



**Cyfoeth
Naturiol
Cymru
Natural
Resources
Wales**

Natural Resources Wales permitting decisions

**Mr William Hughes
Pertheirin Free Range Poultry
Unit**

Decision Document

Bespoke permit

The application number is: PAN-002327

The Applicant / Operator is: Mr William Hughes

The Installation is located at: Pertheirin Free Range Poultry Unit, Pertheirin, Pontdolgoch, Caersws, Powys, SY17 5NJ

We have decided to grant the permit for Pertheirin Free Range Poultry Unit operated by Mr William Hughes.

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:

- explains how the application has been determined
- provides a record of the decision-making process
- shows how all relevant factors have been taken into account
- justifies the specific conditions in the permit other than those in our generic permit template.

Unless the decision document specifies otherwise we have accepted the applicant's proposals.

Structure of this document

- Table of contents
- Key issues
- Annex 1 the consultation and web publicising responses

Table of Contents

Contents

Bespoke permit	2
Purpose of this document	2
Structure of this document	2
Table of Contents	3
Contents	3
Key issues of the decision	5
1 Our decision	5
2 How we reached our decision	5
2.1 Receipt of Application	5
2.2 Consultation on the Application	5
2.2.1 Draft Permit Consultation	6
3 The Legal Framework	6
4 The Installation	7
4.1 Description of the Installation and related issues	7
4.2 The site and its protection	7
4.3 Operation of the Installation – general issues	8
5 Minimising the Installation’s environmental impact	10
5.1 Assessment of Impact on Air Quality	11
5.2 Assessment of odour impact	11
5.3 Assessment of impact to surface and ground water	12
5.4 Emissions to sewer	12
5.5 Fugitive emissions	12
5.6 Assessment of noise impact	12
5.7 Impact on Habitats sites, SSSIs, non-statutory conservation sites etc.....	13
6 Setting ELVs and other Permit conditions	14
6.1 Translating BAT into Permit conditions	14
6.2 Monitoring	14
6.3 Reporting	14
ANNEX 1: Consultation Responses	15
A) Advertising and Consultation on the Application	15
1) Consultation Responses from Statutory and Non-Statutory Bodies.....	15
2) Consultation Responses from Members of the Public and Community Organisations	15

a)	Representations from Local MP, Assembly Member (AM), Councillors and Parish / Town / Community Councils	15
b)	Representations from Community and Other Organisations.....	15
c)	Representations from Individual Members of the Public	15

Key issues of the decision

1 Our decision

We consider that, in reaching that decision, we have taken into account all relevant considerations and legal requirements and that the permit will ensure that a high level of protection is provided for the environment and human health.

This Application is to operate an installation which is subject principally to the Industrial Emissions Directive (IED).

The permit contains many conditions taken from our standard Environmental Permit template including the relevant Annexes. We developed these conditions in consultation with industry, having regard to the legal requirements of the Environmental Permitting Regulations and other relevant legislation. This document does not therefore include an explanation for these standard conditions. Where they are included in the permit, we have considered the Application and accepted the details are sufficient and satisfactory to make the standard conditions appropriate.

2 How we reached our decision

2.1 Receipt of Application

The Application was received on 05 February 2018 and was duly made on 20 March 2018. This means we considered it was in the correct form and contained sufficient information for us to begin our determination, but not that it necessarily contained all the information we would need to complete that determination.

2.2 Consultation on the Application

We carried out consultation on the Application in accordance with the EPR and our statutory Public Participation Statement (PPS).

We advertised the Application by a notice placed on our website, which contained all the information required by the IED, including telling people where and when they could see a copy of the Application.

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.

We sent copies of the Application to the following bodies, which includes those with whom we have “Working Together Agreements”:

- Powys County Council Planning Authority
- Powys County Council Environmental Protection Department

- Food Standards Agency
- Health Protection Agency
- Public Health Wales

These are bodies whose expertise, democratic accountability and/or local knowledge make it appropriate for us to seek their views directly.

Further details along with a summary of consultation comments and our response to the representations we received can be found in Annex 1. In this instance no comments were received.

