Permitting Decisions - Variation

We have decided to grant the variation for Beck House Poultry Farm operated by Mr John Howard Mitchinson & Mrs Barbara Mitchinson.

The variation number is EPR/LP3530UB/V006.

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

Overview of application: this substantial variation is to increase the permitted capacity from 426,000 broiler places to 506,000 broiler places, with two new poultry houses built on Site 2, each with the capacity for 40,000 birds, fitted with high velocity ridge fans, baffled gable end fans and heat exchangers. There is an increase in the permitted boundary of Site 2 to accommodate the new poultry houses. An additional standby generator is also added at Site 2, with a thermal input capacity of 0.3MWth (making a total of four standby generators on site). Removal of emission point for the incinerator on Site 1 (incinerator on Site 2 remaining).

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 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 their revised document reference HWD-R03-F1 BAT Assessment and received 04/05/2026 (submitted with in response to a request for further information), which has been referenced in Table S1.2 - Operating Techniques of the permit.

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

BAT 3 Nutritional management - Nitrogen excretion

The Applicant has confirmed it will demonstrate that the installation can achieve levels of nitrogen excretion below the required BAT AEL of 0.6 kg N/animal place/year.

BAT 4 Nutritional management - Phosphorus excretion

The Applicant has confirmed it will demonstrate that the installation can achieve levels of phosphorus excretion below the required BAT AEL of 0.25 kg P_2O_5/animal place/year.

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

Only applicable where an OMP is required and/or nuisance complaints have been substantiated. In this instance there are no sensitive receptors within 400m (excluding those owned or occupied by people associated with the installation) and there are no known nuisance issues for odour therefore no further details 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 (broilers)

A BAT Associated Emission Level (AEL) provides us with a performance benchmark to determine whether an activity is BAT. The BAT Conclusions include a set of BAT AELs for ammonia emissions to air from animal housing for broilers.

'New plant' is defined as plant first permitted at the site of the farm following the publication of the BAT Conclusions.

For variations all new housing on existing farms will need to meet the BAT AEL. Existing housing BAT compliance has been subject to a sector review.

Industrial Emissions Directive (IED)

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

Groundwater and soil monitoring

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

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

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

- The environmental risk assessment identifies no hazards to land or groundwater; or

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

The revised site condition report (SCR) for Beck House Poultry Farm received 04/05/2026 (and dated 29/04/2026) 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 3.3.1 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 there are sensitive receptors (sensitive receptors in this instance excludes properties associated with the farm) within 400m of the installation boundary. In this instance we do not require an OMP as no relevant sensitive receptors have been identified within 400m of the installation.

Because we have not required an OMP, condition 3.3.2 has been included:

"The operator shall:

(a) if notified by the Environment Agency that the activities are giving rise to pollution outside the site due to odour, submit to the Environment Agency for approval within the period specified, an odour management plan which identifies and minimises the risks of pollution from odour; and

(b) implement the approved odour management plan, from the date of approval, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Environment Agency."

The risk assessment for the installation provided with the application lists key potential risks of odour pollution beyond the installation boundary. These activities included odour from the poultry housing, litter and dirty water removal, standby generators, transportation of livestock and litter management.

Conclusion

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

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 3.4.1 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 there are sensitive receptors (sensitive receptors in this instance excludes properties associated with the farm) within 400m of the installation boundary. In this instance we do not require an NMP as no sensitive receptors have been identified within 400m of the installation.

Because we have not required an NMP, condition 4.3.2 has been included:

"The operator shall:

(a) if notified by the Environment Agency that the activities are giving rise to pollution outside the site due to noise and vibration, submit to the Environment Agency for approval within the period specified, a noise

and vibration management plan which identifies and minimises the risks of pollution from noise and vibration; and

(b) implement the approved noise and vibration management plan, from the date of approval, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Environment Agency."

The risk assessment for the installation lists key potential risks of noise pollution beyond the installation boundary. These activities include livestock and associated transport, poultry housing, vehicles collecting litter and dirty water, standby generators and feed and fuel delivery.

Conclusion

We are satisfied that the manner in which operations are carried out on the Installation will minimise the risk of noise pollution, 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 dust and bioaerosol management plan provided by the applicant and assessed below was received on 07/10/2025, in support of the application duly made on 08/10/2025.

There are two sensitive receptors within 100m of the installation boundary:

- Beckstones Farm (its assumed property boundary including garden) is located directly to the south of the Site 1 installation boundary, adjacent to poultry house 2.
- Beck House (its assumed property boundary) is approximately 10m metres to the north of the Site 2 installation boundary, and approximately 50 metres from the nearest poultry house 7.

