Permitting Decisions - Bespoke Permit

We have decided to grant the permit for Kirby Wold Poultry Farm operated by Kirby Wold Farming Ltd.

The permit number is EPR/GP3924ML.

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 application is for operation of a new intensive farming poultry installation, comprising four poultry houses with capacity for 140,000 broiler places.

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.

Now the BAT Conclusions are published, 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.

The Applicant has confirmed their compliance with all BAT conditions for the new installation in 'Application Bespoke A001 - Kirby Wold Poultry Farm - 25042026' and dated 25/04/2026, 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 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 Odour Monitoring

There are no receptors within 400m of the installation boundary, therefore there is no requirement for BAT odour monitoring.

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.

All new bespoke applications issued after the 21st February 2017, including those where there is a mixture of old and new housing, will now need to meet 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 site condition report (SCR) for Kirby Wold Poultry Farm dated 25/04/2026, 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.

There are no relevant receptors within 400 metres of the installation boundary.

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 no relevant receptors within 400 metres of the installation boundary.

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 17/07/2026.

There are two sensitive receptors within 100m of the installation boundary, the nearest sensitive receptor (the nearest point of their assumed property boundary) is approximately 22 metres to the east of the installation boundary, and approximately 80 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
- Bedding materials

- Ventilation
- Carcass disposal
- House cleaning operations
- Litter management
- Fugitive emissions

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

Medium Combustion Plant (MCP)

The installation includes an existing 1.15MWth thermal input capacity biomass boiler (in operation prior to December 2018), for site heating requirements, which is permitted to use biomass chips or pellets comprising virgin timber, straw, miscanthus or a combination of these as fuel.

The biomass boiler falls outside of the requirements of the Medium Combustion Plant Directive and so an assessment has not been undertaken.

Biomass boiler

We have carried out a standard biomass boiler screening (31/07/2026). A quantitative modelling assessment was not required for this case.

The Applicant is varying their permit to include a single biomass boiler with a net rated thermal input of 1.15MWth.

The Environment Agency has assessed the pollution risks and has concluded that air emissions from small biomass boilers are not likely to pose a significant risk to the environment or human health providing certain conditions are met. Therefore, a quantitative assessment of air emissions will not be required for intensive farming installations where:

- the fuel will be derived from virgin timber, miscanthus or straw, and;
- the biomass boiler appliance and installation meets the technical criteria equivalent to the eligibility for the former Renewable Heat Incentive, and;

<u>For poultry:</u>

- the aggregate boiler net rated thermal input is less than or equal to 4 MWth, and no individual boiler has a net thermal input greater than 1 MWth, and;
- the stack height must be a minimum of 5 metres above the ground (where there are buildings within 25 metres the stack height must be greater than 1 metre above the roof level of buildings within 25 metres (including building housing boilers if relevant) and:

- there are no sensitive receptors within 50 metres of the emission point

This is in line with the Environment Agency's document "Air Quality and Modelling Unit C1127a Biomass firing boilers for intensive poultry rearing". An assessment has been undertaken to consider the proposed addition of the biomass boiler(s).

Our risk assessment has shown that the biomass boilers will meet the requirements of the criteria above and are, therefore, considered not likely to pose a significant risk to the environment or human health and no further assessment is required.

Additional assessment criteria

the aggregate boiler net rated thermal input is:

A. less than 0.5MWth, or;
B. less than 1MWth where the stack height is greater than 1 metre above the roof level of adjacent buildings including building housing boiler if relevant (where there are no adjacent buildings, the stack height must be a minimum of 3 metres above ground), and there are:
    - no Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas, Ramsar sites or Sites of Special Scientific Interest within 500 metres of the emission point;
    - no National Nature Reserves, Local Nature Reserves, ancient woodlands or local wildlife sites within 100 metres of the emission point(s), or;
C. less than 2MWth where, in addition to the above criteria for less than 1MWth boilers, there are:
    - no sensitive receptors within 150 metres of the emission points.

This is in line with the Environment Agency's May 2013 document "Biomass boilers on EPR Intensive Farms". An assessment has been undertaken to consider the proposed addition of the biomass boiler(s).

The Environment Agency's risk assessment has shown that the biomass boiler does not meet the requirements of any of above criteria. Hence further assessment is required.

<u>Conclusion of further assessment</u>

- The biomass boiler is only slightly above 1MWth and meets all the criteria otherwise under criteria B.
- The distance from emission point to receptor is 110 metres.

