Permitting Decisions - Variation

We have decided to grant the variation for Beech Farm operated by Crown Chicken Limited.

We consider in reaching that decision we have taken into account all relevant considerations and legal requirements and that the permit will ensure that the appropriate level of environmental protection is provided.

The variation number is EPR/SP3430JR/V004.

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 authorises the following changes:

- Extend installation boundary for three new poultry houses to bring the total number of poultry houses to ten (numbered one to ten).
- Increase broiler numbers from 176,000 to 314,710.
- Mobile macerator added as a Directly Associated Activity (Table S1.1).
- A package water fogging system will be used to cool the temperature inside poultry houses (numbered five to ten) in warm weather. During cleaning and maintenance, the wastewater is directed to a sealed permanent pipe to the underground dirty water storage tanks.
- Heat exchangers installed on new poultry houses (numbered eight to ten) and retrofitted on existing poultry houses (numbered five to seven). The condensate drains via a sealed permanent pipe to the underground dirty water storage tanks.

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.

The Applicant has confirmed their compliance with all BAT conditions for the new housing in “Application Variation V004 Summary^LLJ technical standards ^LL0 controls” dated 26/06/2026, which has been referenced in Table S1.2 - Operating Techniques, of the permit.

The following is a more specific review of the measures the 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 0.6kg 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 0.25kg 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 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 daily 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.

- Daily 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 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

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 Beech Farm dated 23/01/2026 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.
- Poultry house clean out.
- Mobile macerator.
- Carcass storage and disposal.

Odour Management Plan Review

There are fifty seven sensitive receptors within 400m of the installation boundary, the nearest sensitive receptor (the nearest point of their assumed property boundary) is approximately 135 metres to the southwest of the installation boundary, and approximately 160 metres from the nearest poultry house.

The sensitive receptors that have been considered under odour and noise, does not include the operator's property and other people associated with the farm operations as odour and noise are amenity issues.

The Operator has provided an OMP (submitted 25/06/2026) 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) or Pig Industry Good Practice Checklist (August 2013), as well as the site-specific circumstances at the Installation. We consider that the OMP is acceptable because it complies with the above guidance, with details of odour control measures, contingency measures and complaint procedures described below.

The Operator is required to manage activities at the Installation in accordance with condition 3.3.1 of the Permit and its OMP. The OMP includes odour control measures and procedural measures. The Operator has identified the potential sources of odour as well as the potential risks and problems, and detailed actions taken to minimise odour including contingencies for abnormal operations.

It should also be noted that for existing farms, having consulted with the Local Authority and our local area compliance team (see consultation response 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 H4 Odour management guidance note. We agree with the scope and suitability of key measures, but this should not be taken as confirmation that the details of equipment specification design, operation and maintenance are suitable and sufficient. That remains the responsibility of the Operator.

Although there is the potential for odour pollution from the Installation, the Operator's compliance with its OMP and permit conditions will minimise the risk of odour pollution beyond the Installation boundary. The risk of odour pollution at sensitive receptors beyond the Installation boundary is therefore not considered significant.

Conclusion

We have assessed the OMP and conclude that the Applicant has followed the guidance set out in EPR 6.09 Appendix 4 'Odour management at intensive livestock installations'. We are satisfied that all sources and receptors have been identified, and that the proposed mitigation measures will minimise the risk of odour pollution/nuisance.

Noise management

Intensive farming by its nature involves activities that have the potential to cause noise pollution. This is recognised in our 'How to Comply with your Environmental Permit for Intensive Farming' EPR 6.09 guidance.

Condition 3.4 of the permit reads as follows:

"Emissions from the activities shall be free from noise and vibration at levels likely to cause pollution outside the site, as perceived by an authorised officer of the Environment Agency, unless the Operator has used appropriate measures, including, but not limited to, those specified in any approved noise and vibration management plan, to prevent or where that is not practicable to minimise the noise and vibration".

Under section 3.4 of the guidance, a Noise Management Plan (NMP) is required to be approved as part of the permitting process if, as is the case here, sensitive receptors (sensitive receptors in this instance excludes properties associated with the farm) are within 400m of the installation boundary. It is appropriate to require a NMP when such sensitive receptors have been identified within 400m of the installation to prevent or, where that is not practicable, to minimise the risk of pollution from noise emissions.