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:

- Bedding
- Day-to-day activities
- Feed type, delivery, storage, feed spill control, feeding method
- Ventilation
- House cleaning operations
- Building design
- Litter management

Conclusion

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

Standby generator

There are four standby generators; two at Site 1 with thermal input capacities of 0.31 MWth and 0.3 MWth respectively and two at Site 2 with thermal input capacities of 0.36 MWth and 0.3MWth. The applicant has confirmed in their response to a request for further information (requested 16/04/2026, response received 04/05/2026) that three were already installed across the two sites, with the fourth installed at Site 2 as part of this variation (please note: the last consolidated permit EPR/LP3530UB/V004 issued in 2015 only included two standby generators, one at each site).

Each standby generator will not be tested for more than 50 hours per annum or operated for more than 500 hours per annum, including testing, averaged over a 3 year period. They will only be used for emergency power supply in the event of a mains power failure.

Heat exchangers

Heat exchangers are being fitted on new poultry houses 10 and 11 introduced 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.

The Applicant has not claimed a reduction of ammonia emissions from the use of heat exchangers at this installation site.

Ammonia

There is one Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and one Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) located within 5 km of the installation boundary. There are also five other nature conservations sites, comprising of one Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and four Ancient Woodlands (AW) within 2 km of the installation boundary.

Ammonia assessment – SAC

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

- If, using the Ammonia Screening Tool (AST v4.6) the process contribution (PC) is below 4% of the relevant critical level (CLe) or critical load (CLo) then the farm can be permitted with no further assessment.
- Where this threshold is exceeded, detailed ammonia modelling is required, and, if the PC from such modelling is below 1% of the relevant critical level (CLe) or critical loads (CLo) then the farm can be permitted with no further assessment.
- Where the PC (after modelling) exceeds 1%, further detailed assessment is required, taking into consideration the ammonia and nitrogen background concentrations and may also require an in-combination assessment.
- For variation applications, where the PC (after modelling) exceeds 1%, but detailed modelling of both the baseline and proposal indicate the incremental increase of PC < 1%, then the farm can be permitted with no further assessment.
- Where an in-combination assessment is required, the combined PC for all relevant existing permitted installations identified within 5 km of the SAC/SPA/Ramsar will be considered, together with impacts from other local plans, projects, and non-permitted farms which could act in-

combination. The in-combination assessment is limited to those impacts not already included in the relevant background emission baseline.

River Eden SAC

Detailed ammonia modelling (reference Appendix 1 - AS Modelling & Data Ltd Ammonia Modelling Report, dated 25/08/2025, within document HWD-R02-F2 Environmental Risk Assessment (ERA), submitted on 04/05/2026 in response to a request for further information (please note: the modelling report was not changed since original submission of ERA application)) has determined that the incremental increase of process contributions of ammonia emissions, nitrogen deposition and acid deposition at the River Eden SAC from Beck House Poultry Farm are less than the 1% insignificance threshold.

It is therefore possible to conclude no likely significant effect.

Detailed modelling provided by the Applicant has been audited by AQMAU and we have confidence that we can agree with the report conclusions.

The worst-case modelled process contributions (at receptor 16) are summarised in tables below:

Table 1 – Ammonia emissions (comparison of existing and proposed sites)

Site	Critical level ammonia µg/m^3	Predicted process contribution µg/m^3	% of critical level
River Eden SAC (existing (baseline))	1*	0.02	2.05
River Eden SAC (proposal)	1*	0.025	2.47
Incremental increase			**0.42%**

* Natural England advised that a CLe of 1 µg/m^3 for ammonia should be applied to the River Eden SAC (11/02/2026)

Table 2 – Nitrogen deposition (comparison of existing and proposed sites)

Site	Critical load kg N/ha/yr	Predicted process contribution kg N/ha/yr	% of critical load
River Eden SAC (existing (baseline))	10*	0.11	1.1
River Eden SAC (proposal)	10*	0.13	1.3
Incremental increase			**0.2%**

* Natural England advised that a CLo of 10 kg/ha/yr for nitrogen deposition should be applied to the River Eden SAC (11/02/2026)

The modelling report did not include PCs for acid deposition, therefore we have estimated the PC by dividing the PC for nitrogen deposition by 14:

Table 3 – Acid deposition (comparison of existing and proposed sites)

Site	Critical load keq/ha/yr	Predicted process contribution keq/ha/yr	% of critical load
River Eden SAC (existing (baseline))	0.502*	0.0079	1.57
River Eden SAC (proposal)	0.502*	0.0093	1.85
Incremental increase			**0.28%**

* Natural England advised that a CLo of 0.502 keq/ha/yr for acid deposition should be applied to the River Eden SAC (11/02/2026)

No further assessment is required.

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.

Screening using the ammonia screening tool version 4.6 (updated 02/04/2026) has indicated that emissions from Beck House Poultry Farm will only have a potential impact on SSSIs with a precautionary CLe of 1 µg/m^3 if they are within 1,541 metres of the emission source.

Beyond 1,541m 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 the SSSI is 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 4 – SSSI Assessment

Name of SSSI	Distance from site (m)
River Eden and Tributaries	4,064

No further assessment is required.