2.2.1 Draft Permit Consultation

We have carried out a consultation on our draft decision. This consultation began on 14/06/18 and end on 12/07/18.

3 The Legal Framework

The Permit will be granted, under Regulation 13 of the EPR. The Environmental Permitting regime is a legal vehicle which delivers most of the relevant legal requirements for activities falling within its scope. In particular, the regulated facility is:

- an installation as described by the IED
- subject to aspects of the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 and the Environment (Wales) Act 2016 which also have to be addressed.

We address the legal requirements directly where relevant in the body of this document. NRW is satisfied that this decision is consistent with its general purpose of pursuing the sustainable management of natural resources (SMNR) in relation to Wales, and applying the principles of SMNR. In particular, NRW acknowledges that it is a principle of sustainable management to take action to prevent significant damage to ecosystems. We consider that, in granting the Permit a high level of protection will be delivered for the environment and human health through the operation of the Installation in accordance with the permit conditions.

4 The Installation

4.1 Description of the Installation and related issues

4.1.1 The permitted activities

The Installation is subject to the EPR because it carries out an activity listed in Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the EPR:

- Section 6.9 Part A(1)(a)(i) Rearing poultry in an installation with more than 40,000 places.

An installation may also comprise “directly associated activities”, which at this Installation include:

- Dirty water storage
- Feed Silos

Together, these listed and directly associated activities comprise the Installation.

4.1.2 The Site

The site lies to the west of Caersws, Powys, approximately 10km West of Newtown at grid reference SO 00831 93393. The surrounding area is hilly with some woodland. The predominant land use is grassland and grazing.

The operator has provided a plan which we consider is satisfactory, showing the extent of the site of the facility. In addition, the operator has provided a site layout/drainage plan which includes discharge points.

A plan is included in the permit and the operator is required to carry on the permitted activities within the site boundary.

4.1.3 What the Installation does

The facility will comprise of three poultry houses, with capacity for 80,000 free range layers. All three sheds will be an Aviary system. Birds will be housed at a point of lay and depopulated at the end of their egg laying cycle. This will be done on an all-in, all-out basis. There will be approximately one cycle per annum. Litter will be removed at the end of each production cycle and removed off site. Birds are allowed to range by means of pop holes at the base of the sides of the houses.

4.2 The site and its protection

4.2.1 Proposed site design: potentially polluting substances and prevention measures

There will be three poultry houses, with a combined capacity for 80,000 birds. The working area where vehicles operate is laid to concrete and hard standing. The housing will be well insulated and the sheds have a damp proof course. A computer

automatically controls the ventilation so that the temperature is maintained for the age of the birds. This controls the ventilation rates depending on the health and welfare needs of the birds and the outside weather conditions.

Water is via a nipple drinking system fitted with cups to reduce leakage and spills, leading to drier litter. Feed is delivered in covered lorries and stored on site in vermin proof steel galvanised bins. The sheds will be cleaned out in their entirety at the end of each production cycle with manure removed every four days via manure belt into a sheeted trailer. At depletion any remaining litter will be removed from the site and used on operator-controlled land or used as fuel for a local Anaerobic Digester.

4.2.2 Closure and decommissioning

Permit condition 1.1.1 requires the Operator to have a written management system in place which identifies and minimises risks of pollution including those arising from closure. At the definitive cessation of activities, the Operator has to satisfy us that the necessary measures have been taken so that the site ceases to pose a risk to soil or groundwater, taking into account both the baseline conditions and the site's current or approved future use. To do this, the Operator has to apply to us for surrender, which we will not grant unless and until we are satisfied that these requirements have been met.

The operator has included a site closure plan with their application detailing the steps that will be taken on the event of the facility closing.

A site condition report has been completed providing a baseline for the site at the time of the permit application. It is noted that the land has previously been used as an intensive pasture field which has been improved at Pertheirin. No pollution incidents have previously occurred at the site. We consider that the description provided is satisfactory. The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on site condition reports – guidance and templates (H5).

4.3 Operation of the Installation – general issues

4.3.1 Administrative issues

The Applicant is the sole Operator of the Installation. We are satisfied that the Applicant is the person who will have control over the operation of the Installation; and that the Applicant will be able to operate the Installation so as to comply with the conditions included in the Permit. The decision was taken in accordance with EPR RGN 1 Understanding the meaning of operator.

