

Permitting decisions

Variation

We have decided to grant the variation for Bradeley Farm operated by Dinnawell Limited.

The variation number is EPR/UP3832NZ/V004.

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

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 checklist](#) to show how all 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. The introductory note summarises what the variation covers.

Key issues of the decision

New Intensive Rearing of Poultry or Pigs BAT Conclusions document

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

The BAT Conclusions document is as per the following link

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32017D0302&from=EN>

Now the BAT Conclusions are published **all new housing within variation applications** issued after the 21st February 2017 must be compliant in full from the first day of operation.

There are some new requirements for permit holders. The conclusions include BAT Associated Emission Levels for ammonia emissions which will apply to the majority of permits, as well as BAT associated levels for nitrogen and phosphorous excretion.

For some types of rearing practices stricter standards will apply to farms and housing permitted after the new BAT Conclusions are published.

This variation determination includes a review only of BAT compliance for new housing introduced with this variation. A BAT review of existing housing compliance with BAT conclusions document is to be the subject of a sector permit review and is beyond the scope of this variation application permit determination.

New BAT conclusions review

There are 33 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 document reference 'Technical Standards Bradeley Farm' dated 21/03/18.

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

BAT measure	Applicant compliance measure
BAT 3 - Nutritional management Nitrogen excretion	The Applicant has confirmed it will demonstrate it achieves levels of Nitrogen excretion below the required BAT-AEL of 0.6 kg N/animal place/year by an estimation using manure analysis for total Nitrogen content. This confirmation was provided within document reference 'Technical Standards Bradeley Farm' dated 21/03/18, which has been referenced in Table S1.2 Operating Techniques of the Permit. Table S3.3 of the Permit concerning process monitoring requires the Operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT Conclusions.
BAT 4 Nutritional management Phosphorous excretion	The Applicant has confirmed it will demonstrate it achieves levels of Phosphorous excretion below the required BAT-AEL of 0.25 kg P ₂ O ₅ animal place/year by an estimation using manure analysis for total Phosphorous content. This confirmation was provided within document reference 'Technical Standards Bradeley Farm' dated 21/03/18, which has been referenced in Table S1.2 Operating Techniques of the Permit. Table S3.3 of the Permit concerning process monitoring requires the Operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT Conclusions. The applicant's approach to meet this limit is detailed in BAT 3 above.
BAT 24 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters	Table S3.3 Process monitoring requires the operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT conclusions.

BAT measure	Applicant compliance measure
- Total nitrogen and phosphorous excretion	
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.
BAT 26 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Odour emissions	The approved OMP includes the following details for on Farm Monitoring and Continual Improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the event of substantiated odour complaints being received, twice daily olfactory checks coinciding with stock inspections (normally 07:00 – 10:00 hrs and 16:00 – 18:00 hrs), with any abnormalities recorded and investigated. - Following fugitive odour release, the operator will review the OMP and document any changes and submit the reviewed OMP to the Environment Agency for approval.
BAT 27 Monitoring of emissions and process parameters - Dust emissions	Table S3.3 Process monitoring requires the operator to undertake relevant monitoring that complies with these BAT conclusions.
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 0.034 kg NH ₃ /animal place/year. Ammonia emissions will be reported annually through estimation using emission factors. The Installation does not include an air abatement treatment facility, hence the standard emission factor complies with the BAT AEL.

More detailed assessment of specific BAT measures

Ammonia emission controls

A BAT Associated Emission Level (AEL) provides us with a performance benchmark to determine whether an activity is BAT.

Ammonia emission controls – BAT conclusion 32

The new BAT conclusions include a set of BAT-AEL's for ammonia emissions to air from animal housing for broilers.

For variations all new housing on existing farms will need to meet the BAT-AEL.

Industrial Emissions Directive (IED)

The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) (Amendment) Regulations 2013 were made on the 20 February 2013 and came into force on 27 February 2013. These Regulations transpose the requirements of the 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 Bradeley Farm (dated 02/03/18) 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

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: (http://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/297084/geho0110brsb-e-e.pdf).

Condition 3.3 of the environmental permit reads as follows:

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

Under section 3.3 of the guidance an Odour Management Plan (OMP) is required to be approved as part of the permitting process, if as is the case here, sensitive receptors (sensitive receptors in this instance excludes properties associated with the farm) are within 400m of the Installation boundary. It is appropriate to require an OMP when such sensitive receptors have been identified within 400m of the installation to prevent, or where that is not practicable, to minimise the risk of pollution from odour emissions.

The risk assessment for the Installation provided with the Application lists key potential risks of odour pollution beyond the Installation boundary. These activities are as follows: feed manufacture, selection, delivery and storage, ventilation and heating systems, litter management, carcass disposal, house clean out, washing operations including vehicles, fugitive emissions, dirty water management, abnormal operations, waste production and storage and other material storage.

