



**Cyfoeth
Naturiol**
Cymru
**Natural
Resources**
Wales

Natural Resources Wales permitting decisions

Sun Valley Foods Limited Gaufron Poultry Unit

Decision Document

Bespoke permit

The application number is: PAN-001220

The Applicant / Operator is: Sun Valley Foods Limited

The Installation is located at: Gaufron Poultry Unit, Howey, Llandrindod Wells, Powys, LD1 5RG

We have decided to grant the permit for Gaufron Poultry Unit operated by Sun Valley Foods Limited.

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 2 the consultation and web publicising responses

Table of Contents

Contents

Bespoke permit	2
The application number is: PAN-001220	2
The Applicant / Operator is: Sun Valley Foods Limited.....	2
The Installation is located at: Gaufron Poultry Unit, Howey, Llandrindod Wells, Powys, LD1 5RG	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
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	16
6.1 Translating BAT into Permit conditions	16
6.2 Monitoring	16
6.3 Reporting	16
ANNEX 1: Consultation Responses.....	17
A) Advertising and Consultation on the Application	17
1) Consultation Responses from Statutory and Non-Statutory Bodies.....	17

2) Consultation Responses from Members of the Public and Community Organisations.....	19
a) Representations from Local MP, Assembly Member (AM), Councillors and Parish / Town / Community Councils	19
b) Representations from Community and Other Organisations.....	19
c) Representations from Individual Members of the Public	19

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 17 January 2017 and was duly made on 7 February 2017. 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

- Public Health Wales
- Powys Teaching Health Board

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.

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.

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 in relation to Wales, and applying the principles of sustainable management of natural resources. 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.

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

4.1.2 The Site

The site lies approximately 2.2km South West of Howey, Powys at grid reference SO 04030 56749. 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 two poultry houses, with capacity for 56,000 pullets to be raised as breeder layers. Both houses will be an Aviary system. Birds will be housed at one day old and depopulated at the end of the rearing cycle at approximately 17 weeks of age. This will be done on an all-in, all-out basis. There will be approximately 2.2 cycles per annum.

4.2 The site and its protection

4.2.1 Proposed site design: potentially polluting substances and prevention measures

There will be two poultry houses, with a combined capacity for 56,000 birds. The working area where vehicles operate is laid to concrete and hard standing. Ventilation is controlled by temperature, and both houses have high velocity roof mounted extraction fans. 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. Manure will be removed from the houses twice a week by a belt system. Dirty wash water will be directed to an underground storage tank prior to being spread on operator controlled land.

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 for breeder layer production. 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 Operator of the Installation. We are satisfied that the Applicant is 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.

Ventilation is controlled by temperature, extraction fans are high velocity roof mounted. The birds themselves generate sufficient heat to negate the need for any additional heating. Water is via a nipple drinking system fitted with cups to reduce leakage and spills leading to drier litter.

Birds are fed a minimum of three diets during their cycle, with gradually reducing levels of protein and phosphorous as bird age increases. 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 incineration in an on-site incinerator.

Manure belts are operated twice weekly removing litter from the houses.

Ammonia emissions will be reduced by reduced protein feed, maintaining good litter conditions with dry matter content above 60%.

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 sold to third parties.

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 ouE/m³ to assess the potential impact of odour on nearby sensitive receptors. Modelling has been carried out based on emissions from the two 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 Receptor 1, where the modelled results are all above the 3 ouE/m³ benchmark (maximum 4.10 ouE/m³). This is a residential property, is owned by the Operator and will be occupied by the Site Manager. Given the ownership and occupational status of this property, in line with our guidance, we do not consider this receptor to be as 'sensitive' as we would consider dwellings unassociated with the farm. As such we are satisfied that a higher odour concentration is acceptable for this dwelling and therefore deem the modelled odour levels to be acceptable. Results at other 21 sensitive receptors considered are within the benchmark of three odour units. At the nearest sensitive receptor, a residential property approximately 160 metres north-east of the site, the results are all below two 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 tanks.

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 removed from site. 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.