- The stack height is 1.4 metres above the closest building and hence dispersion is expected to be above the standard assumed for generic criteria listed above.
- Specific concentration data for critical Oxides of Nitrogen emission for this boiler is approximately 15-20 % lower than standard emission data which underpins above screening criteria.

Hence it is considered in light of above boiler specific data that the impacts from this boiler can be considered satisfactory and not result in significant impacts on local human receptors.

No further assessment is required.

In accordance with the Environment Agency's Air Quality Technical Advisory Guidance 14 version 2, dated November 21, for combustion plants under 2 MW, habitats assessment is only required for European sites and Sites of Special Scientific Interest if within 2km and for other nature conservation sites if within 300m. This proposal has no European sites or Sites of Special Scientific Interest within 2km and no for other nature conservation sites within 300m so is considered acceptable and no further assessment is required.

Standby generator

There is one standby generator with a net thermal rated input of 0.833MWth and it will not be tested more than 50 hours per year or operated (including testing) for more than 500 hours per year (averaged over 3 years) for emergency use only as a temporary power source if there is a mains power failure.

Ammonia

The Applicant has demonstrated that the housing will meet the relevant NH_3 BAT AEL.

There are no Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Areas (SPA) or Ramsar sites located within 5 kilometres (km) of the installation boundary. There are four Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) located within 5km of the installation boundary. There are no Local Wildlife Sites (LWS), Ancient Woodlands (AW) or Local Nature Reserves (LNR) within 2 km 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 08/04/2026) has indicated that emissions from Kirby Wold Poultry Farm will only have a potential impact on SSSIs with a precautionary CLe of 1 μg/m^3 if they are within 656 metres of the emission source.

Beyond 656m the PC is less than 0.2 μg/m^3 (i.e. less than 20% of the precautionary 1 μg/m^3 CLe) and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case all SSSIs are beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

Where the precautionary level of 1 μg/m^3 is used and the PC is assessed to be less than 20%, the site automatically screens out as insignificant and no further assessment of CLo is necessary. In this case the 1 μg/m^3 level used has not been confirmed by Natural England, but it is precautionary. It is therefore possible to conclude no likely damage to these sites.

Table 1 – SSSI Assessment

Name of SSSI	Distance from site (m)
Ladyhills	3,008
Nine Spring Dale	3,832
Stonepit and Nova Slacks	4,588
Wintringham Marsh	5,045

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- North Yorkshire Council.
- 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.

Operator

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

The regulated facility

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

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

The site

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

The 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 not within our screening distances for these designations.

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.

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

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

Monitoring

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

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

Reporting

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

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

Management system

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

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

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 04/06/2026 and ended on 02/07/2026.

Responses from organisations listed in the consultation section

Response received from UK Health Security Agency (dated 16/06/2026):

Brief summary of issues raised:

1. The main emissions of potential public health significance are emissions to air of bioaerosols, dust including particulate matter and ammonia. The applicant has included dust and accident management plans which outline a range of appropriate control and mitigation measures and, other than two operator owned dwellings, there are no other human health receptors within 500m of the site. Based on this, the applicant concludes that the risk to human health receptors is low.
   UKHSA is reassured that abatement measures outlined within the permit documentation will help reduce emissions to air from site processes and comply with permit guidance and conditions.
   The Environment Agency screen intensive livestock rearing units using a distance of 100m to the nearest sensitive receptor(s). This is based on a 2009 DEFRA report. Should it be identified by the applicant that there are sensitive receptors within 100m from the boundary of such units the applicant is required to carry out a bioaerosol risk assessment.

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.

Response received from Local Authority – Environmental Health/Environmental Protection department- North Yorkshire Council (dated 16/06/2026).

Brief summary of issues raised:

1. There are no sensitive residential receptors within 400m of the site, other than the operator dwellings at Kirby Wold House and Kirby Wold Cottage. The nearest non-associated dwelling, Thirkleby Manor, is located approximately 1.2km from the site. On this basis, the potential for dust, odour and noise emissions to adversely affect residential amenity is considered low.

   Dust and Bioaerosols:
   A Dust and Bioaerosol Management Plan (DBMP) has been submitted. This identifies potential emission sources, including broiler production, feed delivery and storage, bedding materials, ventilation, litter management and house clean-out activities. The DBMP sets out appropriate control measures to minimise emissions and includes provisions for recording and investigating complaints. It also states that the plan will be reviewed at least annually, or sooner in the event of complaints.

   Odour:
   An Odour Assessment has been provided, identifying potential sources including broiler housing, feed storage and delivery, bedding materials, ventilation systems, litter management and clean-out operations. These sources are assessed as not significant, or not significant if appropriately managed, in terms of odour annoyance risk.
   While suitable control measures are proposed, the assessment does not explicitly set out procedures for logging and investigating complaints, nor does it confirm whether the measures will be subject to regular review or updated in response to complaint investigations.