4.3.2 Relevant convictions

Our Enforcement Database has been checked to ensure that all relevant convictions have been declared. No relevant convictions were found.

4.3.3 Management

The Applicant has stated in the Application that they will implement an Environmental Management System (EMS) that will meet the requirements for an EMS in our "How

to comply with your environmental permit guidance”. The Applicant submitted a summary of the EMS with their application which includes sections on normal operations, maintenance schedule recording, incidents and abnormal operations, complaints, accident/emergency plan, training, installation plans and site security.

All written management systems will be subject to regular review by the Operator.

We are satisfied that appropriate management systems and management structures will be in place for this Installation, and that sufficient resources are available to the Operator to ensure compliance with all the Permit conditions. The decision was taken in accordance with RGN 5 on Operator Competence.

4.3.4 Accident management

In order to ensure that the management system proposed by the Applicant sufficiently manages the residual risk of accidents, permit condition 1.1.1a requires the implementation of a written management system which addresses the pollution risks associated with, amongst other things, accidents.

The operator has an emergency plan which will be subject to regular review. It includes contingencies for events such as fire, power failure, flood, disease and containment failure.

4.3.3 Site security

The site itself does not have a secure boundary fence. Poultry houses and all store rooms are kept locked and secure, preventing any unauthorised access.

Having considered the information submitted in the Application, we are satisfied that procedures will be in place to ensure that the site remains secure.

4.3.5 Operating techniques

Before bird arrival the house floors will be covered to a sufficient depth of bulk shavings. Temperature and humidity will be closely monitored on a daily basis to achieve bird comfort and a relative humidity of 55-60%, this should achieve litter with a dry matter content of between 60-70%, which is important to minimising emissions.

A computer automatically controls ventilation so that temperature is maintained for the age of the birds. Temperature in the sheds meets the health and welfare needs for the age and the number of birds. Water is via a nipple drinking system fitted with cups to reduce leakage and spills leading to drier litter.

Feed is delivered from a UKASTA accredited feed mill and blown into bulk feed bins situated adjacent to the houses, from the feed bins the feed is augered into the houses and distributed to the birds via a pan feeding system.

Fallen stock will be recorded daily and securely stored in vermin proof containers awaiting regular collection by a licenced renderer.

Manure belts are operated every four days removing litter from the houses.

Ammonia emissions will be reduced by reduced protein feed, maintaining good litter conditions with dry matter content above 60%. Containment of wash waters will prevent pollutants being released to the environment.

Records of tonnages of litter and wash water removal are recorded.

We have reviewed the techniques proposed by the operator and compared these with the relevant guidance notes. We are satisfied that the techniques represent appropriate measures for the installation in line with BAT standards in EPR 6.09.

4.3.6 Incorporating the application

We have specified that the applicant must operate the permit in accordance with descriptions in the application, including all additional information received as part of the determination process.

These descriptions are specified in the Operating Techniques table in the permit.

4.3.7 Energy efficiency

We are satisfied that the Applicant will ensure that energy is used in the most efficient way possible.

4.3.8 Avoidance, recovery or disposal of wastes produced by the activities

At depletion any remaining litter will be removed from the site and used on operator-controlled land or used as fuel for a local Anaerobic Digester.

5 Minimising the Installation's environmental impact

Regulated activities can present different types of risk to the environment, these include odour, noise and vibration; accidents, fugitive emissions to air and water; as well as point source releases to air, discharges to ground or groundwater, global warming potential and generation of waste. All these factors are discussed in this and other sections of this document.

For an installation of this kind, the principal emissions are:

- Ammonia
- Dust
- Odour
- Noise
- Effluent discharges

The next sections of this document explain how we have approached the critical issue of assessing the likely impact of emissions from the Installation on human health and

the environment and what measures we are requiring to ensure a high level of protection.

5.1 Assessment of Impact on Air Quality

The applicant has carried out a risk assessment identifying potential risks to human health including dust and ammonia. Operating procedures have been put in place to minimise the risks, in line with BAT procedures. It is considered that if the site is operated in line with these procedures, there is no significant risk to human health as a result of activities at the site.

