Permitting Decisions - Bespoke Permit

We have decided to grant the permit for **Rise Hill Farm** operated by **Mr Robert Read.**

The permit number is **EPR/MP3527MG**.

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 new intensive farming Installation:

Rise Hill Farm is a new green field farm Installation for 64,000 free range layers for the production of free-range eggs, housed in 2 poultry houses with high velocity roof fan extraction. The poultry houses are operated as a multi-tier system.

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 their BAT document and dated 10/08/2026, 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 **0.8** kg N/animal place/year and will use BAT 3a technique reducing the crude protein content.

BAT 4 Nutritional management - Phosphorus excretion

The Applicant has confirmed it will demonstrate that the Installation can achieve levels of phosphorus excretion below the required BAT-AEL of **0.45** kg P_2O_5/animal place/year and will use BAT 4a technique reducing the crude protein content.

BAT 24 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Total nitrogen and phosphorus excretion

Table S3.3 of the permit concerning process monitoring requires the Operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT Conclusions.

This will be verified by means of manure analysis and reported annually.

BAT 25 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters – Ammonia emissions

Table S3.3 of the permit concerning process monitoring requires the Operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT Conclusions.

The Applicant has confirmed they will report the ammonia emissions to the Environment Agency annually by utilising estimation by using emission factors.

BAT 26 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Odour emissions

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

• The staff will perform a weekly boundary walk to check the surrounding area for high levels of odour. Checks will also be performed on the surrounding area by persons who do not regularly work on the farm.

• 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 31 Ammonia emissions from poultry houses - Laying hens

The BAT-AEL to be complied with is 0.13 kg NH_3/animal place/year. The Applicant will meet this as the emission factor for layers with multi-tier type housing is 0.073 kg NH_3/animal place/year.

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 this Installation dated 10/08/26, demonstrates that there are no hazards or likely pathway to land or groundwater and no historic contamination on site that may present a hazard from the same contaminants. Therefore, on the basis of the risk assessment presented in the SCR, we accept that they have not provided base line reference data for the soil and groundwater at the site at this stage and although condition 3.1.3 is included in the permit no groundwater monitoring will be required.

Odour management

Intensive farming is by its nature a potentially odorous activity. This is recognised in our 'Intensive pig and poultry farming: How to comply with your permit' 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 nine sensitive receptors within 400m of the Installation boundary, the nearest sensitive receptor (the nearest point of their assumed property boundary) is approximately 224 metres to the northwest of the Installation boundary.

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 risk assessment for the Installation provided with the application lists key potential risks of odour pollution beyond the Installation boundary and relevant control measures to minimise odour pollution.

Odour Management Plan Review

The Operator has provided an OMP (submitted 01/11/2026) and this has been assessed against the requirements of 'Intensive pig and poultry farming: how to comply with your permit' guidance and our Top Tips Guidance, as well as the site-specific circumstances at the Installation. We consider that the OMP is acceptable because it complies with the above guidance, with details of odour control measures, contingency measures and complaint procedures described below.

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

This is a green field site so there is no odour complaint history linked to this new Installation.

The OMP also provides a suitable procedure in the event that complaints are made to the Operator. The OMP is required to be reviewed at least every year (as committed to in the OMP) and/or after a complaint is received, and/or after any changes to operations at the Installation, whichever is the sooner. The OMP includes contingency measures to minimise odour pollution during abnormal operations. A list of remedial measures is included in the contingency plan, including triggers for commencing and ceasing use of these measures.

The Environment Agency has reviewed the OMP and considers it complies with the requirements of our Odour management guidance note. We agree with the scope and suitability of key measures, but this should not be taken as confirmation that the details

of equipment specification design, operation and maintenance are suitable and sufficient. That remains the responsibility of the Operator.

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

Conclusion

We have assessed the OMP and conclude that the Applicant has followed the guidance set out in 'Intensive pig and poultry farming: how to comply with your permit'. 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 'Intensive pig and poultry farming: How to comply with your permit' 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 and relevant control measures to minimise noise pollution.

Noise Management Plan Review

The final NMP provided by applicant and assessed below was received as part of the application supporting documentation on 01/11/2026.

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.

This is a green field site so there is no noise complaint history linked to this new Installation.

We have included our standard noise and vibration condition, condition 3.4.1, in the Permit, which requires that emissions from the activities shall be free from noise and vibration at levels likely to cause pollution outside the site, as perceived by an authorised officer of the Environment Agency, unless the Operator has used appropriate measures, including, but not limited to, those specified in any approved NMP (which is captured through condition 2.3 and Table S1.2 of the Permit), to prevent or where that is not practicable to minimise the noise and vibration.

We are satisfied that the manner in which operations are carried out on the Installation will minimise the risk of noise pollution.

Conclusion

We have assessed the NMP for noise and conclude that the Applicant has followed the guidance set out in 'Intensive pig and poultry farming: how to comply with your permit'. 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

There are no relevant receptors within 100 metres of the Installation boundary and therefore there is no requirement for a dust and bioaerosol management plan for this Installation.