Odour Management Plan Review

The variation application is to increase the poultry numbers from 200,000 to 400,000 broiler places, to increase the number of bird buildings from four to eight, to construct a second attenuation pond, add a second biomass boiler (bringing the aggregated thermal input to 1.99MWth) and to extend the site boundary to the north east of the site to make space for these changes.

The closest relevant receptor is Dinnawell Cottage at SO 59500 94833 approximately 125m south west of the installation boundary.

Therefore, an Odour Management Plan (OMP) is formally required under our guidance.

It is noted that no odour complaints have been received regarding the installation to date.

The OMP (document reference Odour Management Plan Bradeley Farm Poultry Unit) dated 9th March 2018, provided as part of this permit application is considered acceptable having been assessed against the requirements of Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control (IPPC) SRG 6.02 (Farming): Odour Management at Intensive Livestock Installations, the NFU 'Top Tips Guidance and Poultry Industry Good Practice Checklist' and with regard to the site specific circumstances at the installation. The operator is required to manage activities at the installation in accordance with condition 3.3.1 of the environmental permit and this Odour Management Plan.

There is the potential for odour pollution from this installation, however the operator's compliance with their Odour Management Plan, should minimise the risk of odour pollution beyond the installation boundary. The risk of odour pollution at sensitive receptors beyond the installation boundary is not considered significant. We, the Environment Agency, have reviewed and approved the Odour Management Plan and consider it complies with the requirements of our H4 Odour management guidance note. We agree with the scope and suitability of key measures but this should not be taken as confirmation that the details of equipment specification design, operation and maintenance are suitable and sufficient. That remains the responsibility of the operator.

Noise

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. Under section 3.4 of this guidance a Noise Management Plan (NMP) must be approved as part of the permitting determination, if there are sensitive receptors within 400m of the Installation boundary.

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.

There are sensitive receptors within 400 metres of the Installation boundary as stated in the odour section above. The Operator has provided a noise management plan (NMP) as part of the Application supporting documentation, and further details are provided below.

The risk assessment for the Installation provided with the Application lists key potential risks of noise pollution beyond the Installation boundary. These activities are as follows: ventilation fans, feed deliveries, feeding systems, fuel deliveries, alarm systems, bird catching, clean out operations, maintenance/repair and the standby generator.

We have assessed the NMP and the H1 risk assessment for noise and conclude that the Applicant has followed the guidance set out in EPR 6.09 Appendix 5 'Noise management at intensive livestock installations'. We are satisfied that all sources and receptors have been identified, and that the proposed mitigation measures will minimise the risk of noise pollution / nuisance.

Noise Management Plan Review

There is the potential for noise pollution from this installation, however the operator's compliance with their Noise Management Plan, should minimise the risk of odour pollution beyond the installation boundary. The risk of noise pollution at neighbouring properties, which are over 100 metres away from the installation, is therefore not considered significant.

We have assessed the NMP and the H1 risk assessment for noise and conclude that the Applicant has followed the guidance set out in EPR 6.09 Appendix 5 'Noise management at intensive livestock installations'. We are satisfied that all sources and receptors have been identified, and that the proposed mitigation measures will minimise the risk of noise pollution / nuisance.

Dust and Bio aerosols

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 satisfactory 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.

There is one sensitive receptor within 100m of the Installation boundary. The nearest sensitive receptor Bradeley Farm Farmhouse at SO 59601 94846 is approximately 95m metres to the south of the installation boundary.

Guidance on our website concludes that applicants need to produce and submit a dust and bio aerosol risk assessment with their applications only if there are relevant receptors within 100 metres of their farm, e.g. the farmhouse or farm worker's 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 bio aerosol risk assessment in this format.

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 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 the following measures in their operating techniques to reduce dust:

- Feed will be delivered in sealed systems by being blown directly from the lorry into the storage silos.
- Closed system delivery of feed from the silos to the poultry houses by piping.
- Dust socks fitted to silo exhaust pipes.
- Particular housekeeping attention given to feed storage silo areas and immediate clean-up of feed spillages.
- Use of suitable bedding materials.
- A computer controlled environment to keep the housing humidity between 55% and 60%.
- High velocity roof extraction fans.
- Trailers full of litter are fully sheeted before leaving the installation.
- Careful removal of litter during cleanout operations to avoid spillages, with the trailers parked close to the poultry house doors.

Conclusion

We are satisfied that the measures outlined in the Application will minimise the potential for dust and bio aerosol emissions from the Installation.