There are sensitive receptors within 400 metres of the installation boundary as stated under the 'Odour' section. The Operator has provided a NMP as part of the application supporting documentation, and further details are provided below.

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

- 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.
- Building work and repairs.
- Mobile macerator.
- Personnel.
- Chickens – including catching and removal from site.
- Clean out operations.
- Alarm system and standby generator.

Noise Management Plan Review

The final NMP provided by applicant and assessed below was received as part of the application supporting documentation on 25/06/2026.

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 response 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 Applicant has followed the guidance set out in EPR 6.09 Appendix 5 ‘Noise management at intensive livestock Installations’. We are satisfied that all sources and receptors

have been identified, and that the proposed mitigation measures will minimise the risk of noise pollution/nuisance.

Dust and bioaerosols management

The use of Best Available Techniques and good practice will ensure minimisation of emissions. There are measures included within the permit (the 'Fugitive Emissions' conditions) to provide a level of protection. Condition 3.2.1 'Emissions of substances not controlled by an emission limit' is included in the permit. This is used in conjunction with condition 3.2.2 which states that in the event of fugitive emissions causing pollution following commissioning of the installation, the Operator is required to undertake a review of site activities, provide an emissions management plan and to undertake any mitigation recommended as part of that report, once agreed in writing with the Environment Agency.

In addition, guidance on our website concludes that Applicants need to produce and submit a dust and bioaerosol management plan beyond the requirement of the initial risk assessment, with their applications only if there are relevant receptors within 100 metres including the farmhouse or farm workers' houses. Details can be found via the link below:

www.gov.uk/guidance/intensive-farming-risk-assessment-for-your-environmental-permit#air-emissions-dust-and-bioaerosols.

As there are receptors within 100m of the installation, the Applicant was required to submit a dust and bioaerosol management plan in this format. The final dust and bioaerosol management plan provided by the applicant and assessed below was received on 23/01/2026.

There is one sensitive receptor within 100m of the installation boundary, the nearest sensitive receptor (the nearest point of their assumed property boundary) is approximately 0 metres to the south of the installation boundary, and approximately 25 metres 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 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 type and delivery.
- Ventilation.
- Bedding materials.

- Litter management.
- House cleaning operations.

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

Mobile macerator

A mobile macerator is operated within the installation boundary for maceration of dead-in-shell and pipping eggs (not-hatched) and non-viable chicks. The macerator is contained inside a small, covered trailer. There are no point source emissions to air, water or land from operation of the macerator. Operation of the macerator is limited to normal day time hours (07.00-23.00hrs) in the working week (Monday to Friday and Saturday morning but exclusive of public & bank holidays). The macerator arrives on site the day after egg hatching and is only in use for a maximum of 1 hour per day. The macerated material, plus a small volume of dirty water from cleaning and disinfecting the macerator, is stored in the secure, covered non-leaking carcass containers, which are kept locked, and removed from site weekly.

The mobile macerator is used for a limited period of time; however, the maceration process has the potential for environmental impact linked to odour pollution. It is also technically connected to the intensive farming scheduled activity through processing of rejected eggs and unviable chicks from the installation. In addition, in this specific case the capacity of the macerator unit is not insignificant at 112.8 t/day and hence theoretically above the Section 5.4 A(1) scheduled activity threshold for physico-chemical treatment of 50 t/day. However, as the operator has confirmed in the “Technical Standards” dated 26/06/2026 that the maximum time usage of the macerator is 1 hour per day and the actual maximum operational capacity is limited to 4.7 tonnes per day. This is controlled via the addition of the macerator as a directly associated activity with the above stated operational capacity limit in the revised Table S1.1 of the permit. Controls to minimise odour emissions resulting from operation of the macerator have been included in the OMP. The OMP plus operating techniques for the macerator have been included in Table S1.2 of the Permit.

Standby generator

There is one standby generator each with a net thermal rated input of 0.344MWth 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.

