



The Company Director and or Secretary
Crown Waste Management Limited
Suite 17
Building 2/4 Bilton Industrial Estate Humber
Avenue
Coventry
CV3 1JL

Our ref: EPR/TP3035EW/A001

Date: 18 December 2015

Dear Sir or Madam

Pollution Inventory reporting

As part of your EPR permit to operate, you are required to report on annual releases of pollutants from your installation to our Pollution Inventory.

Enclosed is a notice requiring you to make your annual report to the Pollution Inventory (PI). We serve this in exercise of our powers under regulation 60(1) of the Environmental Permitting Regulations, 2010.

Important changes to the Pollution Inventory

The notice requires the completion and submission of information specified in the attached Pollution Inventory Schedule, for each permit detailed, for the calendar year 2012 onwards. The Schedule asks for information on annual mass releases to air, water and land and off-site transfers of waste and of specified substances in waste water.

Following the 2012 Pollution Inventory substance review a decision has been made to reduce the number of reportable substances to 110. Of this number, 8 new substances identified as priority pollutants under the Water Framework Directive have been added to the substance list. Reporting on these additional substances will become mandatory only in February 2014 for the 2013 reporting year.

The deadline for submitting this information is the **28 February** of the year following that being reported. Please note that the report asks for total releases during each calendar year, so you should not return any information until after 31st December of that year. The Environment Agency will no longer be issuing notices on a three year cycle, notices will only be issued when changes are made to the Pollution Inventory reporting requirements

This letter and notice have been sent to both the installation and registered office address, where these are different. Only one form per installation needs to be submitted.

The Environment Agency, Quadrant 2, 99 Parkway Avenue, Sheffield, S9 4WF
National Customer Contact Centre: 03708 506 506

We use the information to meet the UK's obligations to report on releases from industrial sites to the European Pollutant Release and Transfer Register (E-PRTR), and to produce our Pollution Inventory. These will be published on the Internet. We recommend that you complete your PI return using our web-based reporting system. This system can be accessed by following the links to our Pollution Inventory homepage on our website (<https://www.gov.uk/environmental-permit-how-to-apply/monitoring-and-reports>).

If you are unable to use the web-based reporting system, you can complete a paper form. This is available to download from our website (<https://www.gov.uk/environmental-permit-how-to-apply/monitoring-and-reports>) or from any Environment Agency office. The completed form must be returned to your local Environment Agency office.

A fact sheet on legislation, information on reporting requirements and tools for estimating releases, are available on our website (<https://www.gov.uk/environmental-permit-how-to-apply/monitoring-and-reports>).

For any queries on Pollution Inventory reporting please contact either your local Environment Agency officer, or the Pollution Inventory team (contact details at the bottom of the page).

Yours faithfully,



Damian Matthias
Customer Operations Manager

Encs.

- Regulation 60(1) notice
- Pollution Inventory Schedule 2

Requirement for information
Environmental Permitting (England and Wales)
Regulations 2010 Regulation 60(1) Notice

Notice requiring information

To: The Company Director and or Secretary
Crown Waste Management Limited
Suite 17
Building 2/4 Bilton Industrial Estate Humber Avenue
Coventry
CV3 1JL

This Notice relates to the activities you operate that are authorised by the Permit Number(s) specified below (each permit number is shown with the appropriate operating address).

EPR/TP3035EW/A001	Crown Waste Management Limited	Crown Stables, Nuneaton Road, Mancetter, North Warwickshire CV9 1RF
-------------------	--------------------------------	--

The Environment Agency, exercising our power under Regulation 60(1) of the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010, requires you to provide the information detailed in the attached Pollution Inventory Schedule in respect of each Permit referred to above:

- for the 2014 calendar year by 28 February 2015, and for every calendar year thereafter by 28 February of the following year, until further notice is given.

The information must be provided by submission of:

- an electronic return (this can be achieved by following the links to the web-based reporting system from the Environment Agency's Pollution Inventory homepage (<https://www.gov.uk/environmental-permit-how-to-apply/monitoring-and-reports>); or
- Environment Agency Pollution Inventory form (this is available from the Pollution Inventory web pages or in paper copy from any Environment Agency office).

When returning information on the Pollution Inventory form, this should be submitted to your local area office.