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:

European Sites (Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Areas (SPA)) and Ramsars (afforded the same status as European Sites under UK policy) within 10km of the installation boundary:

- River Wye SAC UK0012642 (1.25 km to South East)
- Ellenydd SAC UK0012928 (9.78km to North West)
- Ellenydd Maellen SPA UK9014111 (9.78 North West)

Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) within 5km of the installation boundary:

• ABERITHON AND BEDW TURBARIES	32WRB	2.54km WNW
• CAE COMIN COCH	32WVF	4.98kmSE
• COED-MAWR QUARRY	32WGZ	2km SSE
• COLWYN BROOK MARSHES (NORTH & SOUTH)	32WXD	3.28km ESE
• CORS Y LLYN	32WRS	2.71km SW
• GWERN-YFED-FACH QUARRY	32WSK	3.42km NNW
• GWEUNYDD DWFNANT (DWFNANT PASTURE)	32WHB	3.33km NNW
• LAKE WOOD, LLANDRINDOD WELLS	32WSA	3.92km NE
• LLANELWEDD ROCKS	32WRH	4.04km SSE
• NEUADD AND TYLELO MIRES	32WEI	1.21km S
• NEWMEAD	32WYX	3.01km SE

• PEN-CERRIG STREAM SECTION	32WHA	2.87km S
• PENTROSFA MIRE	32WZL	3.01km NE
• UPPER WYE TRIBUTARIES	32WXT	3.10km W
• RHOS DWFNANT	32WHT	3.5km NW
• RHOS PENRHIW	32WQ1	1.69km N
• RIVER ITHON	32WMH	1.01km NW
• RIVER WYE (TRIBUTARIES)	32WGU	2.54km ESE
• RIVER WYE (UPPER WYE)	32WUQ	2.75km WNW
• TRECOED/CASTLE CRAB	32WPJ	3.92km NE

Non-statutory sites within 2km of the installation boundary:

- Tyn Coed Wood Local Wildlife Site
- x 120 ancient woodlands

The applicant has carried out detailed modelling of the potential impact of dispersion and of ammonia from the site. The submitted report concludes that the maximum predicted ammonia process contributions (PCs) at European sites are all below the lower screening threshold of 4% of the lower critical level (CL_e) of 1 µg/m³, with the exception of three locations within the River Wye SAC. One of the designated features of this SAC is 'transition mires and quaking bogs', which are sensitive to aerial ammonia deposition and nutrient nitrogen enrichment, and therefore the lower ammonia CL_e is applicable to this habitat.

However, this feature is only present in a certain part of the SAC; this being in the Colwyn Brook Marshes located at about 307805, 255624. The Applicant's dispersion modelling has calculated the ammonia concentration at another part of the SAC (at 306825, 256244) to be 0.032 µg/m³. This is 3.2% of the lower CL_e, which is below the threshold of insignificance of 4%. Given that Colwyn Brook Marshes is located 0.54km further East of the proposed installation than this location the level of additional dispersion that will occur will mean that the ammonia concentration at Colwyn Brook Marsh will be lower than 0.032 µg/m³. In addition, the Applicant has carried out dispersion modelling for a location within the Colwyn Brook Marshes SSSI (specifically at 308008, 255612). This location is 100m East of the Colwyn Brook Marshes section of the River Wye SAC. The maximum ammonia concentration predicted by the applicant at this location is 0.025µg/m³, which is 2.5% of the lower ammonia CL_e. This is also within the threshold of insignificance of 4%. Consequently we are satisfied that the predicted ammonia concentrations at European sites are insignificant.

The Applicant's modelling has produced process contributions (PC) for ammonia at the point of maximum impact within all of the SSSIs listed above with the exception of:

- Gwern-yfed-fach quarry
- Upper Wye tributaries
- River Ithon
- River Wye (Tributaries)
- River Wye (Upper Wye)

Gwern-yfed-fach quarry does not need to be considered as this SSSI is designated for Geological features. The other sites are primarily aquatic in nature and therefore are not sensitive to ammonia deposition and / or nutrient nitrogen enrichment.

The maximum modelled PC for any of the other SSSIs is $0.047\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ at Aberithon and Bedw Turbaries SSSI. This is 4.7% of the lower critical level (CLE) for ammonia. The threshold for insignificance for SSSIs is 20% of the relevant CLE and therefore all modelled PCs can be said to be insignificant, even when assessed against the most conservative CLE.