Heat exchangers

Heat exchangers are being installed on poultry houses 8-10 and retrofitted on 5-7 poultry houses with this application.

All condensate from the heat exchangers will be directed to dirty water tanks. The operation and maintenance of the heat exchangers will be in accordance with manufacturer's instructions.

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 four Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) located within 5km of the installation boundary. There are also three Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) and one Ancient Woodland (AW) within 2km of the installation boundary.

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 12/02/2026) has indicated that emissions from Beech Farm will only have a potential impact on SSSIs with a precautionary CLe of 1 $\mu g/m^3$ if they are within 1,157 metres of the emission source.

Beyond 1,157m the PC is less than 0.2 $\mu g/m^3$ (i.e. less than 20% of the precautionary 1 $\mu g/m^3$ 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 $\mu g/m^3$ 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 $\mu g/m^3$ 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)
Lower Wood, Ashwellthorpe (SSSI)	3,840
New Buckenham Common (SSSI)	3,892
Aslacton Parish Land (SSSI)	4,057
Forncett Meadows (SSSI)	4,480

No further assessment is required.

Ammonia assessment – LWS and 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 12/02/2026) has indicated that emissions from Beech Farm will only have a potential impact on the LWS and AW sites with a precautionary CLe of 1 µg/m^3 if they are within 403m of the emission source.

Beyond 403m the PC is less than 1 µg/m^3 and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case all LWSs and AW are beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

Table 2 – LWS and AW Assessment

Site	Distance from site (m)
Pond Farm Pond	1,432
Bunwell Wood	1,841
Grove Wood	1,841
Bunwell Wood	1,841

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 Health/Environmental Protection department.
- Local Authority – Director of Public Health.
- Health and Safety Executive.
- UK Health Security Agency.

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

The site

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

The plans show the location of the part of the installation to which this permit applies on that site.

The plans are included in the permit.

Site condition report

The Operator has provided a description of the condition of the site, which we consider is satisfactory. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on site condition reports and baseline reporting under the Industrial Emissions Directive.

Nature conservation, landscape, heritage and protected species and habitat designations

We have checked the location of the application to assess if it is within the screening distances, we consider relevant for impacts on nature conservation, landscape, heritage and protected species and habitat designations. The application is within our screening distances for these designations.

We have assessed the application and its potential to affect sites of nature conservation, landscape, heritage and protected species and habitat designations identified in the nature conservation screening report as part of the permitting process.

We consider that the application will not affect any site of nature conservation, landscape and heritage, and/or protected species or habitats identified.

See Ammonia section in the Key Issues above for more details.

The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance.

Environmental impact assessment

In determining the application, we have considered the Environmental Statement.

We have also considered the planning permission and the committee report approving it.

Environmental risk

We have reviewed the Operator's assessment of the environmental risk from the facility.

The Operator’s risk assessment is satisfactory.

General operating techniques

We have reviewed the techniques used by the Operator and compared these with the relevant guidance notes and we consider them to represent appropriate techniques for the facility.

The operating techniques that the applicant must use are specified in table S1.2 in the environmental permit.

The proposed techniques for priorities for control are in line with the benchmark levels contained in the Sector Guidance Note EPR6.09 and we consider them to represent appropriate techniques for the facility. The permit conditions ensure compliance with The Best Available Techniques (BAT) Reference document (BREF) for the Intensive Rearing of Poultry or Pigs (IRPP) published on 21st February 2017.

Odour management

We have reviewed the odour management plan in accordance with our guidance on odour management.

We consider that the odour management plan is satisfactory, and we approve this plan.

We have approved the odour management plan as we consider it to be appropriate measures based on information available to us at the current time. The applicant should not take our approval of this plan to mean that the measures in the plan are considered to cover every circumstance throughout the life of the permit.

The applicant should keep the plans under constant review and revise them annually or if necessary, sooner if there have been complaints arising from operations on site or if circumstances change. This is in accordance with our guidance ‘Control and monitor emissions for your environmental permit’.

The plan has been incorporated into the operating techniques table S1.2.

Noise management

We have reviewed the noise management plan in accordance with our guidance on noise assessment and control.