   Noise:
   A Noise and Vibration Assessment has been submitted, which considers sources such as vehicle movements, feed transfer, ventilation fans, alarms, generators, livestock, site personnel, and maintenance activities. The assessment outlines mitigation measures to minimise noise impacts. However, it does not clearly detail procedures for complaint logging and investigation, nor does it confirm that the assessment and associated controls will be reviewed in response to operational or structural changes or following any substantiated complaints.

Overall, provided that the proposed control measures for dust, odour, noise and pest management are implemented and maintained, the impact of the installation on residential amenity is likely to be minimal.

Summary of actions taken:

1. Dust and Bioaerosols:
   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.

   Odour:
   There are no sensitive receptors within 400m of the Installation boundary and so the Applicant was not required to submit an Odour Management Plan (OMP) as part of the application. In accordance with the guidance, the Applicant submitted an odour risk assessment, as outlined in the key issues section above. Measures to mitigate the potential risks from odour emissions have been identified in the assessment. The use of BAT and good practice will ensure emissions of odour are minimised. Furthermore, standard condition 3.3.1 concerning odour has been included in the permit. An OMP can be requested in future if deemed necessary.
   Based upon the information in the Application we are satisfied that the appropriate measures will be in place to prevent or where that is not practicable to minimise odour and to prevent pollution from odour beyond the Installation boundary and that activities will not give rise to significant pollution or harm to human health.

   Noise:
   There are no sensitive receptors within 400m of the Installation boundary and so the Applicant was not required to submit a Noise Management Plan (NMP) as part of the application. In accordance with the guidance, the

Applicant submitted a noise risk assessment, as outlined in the key issues section above. Measures to mitigate the potential risks from noise emissions have been identified in the assessment. The use of BAT and good practice will ensure emissions of noise are minimised. Furthermore, standard condition 3.4.1 concerning noise has been included in the permit. An NMP can be requested in future if deemed necessary.
Based upon the information in the Application, we are satisfied that the appropriate measures will be in place to prevent or where that is not practicable to minimise noise and to prevent pollution from noise beyond the Installation boundary and that activities will not give rise to significant pollution or harm to human health.

Representations from community and other organisations

Response received from Communities Against Factory Farming (CAFF) (dated 29/06/2026):

Brief summary of issues raised:

1. **Absence of Mandatory Environmental Statement (ES):**
   An Environmental Statement forms part of the Environment Impact Assessment (EIA). It is required as part of any planning application and is available on the public register. The Planning Decision Notice from North Yorkshire Council was submitted as part of the application. We have reviewed this and are satisfied that the Installation has been approved by the local planning authority.

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

   Odour:
   There are no sensitive receptors within 400m of the Installation boundary and so the Applicant was not required to submit an Odour Management Plan (OMP) as part of the application. In accordance with the guidance, the Applicant submitted an odour risk assessment, as outlined in the key issues section above. Measures to mitigate the potential risks from odour emissions have been identified in the assessment. The use of BAT and good practice will ensure emissions of odour are minimised. Furthermore, standard condition 3.3.1 concerning odour has been included in the permit. An OMP can be requested in future if deemed necessary.
   Based upon the information in the Application we are satisfied that the appropriate measures will be in place to prevent or where that is not practicable to minimise odour and to prevent pollution from odour beyond the Installation boundary and that activities will not give rise to significant pollution or harm to human health.

Noise:

There are no sensitive receptors within 400m of the Installation boundary and so the Applicant was not required to submit a Noise Management Plan (NMP) as part of the application. In accordance with the guidance, the Applicant submitted a noise risk assessment, as outlined in the key issues section above. Measures to mitigate the potential risks from noise emissions have been identified in the assessment. The use of BAT and good practice will ensure emissions of noise are minimised. Furthermore, standard condition 3.4.1 concerning noise has been included in the permit. An NMP can be requested in future if deemed necessary.

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

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.

3. **Drainage system and water use:**

The use of manual diverter valves is common practice for farming and in accordance with BAT and EPR 6.09 Sector Guidance Note. The drainage system's compliance to guidance will be reviewed during inspections. A Site Drainage Plan has been provided by the applicant to show the location of the diverter valves. We do not request details of dirty water tanks other than confirmation of compliance to SSAFO Regulations as this will be reviewed during inspections.

