assessments, including ammonia emissions, habitat impacts, odour, noise and dust emissions, based on the full scale of the operation. The full details of such assessments are set out in the key issues section of this document.

It should be noted, as highlighted in the key issues section of this document, for this installation location there are no habitat sites located within the relevant screening distances.

We are satisfied that the impacts of the installation are acceptable.

2. Animal welfare issues

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.

3. Odour/noise pollution concerns

The applicant has provided Odour and Noise Management Plans for this installation. The details are outlined in the key issues section of this document

There are no receptors within 100 metres of the installation boundary and hence a high risk OMP does not apply.

We are satisfied that relevant control measures are in place to minimise odour and noise pollution impacts from this installation.

4. Traffic jams

The Environment Agency regulatory responsibility is limited to environmental emissions and pollution impacts from activities occurring within the installation boundary. Noise problems and traffic jams linked to vehicle movement outside the boundary are a planning issue under the responsibility of the local council.

5. River damage

There are no discharges of clean or lightly contaminated yard water from this installation. All such water is transferred to relevant soakaways within the installation boundary. All relevant dirty water is stored in a contained manner as set out in the Applicant's Technical standards document and site drainage plan.

The Applicant has provided a Fugitive emissions risk assessment, and a contingency and abnormal incident risk assessment to ensure controls are in place to minimise impacts on local watercourses under any abnormal operating scenarios. In addition, the manure management details of the site are outlined in Point 6 below.

In conclusion we are satisfied that all relevant measures are in place to prevent damage to local watercourses from this installation.

6. Litter/manure management

Litter is not stored at the installation. Litter will be sold for land spreading.

Any litter that is exported from the installation has records kept of the quantities, destination and the date of transfer. Contingency arrangements are in place with surrounding farms to accept the manure in case of an emergency.

In these circumstances where the litter is exported for spreading to land, records are kept of the names and addresses of the receiving farms.

The receiver of the manure confirms by signing a docket that litter 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 that will be assessed by our compliance team.

7. Dust impacts

A relevant Dust risk assessment has been submitted by the Applicant. There are no relevant human receptors located within 100 metres of the Installation boundary. Hence in line with our working together agreement with UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) we did not need to consult them on this application

In conclusion this Applicant has complied with BAT measures to minimise dust emissions from this Installation, and we are satisfied that impacts from dust from this Installation are reduced to an acceptable level.

8. Greenhouse gas emissions

The Environment Agency will carry out compliance visits to this Installation once it 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 Operator to complete a Climate change risk assessment, which will be reviewed. The EPR scope of regulation is limited to minimising pollution from emissions from within the Installation boundary.

Conclusion

No responses were received from any of the statutory consultees including East Lindsey District Council Environmental Health department and the Health and Safety Executive.