Biomass boilers

The applicant is varying their permit to add one biomass boiler with a thermal input of 0.995MW to the site; bringing the site to a total of 2 biomass boiler(s) with an aggregated thermal input of 1.99MW.

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 poultry sites where:

- the fuel will be derived from virgin timber, miscanthus or straw, and;
- the biomass boiler appliance and installation meets the technical criteria to be eligible for the Renewable Heat Incentive, and;
- 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 boiler(s) if relevant) and;
- there are no sensitive receptors within 50 metres of the emission point(s).

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.

Our risk assessment has shown that the biomass boilers should 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.

Grade A Wood Burning

The operator has applied to use grade A recycled waste wood as fuel for two biomass boiler(s) with an aggregated thermal input of 1.99 MWth. Where virgin and waste wood are mixed the fuel is all considered a waste.

The biomass boilers are to be fed by grade A wood only or a mixture of Grade A wood and virgin wood.

Grade A wood definition

"grade A waste wood" means visibly 'clean' recycled waste wood mainly originating from packaging waste, pallets, packing cases and process off-cuts from the manufacture of untreated wood products. As defined in BSI PAS 111: 2012.

The total aggregated capacity of the installation biomass boilers using Grade A wood is 570 kg/hour.

As the activity does not meet the criteria of a U4 waste exemption it will fall under section 5.1 B) (a) (v) of the Environmental Permitting Regulations 'The incineration in a small waste incineration plant with an aggregated capacity of 50kgs or more per hour of the following waste – wood waste with the exception of waste which may contain halogenated organic compounds or heavy metals as a result of treatment with wood preservatives or coatings'.

A site specific description of waste source, and procedure have been reviewed and accepted as satisfactory to ensure that only grade A waste wood will be accepted.

The operator will only be permitted to accept this waste type. Table S2.2 of the permit includes relevant waste wood and descriptions. We are satisfied that the waste wood is from a manufacturing source and that it will not be contaminated.

Ammonia

The applicant has demonstrated that the housing will meet the relevant NH3 BAT-AEL.

There are three Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) within 5km of the installation, and one relevant nature conservation site, designated as a Local Wildlife Site (LWS), and three ancient woodlands within 2km of the installation.

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 4.5 has indicated that emissions from Bradeley Farm will only have a potential impact on SSSI sites with a precautionary critical level of $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ if they are within 1,661 metres of the emission source.

Beyond 1,661m the PC is less than $0.2\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (i.e. less than 20% of the precautionary $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ critical level) and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case all SSSIs are beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

Where the precautionary level of $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ is used, and the process contribution is assessed to be less than 20% the site automatically screens out as insignificant and no further assessment of critical load is necessary. In this case the $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ 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)
Hugley Brook	4,193
Wenlock Edge	2,628
Derrington Meadow	4,225

Ammonia assessment - LWS

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

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

Initial screening using ammonia screening tool version 4.5 has indicated that emissions from Bradeley Farm will only have a potential impact on the LWS sites with a precautionary critical level of $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ if they are within 570 metres of the emission source.

Beyond 570m the PC is less than $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and therefore beyond this distance the PC is insignificant. In this case the LWS sites are beyond this distance (see table below) and therefore screen out of any further assessment.

Table 2 – LWS Assessment

Name of LWS	Distance from site (m)
Woodhousefield Gorse	591
Cawley's Coppice	979
Spoonhill Woods	1718
Nover's Coppice	1535

Decision checklist

Aspect considered	Decision
Receipt of application	
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.
Consultation/Engagement	
Consultation	<p>The consultation requirements were identified in accordance with the Environmental Permitting Regulations and our public participation statement.</p> <p>The application was publicised on the GOV.UK website.</p> <p>We consulted the following organisations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public Health England - Director of Public Health - Health and Safety Executive - Shropshire Council - Environmental Health & Planning <p>The comments and our responses are summarised in the consultation section.</p>
The facility	
The regulated facility	<p>We considered the extent and nature of the facility at the site in accordance with RGN2 'Understanding the meaning of regulated facility'.</p> <p>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.</p>
The site	
Extent of the site of the facility	The operator has provided a plan which we consider is satisfactory, showing the extent of the site of the facility. The plan is included in the permit.
Site condition report	<p>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.</p> <p>Please see the key issues section for further information on groundwater and soil condition on site.</p>
Biodiversity, heritage, landscape and nature conservation	<p>The application is within the relevant distance criteria of a site of heritage, landscape or nature conservation and protected species or habitat.</p> <p>We have assessed the application and its potential to affect all known sites of nature conservation, landscape and heritage and protected species or habitats identified in the nature conservation screening report as part of the permitting process.</p> <p>We consider that the application will not affect any sites of nature conservation, landscape and heritage and protected species or habitats identified.</p> <p>We have not consulted Natural England on the application. The decision was taken</p>