Standby generator

There is one standby generator with a net thermal rated input of 0.485 MWth and it will not be tested more than 50 hours per year or operated (including testing) for more than 500 hours per year (averaged over 3 years) for emergency use only as a temporary power source if there is a mains power failure.

Ammonia

The Applicant has demonstrated that the housing will meet the relevant NH_3 BAT-AEL for laying hens.

There are no Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) / Special Protection Areas (SPA) / Ramsar sites located within 5 kilometres (km) of the Installation boundary. There are three Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) located within 5 km of the Installation

boundary. There are also eight Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) and eight Ancient Woodlands (AW) 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 (AST v4.6) dated 20/07/2026 has indicated that emissions from this Installation will only have a potential impact on SSSI's with a precautionary CLe of 1 µg/m^3 if they are within **816 metres** of the emission source.

Beyond **816 m** the PC is less than 0.2 µg/m^3 (i.e. less than 20% of the precautionary 1 µg/m^3 CLe) and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case all 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)
Woodhall Spa Golf Course	3,493
Moor Farm	3,791
Kirkby Moor	4,993

No further assessment is required.

Ammonia assessment – LWS / AW.

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

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

Initial screening using the Ammonia Screening Tool (AST v4.6 (dated 20/07/2026) has indicated that emissions from Rise Hill Farm will only have a potential impact on the LWS /AW sites with a precautionary CLe of 1 µg/m^3 if they are within **280 m** of the emission source.

Beyond **280 m** the PC is less than 1 µg/m^3 and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case all LWS / AWs are beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

Table 2 – LWS / AW Assessment

Site	Distance from site (m)
Thornton Wood LWS	1,312
Ash Holt, Roughton LWS	1,666
High Dar Wood LWS	2,018*
The Wilderness, Roughton LWS	2,075*
Highall Wood LWS	2,159*
Edlington Scrubbs LWS	2,169*
The Spa Trail LWS	2,175*
Low Dar Wood LWS	2,349*
Thornton Wood AW	1,312
Ash Holt AW	1,800
High Dar Wood AW	2,017*
The Wilderness AW	2,075*
White Hall Wood AW	2,086*
Highall Wood AW	2,159*
Low Dar Wood AW	2,347*
Roughton Scrubs AW	2,503*

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

No further assessment is required.

Decision considerations

Confidential information

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

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:

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

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

Operator

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

The regulated facility

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

The extent of the facilities are 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 plan is included in the permit.

Site condition report

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

We have advised the Operator what measures they need to take to improve the site condition report.

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 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 ‘Intensive pig and poultry farming: how to comply with your permit’ guidance and we consider them to represent appropriate techniques for the facility. The permit conditions ensure compliance with The Best Available Techniques (BAT) Reference document (BREF) for the Intensive Rearing of Poultry or Pigs (IRPP) published on 21st February 2017.

Odour management

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

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

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

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

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

Noise management

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

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

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

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

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

Emission limits

Emission Limit Values (ELVs) have been added for the following substances:

- Ammonia atmospheric emissions
- Phosphorous content within manure
- Nitrogen content within manure

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 included in order to ensure compliance with Intensive Farming 2017 BAT conclusions.

Based on the information in the application we are satisfied that the Operator's techniques, personnel and equipment have either MCERTS certification or MCERTS accreditation as appropriate.

Reporting

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

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.

A full review of the management system is undertaken during compliance checks.

Previous performance

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

No relevant convictions were found.

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.

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 **21/08/2026** and ended on **21/09/2026.**

Representations from individual members of the public

One public response received 17/09/2026.

Ammonia screening and habitat protection

Response

Following issues were raised:

- Screening criteria for European/Ramsar sites.
- General screening criteria for differing habitat sites.
- In-combination assessment criteria.
- Relevant emission factor; confirmation how free-range poultry ammonia impact assessments are carried out in a robust manure.
- Poultry house ventilation; issue raised was to confirm accuracy of ventilation to ensure correct input data into screening assessment.

Actions taken

- Screening criteria for European/Ramsar sites.
  There are no European/Ramsar sites within the relevant screening distance of 5 km of this Installation. Therefore, no assessment of such habitat sites is required for this Installation.

- General screening criteria for differing habitat sites and in-combination assessment criteria.
  The screening criteria and in-combination assessment criteria for intensive farming habitat assessments are outlined on gov.uk link below.
  https://www.gov.uk/guidance/intensive-farming-risk-assessment-for-your-environmental-permit#ammonia-screening-assessment

- Free range laying hens' ammonia emission factors:

The barn reared emission factor for laying hens in multi-tier housing is 0.073 kg NH_3/animal place/year. The free-range equivalent emission factor is 0.090 kg NH_3/animal place/year.
We have undergone a review of the simplest approach for initial screening for free range laying hen applications. The conclusion is that for initial screening a robust approach based on the new ranging and housing emission factors as published in November 2024 and the revised 90% to 10% housing to ranging time ratio, assuming all emissions come from the housing when screening with the AST screening tool will be appropriate.

The published data is in the gov.uk link below:
https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ammonia-emission-factors-for-pig-and-poultry-screening-modelling-and-reporting

Hence the usage of the 0.073 kg NH_3/animal place/year is appropriate here for this Installation.
No further actions required.

