



**Natural Resources Wales permitting decisions**

# **David Davies & Co (Court House Farm) Decision Document**

## Contents

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Permit Surrender .....                    | 1 |
| Purpose of this document.....             | 1 |
| Key issues of the decision.....           | 2 |
| Receipt of application.....               | 2 |
| Confidential information.....             | 2 |
| Identifying confidential information..... | 2 |
| Legislation.....                          | 2 |
| Extent of the surrender application.....  | 2 |
| The Regulated Facility.....               | 3 |
| Permitted Activities.....                 | 3 |
| The site.....                             | 3 |
| Pollution Risk.....                       | 4 |
| Site condition report.....                | 4 |
| Satisfactory state.....                   | 4 |

## Permit Surrender

**The permit surrender number is: EPR/BB3197HH/S001**

**The applicant/operator is: David Davies & Co**

**The Installation is located at: Court House Farm, Mellington, Church Stoke, Montgomery, Powys, SY15 6TQ**

We have decided to accept the surrender of the permit for Court House Farm, operated by David Davies & Co.

The permit number is EPR/BB3197HH.

We are satisfied that there has been no pollution risk from permitted operations during the lifetime of the permit, as operations never commenced, and the site is in a satisfactory state at the time of permit surrender.

We consider in reaching that decision we have taken into account all relevant considerations and legal requirements.

### Purpose of this document

This decision document:

- explains how the operator's application has been determined;
- provides a record of the decision-making process;
- shows how all relevant factors have been taken into account.

# Key issues of the 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. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on commercial confidentiality.

### Legislation

This permit surrender is issued under Regulation 25 of the Environmental Permitting (England & Wales) Regulations 2016 (as amended) (EPR). The Environmental Permitting regime is a legal vehicle which delivers most of the relevant legal requirements for activities falling within its scope.

We address the legal requirements directly where relevant in the body of this document.

A copy of the application and all other documents relevant to our determination (see below) are available for the public to view. Anyone wishing to see these documents could arrange for copies to be made.

### Extent of the surrender application

The operator has applied to surrender the permit in full.

## The Regulated Facility

### Permitted Activities

The installation was permitted to have the capacity for 100,000 pullet rearing under Schedule 1 listed activity of EP Regulations (Section 6.9 A(1)(a) Rearing of poultry or pigs intensively in an installation with more than 40,000 places for poultry) The intention was for the birds to be brought in from a hatchery and transported to an egg laying unit at the end of the growing period. The average cycle length was expected to be 18 weeks. All ventilation would have been provided by high velocity ridge fans and side inlets in house. Prior to the arrival of the day-old birds, the floor would have been covered with wood shavings and the house would have been warmed using a hot water boiler system, being heated by LPG boilers. As the birds grew, the temperature would have been gradually reduced until the boilers could be switched off. Birds which would have died during the production cycle would have been removed from house each day and the numbers would have been recorded. The carcasses would have been put in sealed, vermin proof containers prior to collection under the National Fallen Stock Scheme. At the end of the rearing period all birds would have been removed from the houses. The empty houses would then have been washed and disinfected ready for the next crop. The wash water would have been channelled to underground collection tanks close to the houses. All used litter and dirty water would have been spread to land owned by a separate farming business. This would have been done in line with the Code of Good Agricultural Practice and the Litter Management Plan.

### The site

The site lies approximately 2km South of Churchstoke with a national grid reference of SO 26482 92279. The site is located between 145m and 140m above mean sea level, on a small, natural plateau to the west side of a north flowing stream and about 15m from the stream. There are no public footpaths within 100m of the site. Fields are large, mainly pasture, with boundaries predominantly hedged, including some standard trees.

## Pollution risk

David Davies & Co initially rented Court House Farm with a view to converting the buildings into a rearing unit for their hens. Plans changed and operations never commenced on this site and it remained empty and unused until David Davies & Co relinquished their tenancy. No development took place relating to the pullet rearing. The site condition has not changed. We are therefore satisfied that there has been no pollution risk to the site resulting from the operations of the regulated facility throughout the lifetime of the permit, as the facility never commenced operations.

## Site condition report

The operator has provided a description of the condition of the site at permit surrender stage. We consider this description is satisfactory. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on site condition reports – guidance and templates (H5). The Local Environment Area Team were consulted and they advised that they would not undertake a final site inspection visit, as it was considered not necessary given the sites pre-operational status and the site not holding any birds.

## Satisfactory state

We are satisfied that there has been no pollution risk from permitted operations during the lifetime of the permit, and that the land associated with the regulated facility is in a satisfactory state at permit surrender. In coming to this decision we have had regard to the state of the site before the facility was put into operation.