The Applicant has provided details regarding water use within their Minimising Water Use document. Applicants are not required to provide

details regarding the volume or source of water utilised at the installation as part of the EPR application. An assessment of 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 (SCR), covering protection of land and ground water, has been reviewed. We are satisfied that the risk to ground and surface waters is low.

4. **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.

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 cause significant pollution of the environment.

5. **Manure and waste management:**

The applicant has confirmed in the Technical Standards that manure is not stored on the installation. The land where manure may be spread does not form part of the installation and so manure exported from the installation for storage and spreading outside the installation is outside the scope of our determination. The EPR scope of regulation is limited to preventing significant pollution from emissions from the installation. Emissions are substances released from the installation whilst something exported in a controlled manner for subsequent use elsewhere is not considered an emission. The latter includes manure removed as part of poultry house cleanouts.

The installation boundary for permitted farms typically includes the livestock housing, any yard and associated infrastructure but does not routinely include wider adjacent land. Whilst on farm slurry and manure management, yard run off and drainage are regulated by the permit, the spreading of manures and slurry to land (and the associated potential for water quality impacts) is primarily regulated through separate regulatory regimes namely the Reduction and Prevention of Agricultural Diffuse Pollution (England) Regulations (Farming Rules for Water), and, in designated areas, the Nitrate Pollution Prevention Regulations.

The Applicant has confirmed that the manure will be spread to operator-controlled land in accordance with the Code of Good Agricultural Practice, or in accordance with the manure management plan for the receiving land.

6. **Absence of management plans:**
   As mentioned previously, there are no sensitive receptors within 400m of the Installation boundary and so the Applicant was not required to submit an Odour Management Plan (OMP) or Noise Management Plan (NMP) as part of the application. A Dust and Bio aerosol Management Plan has been submitted and is reviewed in the key issues section of this document.

7. **Biomass boiler emissions:**
   The poultry houses are heated with a 1.15MWth biomass boiler. Although the biomass boiler meets the thermal input capacity threshold of >1MWth for Medium Combustion Plant, the boiler has been in operation prior to December 2018, and therefore it is classed as existing plant resulting in it falling outside of the requirements of the Medium Combustion Plant Directive. We will undertake a separate review to ensure all existing MCP plants between 1-5 MW thermal input are subject to assessment and permitting by legal compliance date of 01/01/2029.
   Due to all of the above, an air emissions assessment is not required. Further information on the biomass boiler risk assessment for this specific installation can be found in the key issues section above.

8. **Requirement for a Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Assessment:**
   A Greenhouse Gas Assessment is not required as part of the EPR permit application.

9. **Concerns for BAT Conclusions compliance:**
   The Applicant has confirmed that the installation will meet the requirements of ‘How to Comply with your Environmental Permit for Intensive Farming’ EPR 6.09 (version 2) and the BAT conclusions, and we consider this will be the case. We are satisfied that the installation complies with the 2017 Intensive Farming BAT conclusions, as we have outlined in our assessment detailed within the Key Issues section of this document. The Installation will be checked as part of compliance visits by our site inspector and any concerns raised will need to be addressed by the Operator to ensure compliance with the permit.

10. **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. 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.

11. **National or global food security and sustainability goals:**
    National or global food security and sustainability goals do not fall within the scope of this 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.

12. **Public health and amenity:**
    We are satisfied following a review of the information provided by the Applicant, and the conditions present within the Permit, that on-site operations will not have a significant impact on the health or amenity of local residents.

13. **Imported soy for animal feed and the environmental consequences:**
    This is not an issue under the Environment Agency's regulatory responsibility. It does not therefore fall within the scope of the Permit determination.

14. **Risk of zoonotic disease and bird flu:**
    The birds will be kept indoors at all times so therefore it is extremely unlikely that they will contract Avian flu. Effective biosecurity measures will also ensure that the likelihood of disease will be low. We are satisfied that the risk of pollution of the environment or harm to human health from the activities at the site are not likely to be significant. Our compliance team will ensure all relevant precautions are actioned in the event of any cases of Avian flu.

15. **Use of antibiotics:**
    The use of antibiotics does not fall within the regulatory responsibility of the Environment Agency.

Representations from individual members of the public

Eighty-three 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 and noise issues**:
    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. **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.

Roof water from poultry houses one to four and water draining from the yard (excluding periods of washout when water from the yard drains to the underground dirty water tanks) is intercepted by French drains under the eaves of all poultry houses and act as soakaways. The French drains located adjacent to poultry houses three and four lead to a soakaway east of poultry houses three and four. Therefore, there is no discharge directly to groundwater 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.

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