Signed



Damian Matthias
Customer Operations Manager

Customer services line: 03708 506 506
Email: enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk
Environment Agency, Quadrant 2, 99 Parkway Avenue, Sheffield, S9 4WF

Pollution Inventory Schedule (2)

The Pollution Inventory (PI) requires you to report information relating to the annual releases¹ of substances specified in this Schedule, to air, water and land and off-site transfers of waste and of specified substances in wastewater²

The Environment Agency has just undertaken a substance review. As a result of this review the substances in this Schedule have been significantly reduced overall, with the addition of several new Water Framework Directive substances (shown in italics). You are not required to report on the new substances in your 2012 submission: reporting of these is a requirement in your 2013 submission onwards.

PI information must be submitted in accordance with the dates specified in the enclosed EPR Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010 Regulation 60 (1) Notice.

The information required by this Schedule should be reported to us either by our web-based reporting system, access to which is available via our website at <https://www.gov.uk/environmental-permit-how-to-apply/monitoring-and-reports>, or by completion of the paper Form PI-1.

This schedule is applicable to all EPR A1 intensive agriculture installations, waste landfills and sewage treatment works required to report via the WIA ministerial direction. It is valid from 2012 until revised.

The Schedule, form and web based reporting system consist of the following parts:

- Part 1 – About the operator and site
- Part 2 – Releases to air
- Part 3 – Releases to land
- Part 4 – Releases to controlled waters
- Part 5 – Off-site transfers in wastewater
- Part 6 – Off-site waste transfers
- Part 7 – Overseas waste transfers

The requirements of each part are set out overleaf.

¹ A release is "any introduction of pollutants into the environment as a result of human activity, whether deliberate or accidental, routine or non-routine, including spilling, emitting, discharging, injecting, disposing or dumping or through sewer systems without final waste-water treatment."

² Transfers in wastewater should include masses of PI substances in any wastes transferred via sewer or other means (eg tanker) direct to waste-water treatment works.

Part 1 About the operator and site

The information we require you to provide in Part 1, includes:

- Details about you and your operations – permit number, operator name and address, contact details and description of site activities;
- Any claim that information provided is confidential. If you wish to claim confidentiality for your Pollution Inventory or REPI data you must provide a full justification in the form of an objection notice. This must be provided to your site inspector who will issue you with a notice of determination to grant or decline the request. The Environment Agency does not grant confidentiality for release or emissions data except in cases of national security.

Purpose of Parts 2, 3, 4 and 5 of this Schedule

Parts 2, 3, 4 and 5 of this Schedule list the individual reportable substances for each environmental medium (air, water, land and wastewater) and the reporting thresholds that apply to those substances.

The information you will have to provide for each reportable substance includes:

1. Total releases

Total releases = the sum of **all** releases from the 'reporting unit' (reporting unit describes the EPR permitted facility or sewage treatment works), that is:
annual mass/TEQ of substance released including *fugitive and notifiable* releases.

Fugitive releases = releases not contained at source.

Notifiable releases = releases from unplanned and unpermitted/unauthorised operations, for example resulting from an emergency, accident etc., which require separate notification to us.

- If the 'total releases' figure is below the reporting threshold, it should be reported as 'brt' (below reporting threshold);
- The figures for releases to controlled waters and transfers in wastewater should be compared separately against the reporting thresholds;
- For releases to controlled waters, the receiving media should be reported as either G = groundwater, R = river, E = estuary or S = sea;
- 'n/a' (not applicable) should be entered against substances not released;
- All releases should be reported in either kilotonnes 'kt', tonnes 't', kilograms 'kg', grams 'g' or milligrams 'mg' per year as appropriate.
- Where a substance may be present but is not detected by the accepted analytical method it should be reported as n/a.

2. Method of release determination

This requires identification of the method used to generate the reported releases and transfers, that is *M = Measurement*, *C = Calculation* or *E = Estimation*. Where the data reported is based on *Measurement* or *Calculation*, further details are required. Please refer to PI reporting guidance for more information about this requirement.

3. Separate figure for any *notifiable* releases, where appropriate

You are required to provide a separate figure for any notifiable releases (defined in paragraph 1 above).