5.2 Assessment of odour impact

The applicant has submitted detailed dispersion modelling of the impact of odour from the proposed facility.

H4 Odour Management guidance explains that the odour benchmarks are based on the 98th percentile of hourly average concentrations of odour modelled over a year at the site/installation boundary. The benchmarks are:

- 1.5 odour units for most offensive odours
- 3 odour units for moderately offensive odours
- 6 odour units for less offensive odours

Odours from poultry rearing are usually placed in the moderately offensive category. Therefore for their modelling the applicant has used the benchmark of 3.0 ouE/m³ to assess the potential impact of odour on nearby sensitive receptors. Modelling has been carried out based on emissions from the three poultry houses and areas of the ranging area most likely to be used frequently.

The results of the modelling predict the highest maximum odour concentrations at the buildings directly associated with Perthierin. There is a total of 25 receptors around the unit at Perthierin. Only receptor 1 exceeds the benchmark of three odour units. This receptor is directly associated with the farm, due to this we can raise the benchmark for the receptor as a less sensitive receptor. All other receptors are below 1 odour units.

We are satisfied that the risk of odour pollution at nearby receptors is not significant. NRW has assessed the modelling in detail and is satisfied that it accurately represents the predicted odours. It is recognised that this modelling does only represent the expected odour concentrations for 98% of the time and that odours may be higher for the remaining 2% of the time. NRW is not able to ensure that odour impacts on nearby receptors are reduced to zero, but is determined to ensure that they are minimised.

The applicant has submitted an odour management plan (OMP) for the installation as required by EPR 6.09 “How to Comply with your Permit for Intensive Farming” because there are sensitive receptors within 400 metres of the installation. The OMP describes the measures and controls in place to minimise odour and includes twice daily olfactory checks. We have compared the measures proposed for the site to the BAT standards in EPR 6.09 and are satisfied that the techniques represent appropriate

measures for the installation. The OMP has been incorporated into the operating techniques section of the permit.

Permit condition 3.3.1 requires that emissions from the activities are free from odour at levels likely to cause pollution outside the site, as perceived by an officer of NRW. We are satisfied that this condition will be sufficiently protective in conjunction with the measures described by the applicant for minimising odour production at the installation.

5.3 Assessment of impact to surface and ground water

Based upon the information in the application we are satisfied that the appropriate measures will be in place to prevent pollution of ground and surface water.

Clean, uncontaminated rainwater from roofs and yard areas will drain to soakaways running along the lengths of the poultry houses. Any lightly contaminated yard wash will be directed to a sealed underground tank.

The permit includes a condition that requires periodic monitoring to be carried out at least once every 5 years for groundwater and 10 years for soil, unless such monitoring is based on a systematic appraisal of the risk of contamination.

5.4 Emissions to sewer

When birds are removed from the poultry houses, the site will be pressure washed, disinfected and dried out prior to the next cycle. All wash waters will be contained in sealed underground tank prior to being spread on operator-controlled land. There are no emissions to sewer.

5.5 Fugitive emissions

Based upon the information in the application we are satisfied that the appropriate measures will be in place to prevent or where that is not practicable to minimise fugitive emissions, including dust, and to prevent pollution from fugitive emissions.

5.6 Assessment of noise impact

A risk assessment of the potential impact of noise from the site on nearby sensitive receptors has been carried out by the applicant. Potential sources of noise include vehicles travelling to and from site and ventilation fans.

Because there are sensitive receptors within 400 metres of the installation. The applicant has submitted a noise management plan (NMP) for the installation as required by EPR 6.09 *“How to Comply with your Permit for Intensive Farming”*. The NMP describes the measures and controls in place to minimise noise and includes twice daily inspections of the site.

Roof mounted ventilation fans will be subject to regular, end of cycle maintenance by qualified electricians and noisy fans will be isolated and an electrician notified. Silencers will be fitted to feed delivery lorries. The movement of vehicles outside of the

installation boundary is not within the regulatory scope of the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 and is a matter for the local planning authority.