Aspect considered	Decision
	<p>in accordance with our guidance.</p> <p>Please see the key issues section for further information on ammonia.</p>
Environmental risk assessment	
Environmental risk	<p>We have reviewed the operator's assessment of the environmental risk from the facility.</p> <p>The operator's risk assessment is satisfactory.</p> <p>Please see the key issues section for further information on odour, noise, boiler emissions and ammonia emissions.</p>
Operating techniques	
General operating techniques	<p>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.</p> <p>The operating techniques that the applicant must use are specified in table S1.2 in the environmental permit.</p> <p>The operating techniques detail that the sheds have high velocity roof fans and nipple drinkers.</p> <p>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 relevant BREFs.</p> <p>Please see the key issues section for further information on the New Intensive Rearing of Poultry or Pigs BAT Conclusions document.</p>
Odour management	<p>We have reviewed the odour management plan in accordance with our guidance on odour management.</p> <p>We consider that the odour management plan is satisfactory.</p> <p>Please see the key issues section for further information.</p>
Noise management	<p>We have reviewed the noise management plan in accordance with our guidance on noise assessment and control.</p> <p>We consider that the noise management plan is satisfactory.</p> <p>Please see the key issues section for further information.</p>
Permit conditions	
Updating permit conditions during consolidation	<p>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 permit.</p>
Raw materials	<p>We have specified limits and controls on the use of raw materials and fuels.</p> <p>Fuel for biomass boiler units shall be biomass chips or pellets comprising virgin timber, straw, miscanthus, grade A waste wood or a combination of these.</p>
Waste types	<p>We have specified the permitted waste types, descriptions and quantities, which can be accepted at the regulated facility.</p>

Aspect considered	Decision
	<p>We are satisfied that the operator can accept these wastes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - they are suitable for the proposed activities - the proposed infrastructure is appropriate; and - the environmental risk assessment is acceptable. <p>We made these decisions with respect to waste types in accordance with the relevant guidance.</p>
Emission limits	<p>ELVs and equivalent parameters or technical measures based on BAT have been set for the following substances.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nitrogen: 0.6 kg N/animal place/year - Phosphorus: 0.25 kg P2O5 animal place/year - Ammonia: 0.08 kg NH3/animal place/year
Monitoring	<p>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.</p> <p>These monitoring requirements have been imposed in order to comply with the relevant BAT measures.</p> <p>See the key issues of the decision section of this decision document for further information. We made these decisions in accordance with BAT conclusion document dated 21st February 2017.</p>
Reporting	<p>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.</p> <p>These reporting requirements on monitoring data and performance parameters have been imposed in order to comply with the conditions of the permit.</p> <p>See the key issues of the decision section of this decision document for further information. We made these decisions in accordance with BAT conclusion document dated 21st February 2017.</p>
Operator competence	
Management system	<p>There is no known reason to consider that the operator will not have the management system to enable it to comply with the permit conditions.</p>
Growth Duty	
Section 108 Deregulation Act 2015 – Growth duty	<p>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.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.3 of the guidance says:</p> <p>“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.”</p> <p>We have addressed the legislative requirements and environmental standards to be</p>

Aspect considered	Decision
	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

Consultation

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.

Responses from organisations listed in the consultation section

Response received from
Public Health England, dated 26 th April 2018
Brief summary of issues raised
Public Health England recommended that the varied permit for this site should contain conditions to ensure that the following potential emissions do not impact upon public health; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Odours - Fugitive emissions of ammonia and dust to air, from feed and litter - Exhaust gases and particulate matter from the operation of biomass boilers Beyond the above considerations, Public Health England expressed that they have no significant concerns regarding risk to health of the local population from this proposed activity, providing that the applicant takes all appropriate measures to prevent or control pollution, in accordance with the relevant sector technical guidance or industry best practice.
Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered
Odour, ammonia and particulate matter emissions have all been considered within the determination of this variation, and appropriate management plans have been reviewed by ourselves and included within the operating techniques of the varied permit. See the key issues of the decision section of this decision document for further information.

Response received from
Shropshire Council, dated 24 th April 2018
Brief summary of issues raised
Shropshire Council, the planning authority relevant to this site, confirmed that they are not aware of any amenity related issues associated with the operation of the poultry unit since the site has become operational.
Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered
No action is required. The confirmation that there has not been any amenity related issues has been considered within our decision and is consistent with information held by the Environment Agency area team local to the installation.

Response received from
Health and Safety Executive, dated 5 th April 2018
Brief summary of issues raised
Health and Safety England stated that they have reviewed the documentation provided and have no concerns to raise at the time.
Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered
No action is required.