We consider that the noise management plan is satisfactory, and we approve this plan.

We have approved the noise management plan as we consider it to be appropriate measures based on information available to us at the current time. The applicant should not take our approval of this plan to mean that the measures in the plan are considered to cover every circumstance throughout the life of the permit.

The applicant should keep the plans under constant review and revise them annually or if necessary, sooner if there have been complaints arising from

operations on site or if circumstances change. This is in accordance with our guidance ‘Control and monitor emissions for your environmental permit’.

The plan has been incorporated into the operating techniques table S1.2.

Dust and bioaerosol management

We have reviewed the dust and bioaerosol management plan in accordance with our guidance on emissions management plans for dust.

We consider that the dust and bioaerosol management plan is satisfactory and we approve this plan.

We have approved the dust and bioaerosol management plan as we consider it to be appropriate measures based on information available to us at the current time. The applicant should not take our approval of this plan to mean that the measures in the plan are considered to cover every circumstance throughout the life of the permit.

The applicant should keep the plans under constant review and revise them annually or if necessary sooner if there have been complaints arising from operations on site or if circumstances change. This is in accordance with our guidance ‘Control and monitor emissions for your environmental permit.

The plan has been incorporated into the operating techniques S1.2.

Emission limits

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

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

Monitoring

Monitoring has not changed as a result of this variation.

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

Reporting

Reporting has not changed as a result of this variation.

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 26/02/2026 and ended on 03/04/2026.

Responses from organisations listed in the consultation section

Response received from UK Health Security Agency:

Brief summary of issues raised:

1. The EA should satisfy themselves that the bioaerosol assessment is appropriate as bioaerosols generally decline to background levels within 250 m receptors with 250 m should be considered. UKHSA would need to be reassured that residential receptors within 250 m of the site boundary have been considered within the bioaerosol assessment.

2. UKHSA expects that the use of BAT will minimise the amount of dust released but recommends that the Regulator requests that the applicant reports dust complaints.

3. The applicant has additionally not included an accident management plan as part of this consultation, and the EA should satisfy themselves that this is in place.

Summary of actions taken:

1. In accordance with our guidance, it concludes that applicants need to produce and submit a dust management plan with their application if there are relevant receptors within 100 metres of their farm, including the farmhouse or farm worker's houses. The applicant has submitted a bioaerosol management plan and environmental 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, type and containment of feedstuff and management of poultry litter.

   We are satisfied that these measures will mitigate emissions to prevent a significant impact from the site. Furthermore, standard condition 3.2.1 concerning fugitive emissions has been included in the permit. We are satisfied, following a review of the information provided by the Applicant and the conditions present within the Permit, that emissions from the Installation will not have a significant impact on the health of local

residents. An Environmental Risk Assessment was also submitted for dust and fugitive emissions.

2. Accident Management Plans are assessed during on site compliance visits undertaken by Environment Officers in the Area teams. The applicant has submitted an Environmental Risk Assessment which considers accident risks and mitigation.

Representations from community and other organisations

Response received from Communities Against Factory Farming (CAFF):

Brief summary of issues raised:

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. **Material change of use under section 55 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990:**

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 for determining land use.

3. **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.

4. **Concerns for the impact of the installation on surrounding sensitive receptors:**

<u>Odour</u>

In accordance with our guidance, it concludes that applicants need to produce and submit an odour management plan with their application if there are relevant receptors within 400 metres of their farm.

The applicant has submitted an odour management plan and environmental 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 3.3.1 concerning odour emissions has been included in the permit.

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

Dust

In accordance with our guidance, it concludes that applicants need to produce and submit a dust management plan with their application if there are relevant receptors within 100 metres of their farm, including the farmhouse or farm worker's houses.

The applicant has submitted a bioaerosol management plan and environmental 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, type and containment of feedstuff and management of poultry litter.

We are satisfied that these measures will mitigate emissions to prevent a significant impact from the site. Furthermore, standard condition 3.2.1 concerning fugitive emissions has been included in the permit.

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

Noise

In accordance with our guidance, it concludes that applicants need to produce and submit a noise management plan with their application if there are relevant receptors within 400 metres of their farm.