We have compared the measures proposed for the site to the BAT standards in EPR 6.09 and are satisfied that the techniques represent appropriate measures for the installation. The NMP has been incorporated into the operating techniques section of the permit.

Permit condition 3.4.1 requires that emissions from the activities are free from noise at levels likely to cause pollution outside the site, as perceived by an officer of NRW. We are satisfied that this condition will be sufficiently protective in conjunction with the measures described by the applicant for minimising odour production at the installation.

5.7 Impact on Habitats sites, SSSIs, non-statutory conservation sites etc.

The application is within the relevant distance criteria of a site of heritage, landscape or nature conservation, and/or protected species or habitat.

A full assessment of the application and its potential to affect the sites has been carried out as part of the permitting process. We consider that the application will not affect the features of the sites.

The following sites have been considered:

SSSI (within 5km)

- Llyn Mawr SSSI (3.5km North)

Thirteen areas of ancient semi natural woodland (within 2km).

The applicant has carried out detailed modelling of the potential impact of dispersion and deposition of Ammonia from the site. The submitted reports initial screening of the site show nine ancient woodland and Llyn Mawr SSSI exceeding the 100% and 1% of the critical levels (CLE) respectively.

The applicant has also completed more detailed modelling of the exceeding sites and all ten sites come well below the CLE.

CRoW Appendix 4 have been completed and forwarded onto our internal Natural Resource Management team for consultation. Full details of the assessment carried out of the potential effect of ammonia emissions from the proposed site on the SSSI detailed above are detailed in the forms. Our conclusions were that the proposal is not likely to have a significant effect on any of these sites. The forms were sent to our internal Natural Resource Management team for consultation. The forms are available on our public register.

6 Setting ELVs and other Permit conditions

6.1 Translating BAT into Permit conditions

Article 14(3) of the Industrial Emissions Directive (IED) states that BAT conclusions shall be the reference for setting the permit conditions to installations covered by the Directive. As a result of the Commission Implementing Decision (EU) 2017/302 of 15 February 2017 establishing best available techniques (BAT) conclusions, under Directive 2010/75/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council, for the intensive rearing of poultry or pigs, the format of our Permit for the intensive farming sector has been updated. Appendix 1 of the Permit sets out generic conditions which apply to all sites. Appendix 2 sets out site specific conditions based on the activities being carried out.

6.2 Monitoring

Monitoring should be carried out for the parameters listed in Appendix 1, Schedule 3 of the permit using the methods and to the frequencies specified in Table S3.1 for laying hens and laying hens in non-caged housing. These monitoring requirements have been introduced in order to demonstrate compliance with the best available techniques (BAT) conclusions for the intensive rearing of poultry or pigs, as set out in the Commission Implementing Decision (EU) 2017/302 of 15 February 2017.

No monitoring is required from the point source emissions on site.

6.3 Reporting

We have specified reporting requirements in Appendix 2, Schedule 4 of the Permit to ensure compliance with permit conditions and to monitor the efficiency of farming activities at the site in line with BAT.

ANNEX 1: Consultation Responses

A) Advertising and Consultation on the Application

The Application has been advertised and consulted upon in accordance with Natural Resources Wales Public Participation Statement. The way in which this has been carried out along with the results of our consultation and how we have taken consultation responses into account in reaching our draft decision is summarised in this Annex. Copies of all consultation responses have been placed on Natural Resources Wales public register.

1) Consultation Responses from Statutory and Non-Statutory Bodies

Response Received from Public Health Wales	
Brief summary of issues raised:	Summary of action taken / how this has been covered
Best Available Techniques (BAT) and management controls should be applied.	Permit conditions cover concerns

2) Consultation Responses from Members of the Public and Community Organisations

a) Representations from Local MP, Assembly Member (AM), Councillors and Parish / Town / Community Councils

Response Received from	
Brief summary of issues raised:	Summary of action taken / how this has been covered
None	N/A

b) Representations from Community and Other Organisations

Response Received from	
Brief summary of issues raised:	Summary of action taken / how this has been covered
None	N/A

c) Representations from Individual Members of the Public

Response Received from	
Brief summary of issues raised:	Summary of action taken / how this has been covered
None	N/A