Should any species that are sensitive to ammonia be present at the Upper Wye tributaries, River Ithon, River Wye (Tributaries) and River Wye (Upper Wye) SSSIs (which, as noted above, is unlikely given their aquatic nature), given the distances of these sites from the proposed installation, and the PCs generated for the other sites, is it highly unlikely that ammonia concentrations at these locations will be above 20% of the lower CLE. This is considered a very conservative assessment given that comparison with the lower CLE (and not the upper CLE) has been carried out. Consequently we are satisfied that the predicted ammonia concentrations are not likely to damage any of the special interest features of the SSSIs.

OGN 200 Form 1 and CRoW Appendix 4 have been completed and forwarded onto our internal Natural Resource Management team for information. Full details of the assessment carried out of the potential effect of ammonia emissions from the proposed site on the SAC and SSSIs detailed above are detailed in the forms. The forms are available from our public register.

The maximum PC at any of the non-statutory sites is $0.259\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ which is 25.9% of the lower ammonia critical level of $1\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. As this is within 100% of the CLE we are satisfied that the predicted ammonia concentrations at non-statutory sites are not significant, in line with our policy.

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

No monitoring requirements for pullets are stipulated in 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. Consequently we have not set monitoring requirements in the Permit.

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 Powys Teaching Health Board	
Brief summary of issues raised:	Summary of action taken / how this has been covered
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. A site ammonia and odour management scheme be implemented and maintained to ensure no adverse ammonia concentrations or odours at nearby sensitive receptors. It is important that these are adequately controlled and do not adversely impact on human health, especially given the perceived association between odour and ill health2. The applicant should be required to devise and maintain a manure management plan detailing when and where manures will be stored and applied to land to avoid off-site impacts from odour and flies. This should include avoiding cumulative odour impacts from other odour sources or activities3. Dusts and bio-aerosols (airborne particles containing living organisms, skin fragments, toxins, and waste products) have possible health effects including exposure to infectious diseases, allergic reactions, respiratory symptoms and lung function impairment.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The Technical Standards document outlines measures that will be put in place to control emissions of ammonia. An odour management plan has also been submitted which details the controls in place to minimise odours associated with the on-site activities. Both documents have been incorporated into Table S1.2 of the permit as operating techniques and are therefore enforceable. We are satisfied that the measures outlined in these documents represent BAT for reducing ammonia and odour emissions at the installation.2. Chicken manure is not a controlled waste and will not be stored or spread within the installation boundary. All aspects of manure storage and spreading for this site are outside the regulatory scope of the Environmental permitting process.3. Bio-aerosols can become airborne through dust associated with day to day flock management activities and handling of manure. It is

<p>Dispersion of any dusts or bio-aerosols will be dependent upon environmental circumstances such as local topography and prevailing weather conditions. Appropriate assessment (such as detailed dispersion modelling or mitigation measures) and operational management of such emissions in accordance with BAT is recommended</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. All on-site storage of liquids is accompanied by bunding in compliance with industry practice and guidance to avoid any potential contamination of ground water or water supplies. Similarly, that all waste storage facilities are in line with the Regulator's guidance 5. The Regulator must be sure that the noise from the proposed activities does not cause nuisance at nearby sensitive receptors 6. The applicant should agree with the Regulator a timetable for seeking external accreditation for the Environmental Management System (EMS) e.g. ISO14001 standard 	<p>recognised that dust and bio-aerosols show some correlation. We are satisfied that the installation will be operated in accordance with BAT for minimising dust emissions and that particulates will be adequately dispersed by using high velocity roof mounted ventilation fans. We have not required dust modelling for the installation as we consider that compliance with BAT will ensure that dust is minimised and the Air Quality Objective is not breached.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The Technical Standards document outlines measures that will be put in place to prevent release of dirty wash water to ground and surface water. This document has been incorporated into Table S1.2 of the permit as operating techniques and is therefore enforceable. We are satisfied that the measures outlined in these documents represent BAT for containing releases of liquids at the installation. 5. A noise management plan has been submitted as part of the application and details the controls in place to minimise noise associated with the on-site activities. The noise management plan has been incorporated into Table S1.2 of the permit as an operating technique, so is therefore enforceable. We are satisfied that the measures outlined in the plan represent BAT for reducing noise emissions at the installation. 6. The Operator has submitted a summary of the Environmental Management System (EMS) that is in place. We are satisfied that the Operator's EMS
--	--

	represents BAT for the installation. There is no legal requirement for EMSs to be externally accredited.
--	--

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