The applicant has submitted a noise management plan and environmental 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 feeding equipment, ventilation systems, alarm systems and standby generator, management of vehicle movements to and from the site, scheduling activities within the working week (i.e. clean out operations, building work and repairs, etc.)

We are satisfied that these measures will mitigate emissions to prevent a significant impact from the site. Furthermore, standard condition 3.4.1 concerning noise emissions has been included in the permit.

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

5. **Nighttime operations:**
The use of gable fans is linked to higher temperatures so are less likely to be triggered at night when the temperature is lower. Therefore, we have concluded that the risk of noise pollution from this installation beyond the site boundary is low. Noise impacts have also been considered in the above section 'Concerns for the impact of the installation on surrounding sensitive receptors'.

6. **Impacts of ammonia emissions on human health:**
Assessment of ammonia emissions with regards to human health does not fall within the regulatory responsibility of the Environment Agency. UKHSA was consulted and their comments can be found within the 'Responses from organisations listed in the consultation' section.

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

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

9. **Assessment of impacts on groundwater and nearby watercourses:**
An assessment of the site drainage, including the risk to groundwater and surface water from potential pollutants from the Installation, has been undertaken and the Applicant's Site Condition Report, covering protection of land

and ground water, has been reviewed. We are satisfied that the risk to ground and surface waters is low.

A grass swale to the west of poultry houses one and two and French drains filled with stones adjacent to poultry houses one to four intercept the roof water and act as soakaways. Yard water runoff (excluding periods of washout when water from the yard drains to the underground tanks) for poultry houses one to four is also conveyed to the grass swale soakaway via a concrete apron. Roof water from poultry houses five to ten and yard water (excluding periods of washout when water from the yard drains to the underground tanks) is intercepted by adjacent French drains filled with stones which act as soakaways. These French drains then lead to two unlined attenuation basins acting as soakaways located to the east of the installation. One basin receives the French drain water from poultry houses five to seven to discharge into an offsite ditch via underground pipes at W1 and the other basin receives the French drain water from poultry houses eight to ten to discharge into an offsite ditch via underground pipes at W2. Both offsite ditches ultimately lead to the River Yare. Therefore, there is no direct discharge to ground or surface waters from the installation.

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

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

The Applicant has proposed appropriate measures to manage fugitive emissions (emissions not controlled by an emission limit). We are satisfied that these measures will mitigate emissions to prevent a significant impact from the site. These measures are listed in Table S1.2 of the Permit and the Operator is required to comply with them as stipulated in Condition 2.3.1 of the Permit. Standard conditions 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 concerning fugitive emissions are also included in the permit.

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

10. **Concerns regarding water abstraction:**

Water abstraction licencing and controls are a separate regime outside the scope of the EPR regulations and hence the scope of the application for this installation.

11. **Greenhouse gas assessment calculation required for EIA:**

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

12. **Requirement for a Climate Assessment:**

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

13. **Intensive poultry production represents an inefficient use of grain protein:**

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

14. **Meat consumption:**

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

15. **Risk of zoonotic disease:**

The birds will be kept indoors at all times so therefore it is extremely unlikely that they will contract Avian flu. Effective biosecurity measures will also ensure that the likelihood of disease will be low. We have consulted the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) on the Application in line with our guidance and their comments can be seen above. They have not raised any concerns with regards to zoonotic diseases. 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.

16. **Stocking density and animal welfare:**

Stocking density is an animal welfare issue and beyond our regulatory scope. We respond to applications where stocking densities changes leading to poultry

housing changes in terms of our regulatory responsibility under EPR but overall animal welfare itself is beyond our regulatory scope.

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

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

Representations from individual members of the public

Sixty-nine 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. **Traffic Concerns**

Consideration of increased traffic movements beyond the Installation boundary is outside the scope of the Environment Agency regulatory responsibility under the EPR Regulations as it is not an emission from the installation.

Such traffic noise assessment may be a material consideration for the planning application.

2. **Application document not present**

Application document has been uploaded to Citizen Space.

3. **Use of antibiotics.**

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