Ammonia assessment – LWS / AW

The following trigger thresholds have been applied for the assessment of these sites:

- If the process contribution (PC) is below 100% of the relevant critical level (CLe) or critical load (CLo) then the farm can be permitted with no further assessment.

Screening using ammonia screening tool version 4.6 (updated 02/04/2026) has indicated that emissions from Beck House Poultry Farm will only have a potential impact on the LWS and AWs with a precautionary CLe of 1 μg/m^3 if they are within 528m of the emission source.

Beyond 528m the PC is less than 1 μg/m^3 and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case all LWS and AWs are beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

Table 5 – LWS / AW Assessment

Site	Distance from site (m)
Wreay Hall Woods LWS	2,294*
Gill Beck Wood AW	1,107
Raughtonguill Wood AW	2,004*
Nebsters Wood AW	2,149*
Unnamed woodland AW	2,294*

*these sites are included at > 2km because the screening is based on an approximate centre point of emissions and includes a buffer distance calculated from this centre point to the furthest point of the installation boundary to ensure all nature conservation sites within the threshold distance from the installation boundary have been included in the assessment.

No further assessment is required.

Decision considerations

Confidential information

A claim for commercial or industrial confidentiality has not been made.

Identifying confidential information

We have not identified information provided as part of the application that we consider to be confidential.

The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on confidentiality.

Consultation

The consultation requirements were identified in accordance with the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations (2016) and our public participation statement.

The application was publicised on the GOV.UK website.

We consulted the following organisations:

- Health and Safety Executive
- Westmorland and Furness Council Environmental Health
- UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA)
- Director of Public Health

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

The regulated facility

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

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

The site

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

The 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.

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

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

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

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

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

We have not consulted Natural England on our Habitats Regulation Stage 1 assessment, however we have sent it to Natural England for information only on 15/06/2026.

The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance.

Environmental risk

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

The Operator’s risk assessment is satisfactory.

General operating techniques

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

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

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

Odour management

We do not require an OMP as no relevant sensitive receptors have been identified within 400m of the installation.

Noise management

We do not require an NMP as no relevant sensitive receptors have been identified within 400m of the installation.

Dust and bioaerosol management

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

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

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

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

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

Updating permit conditions during consolidation

We have updated permit conditions to those in the current generic permit template as part of permit consolidation. The conditions will provide the same level of protection as those in the previous permits.

Emission limits

Emission limits have not been amended or deleted as a result of this variation.

Monitoring

Monitoring has not changed as a result of this variation.

Reporting

Reporting has not changed as a result of this variation.

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 16/10/2025 and ended on13/11/2025*.

(*agreed to extend the deadline for UKHSA)

Responses from organisations listed in the consultation section

Response from Westmorland and Furness Council Environmental Health received 30/10/2025.

Brief summary of issues raised: stated they had no comments to make with regards to this application.

Summary of actions taken: no action required.

Response from UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) received 04/12/2025.

Brief summary of issues raised: the main emissions of potential public health significance are emissions to air of bioaerosols, dust including particulate matter and ammonia. However, we are reassured that the application proposes multiple emission reduction measures and adherence with these proposals should ensure that the residual public health risks remain low. The UKHSA made the following recommendations:

- The applicant has demonstrated that the long-term EAL *(Environmental Assessment Level)* for ammonia is not likely to be exceeded. However, the short term EAL was not assessed. Therefore, we recommend the Environment Agency should satisfy itself that the short-term EAL does not require further assessment.

- UKHSA would like to highlight that there is a farmhouse, 30 metres north of the proposed site that is used by staff. It is unclear if there are individuals residing at the property. The Environment Agency should satisfy itself that a bioaerosol risk assessment is not required considering the farmhouse is within 100 metres of the proposed site.

The UKHSA response also included a section on bioaerosols which stated that it is assumed by UKHSA that the installation will comply in all respects with the requirements of the permit, including the application of Best Available Techniques (BAT). This should ensure that emissions present a low risk to human health.

Summary of actions taken:

We have completed an intensive farm installation ammonia impact assessment for nature conservation sites within the relevant thresholds in line with our guidance; see Key Issues Ammonia section above. We do not consider the short term EAL in our assessment.

We identified two properties within 100m and these were taken into account in our determination. The applicant submitted a dust and bioaerosol management plan (received on 07/10/2025, in support of the application duly made on 08/10/2025), please refer to Key Issues, Dust and bioaerosols management section above. Appropriate measures to mitigate the potential risks from emissions have been identified in the plan. The use of Best Available Techniques and good practice will ensure minimisation of emissions. Furthermore, standard condition 3.2.1 concerning fugitive emissions has been included in the permit.

The Health and Safety Executive and Director of Public Health were also consulted but no responses were received and in addition there were no other responses from members of the public or other relevant groups.