- Ventilation type.
  The Applicant has confirmed that the ventilation for the poultry houses is high velocity roof ventilation with a minimum stack height of 5.5 metres and 11 m/s efflux velocity. The stated stack height of 6.7 metres is above the minimum required of 5.5 metres.
  No further actions required.

2. Manure management

Response

- Concerns raised linked to storage of manure and management of manure beyond Installation boundary and correct procedures to minimise pollution.
- Further concerns raised linked to rainwater containment and run off from ranging area plus manure belt discharge in a contained manner.

Actions taken

- There is no manure stored within the Installation boundary.

- In terms of manure management, the Operator response dated 01/11/2026 confirms the following:

  Litter from the free-range unit will be utilised as fertilizer on the operator's land. Operator has 2,000 acres of land in their ownership, currently they are importing broiler litter for use as fertiliser, this would be substituted for the litter from the free-range unit. All fertiliser usage (including poultry litter) is applied and recorded as per the farms manure management plan in accordance with both NVZ regulations and the code of good practice for Soil, Water and Air.

Where weather or soil conditions or closed spreading periods prevent spreading operations, the litter would be removed from the Installation and stored in temporary (no more than 12 months) “A” shaped field heaps (sheeted) away from hedges or water courses and not over field drains.

- Rainwater Containment

  The Operator response dated 01/11/2026 has confirmed the following:

  All roof rainwater is directed to the French drain system piped to the soakaways at the ends of the poultry houses. With high velocity roof extraction fans, the roof water is deemed as clean. Central yard area has gradients directing all water to a drain which has a diverter valve to direct water either to the dirty water tank or to the French drain/soakaway system.

  In addition, the Operator has provided data on the dirty water tanks system volume, which confirms to our satisfaction that suitable dirty water storage capacity is available for this Installation.

- Measures to minimise impact of run off of manure from ranging area

  The Operator response dated 01/11/2026 has confirmed the following:

  - The base of the pop holes are 25cm above both internal and external floor levels, preventing any litter spilling out from the poultry houses.

  - A concrete strip runs along the sides of each poultry house under the pop holes; this is cleaned twice weekly to prevent contaminated run off and to ensure egg cleanliness. A further strip of crushed stone is on the outside of the concrete areas preventing soil erosion. Grass ranging area beyond the crushed stone is segregated into rotational paddocks preventing run off. All watercourses, ditches and ponds are fenced off to exclude the birds with 5m buffer strips of grass to prevent any contamination. Ranging areas close to the poultry houses are aerated twice annually to assist drainage and prevent run off.

- Measures to maximise containment of manure at manure belt discharge

  The Applicant response confirmed in their response dated 02/11/2026 the following measures are in place:
  Litter belts are operated twice weekly; litter belt elevators are fitted with chutes to direct the litter directly into the receiving trailer preventing dust being blown onto concrete. In the event of rain during the operation of the belts, the diverter valve on the drainage system would be set to containment to the dirty water tank as a precaution. Operations are monitored at all times and any spillages cleared up immediately.

In conclusion we are satisfied that suitable measures are in place to minimise risk of pollution from manure linked to this Installation.

3. Odour

Response

General concerns raised linked to gable end fans and clean out procedures to minimise odour pollution.

Actions taken

A revised Odour Management Plan was requested and received 01/11/2026 with a review of actions to minimise odour pollution linked to the following:

- Gable fan usage directions relevant to local resident locations.
- Clean out exact means of litter removal during poultry house clear out with minimum odour risk linked to local resident locations.
- Clean out exact measures to minimise odour pollution during poultry house wash downs linked to local resident locations.

We are satisfied that the measures taken will minimise odour pollution from this Installation beyond the boundary.

4. Noise

Response

General concerns raised linked to minimising time periods of potentially noisy activities.

Actions taken

A revised Noise Management Plan was requested and received 01/11/2026 with a review of such timings to minimise noise pollution linked to the Installation.

We are satisfied that the measures taken will minimise noise pollution from this Installation beyond the boundary.

5.Standby Generator

Response: A concern was raised that separate application documents state different thermal input capacities for the standby generator linked to this new Installation.

Actions taken

We requested confirmation of the accurate thermal input capacity and the Applicant responded stating the correct value was 0.485 KWth. They have provided an updated non-technical summary to confirm this (dated 25/10/2026).

6. General Environmental Compliance

Response: Please ensure that the final permit and incorporated operating techniques clearly secure the pollution controls relied upon in determining the application with appropriate reporting, inspection and incident response requirements.

Action taken

The final permit references appropriate operating techniques in Table S1.2. Further the permit includes reporting requirements and incident response conditions.

Our compliance team then will undergo regular site inspections to ensure the new Operator complies with the permit.

Overall, we are satisfied that the permit reflects the accurate operating techniques and suitable conditions are in place to ensure correct reporting, inspection and response to incidents within this Installation.

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

East Lindsey District County Council Environmental Protection sent a response dated **26/08/2026**, stating they had no comments to make.

In addition, there were no other public or community group or any other responses.