Part 2 Releases to air

Reportable Substance: common name [alternative name]	CAS no.	Reporting threshold in kg
Inorganics		
Ammonia	7664-41-7	1,000
Asbestos	1332-21-4	1
Carbon dioxide	124-38-9	10 million
Carbon dioxide from qualifying renewable fuel sources (Reportable when the total amount of CO ₂ released is above 10 million kg)	124-38-9	
Carbon monoxide	630-08-0	100,000
Hydrogen cyanide	74-90-8	100
Nitrous oxide	10024-97-2	10,000
Sulphur hexafluoride	2551-62-4	10
Organics		
Aldrin	309-00-2	1
Anthracene	120-12-7	10
Benzene	71-43-2	1,000
Benzo(a)pyrene	50-32-8	1
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	205-99-2	1
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	207-08-9	1
Butadiene [1,3-Butadiene]	106-99-0	100
Carbon tetrachloride [Tetrachloromethane]	56-23-5	10
Chlordane	57-74-9	1
Chlordecone	143-50-0	1
Chloroform [Trichloromethane]	67-66-3	100
Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT)	50-29-3	1
Dichloromethane [DCM, Methylene chloride]	75-09-2	1,000
Dieldrin	60-57-1	1
Di(2-Ethylhexyl)phthalate (DEHP)	117-81-7	10
Endrin	72-20-8	1
Ethylene dichloride [1,2-Dichloroethane]	107-06-2	1,000
Ethylene oxide [1,2-Epoxyethane]	75-21-8	1,000
Heptachlor	76-44-8	1
Hexabromobiphenyl	36355-1-8	0.1
Hexachlorobenzene	118-74-1	1
Hexachlorocyclohexane – all isomers	608-73-1	1
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	193-39-5	1
Lindane	58-89-9	1
Methane	74-82-8	10,000
Methyl chloroform [1,1,1-Trichloroethane]	71-55-6	10
Mirex	2385-85-5	1
Naphthalene	91-20-3	100
Pentachlorobenzene	608-93-5	1
Pentachlorophenol	87-86-5	1
Tetrachloroethane [1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane]	79-34-5	10
Tetrachloroethylene [PERC]	127-18-4	100

Reportable Substance: common name [alternative name]	CAS no.	Reporting threshold in kg
Toxaphene	8001-35-2	1
Trichlorobenzene - all isomers	12002-48-1	1
Trichloroethylene	79-01-6	1,000
Vinyl chloride	75-01-4	1,000
Metals and compounds expressed as mass of the metal only		
Arsenic and compounds - as As	7440-38-2	1
Cadmium and compounds – as Cd	7440-43-9	1
Chromium and compounds - as Cr	7440-47-3	10
Copper and compounds - as Cu	7440-50-8	10
Lead and compounds - as Pb	7439-92-1	100
Mercury and compounds – as Hg	7439-97-6	1
Nickel and compounds – as Ni	7440-02-0	10
Selenium and compounds – as Se	7782-49-2	100
Zinc and compounds - as Zn	7440-66-6	100
Other substance groups reported as total mass unless otherwise stated		
Chlorine and inorganic compounds - as HCl	7782-50-5	10,000
Chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs)	-	1
Dioxins and furans (PCDDs/PCDFs) as I-TEQ	-	0.00001
Dioxins and furans (PCDDs/PCDFs) as WHO-TEQ	-	0.00001
Fluorine and inorganic compounds - as HF	7782-41-4	1,000
Halons	-	1
Hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs)	-	1
Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)	-	100
Nitrogen oxides - NO and NO ₂ as NO ₂	-	100,000
Non-methane volatile organic compounds (NMVOCs)	-	10,000
Particulate matter - PM _{2.5}	-	1,000
Particulate matter - PM ₁₀	-	1,000
Particulate matter – TSP	-	10,000
Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)	-	10
Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs)	1336-36-3	0.1
Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) - as WHO-TEQ	1336-36-3	0.00001
Sulphur oxides - SO ₂ and SO ₃ as SO ₂	-	100,000

Part 3 Releases to land

Reporting of releases to land is limited to deep injection and chemical land treatment. It is not for reporting releases to land 'resulting in benefit to agriculture or ecological improvement'

The reportable substances and reporting thresholds shown in the table below are required for the following releases to land:

- Disposal by land spreading within category D2 of Annex IIA of the Waste Framework Directive³;
- Disposal by deep injection within category D3 of Annex IIA of the Waste Framework Directive⁴.

These are required for releases within **or outside** the boundary of the permitted operation.

For other information required in respect of the 'total releases' of each reportable substance, please refer to the section 'Purpose of Parts 2, 3, 4 and 5 of this Schedule'.

Reportable Substance: common name [alternative name]	CAS no.	Reporting threshold in kg
Inorganics		
Asbestos	1332-21-4	1
Organics		
Alachlor	15972-60-8	1
Aldrin	309-00-2	1
Anthracene	120-12-7	1
Atrazine	1912-24-9	1
Benzene (Reportable if sum of BTEX ⁵ exceeds 200 kg)	71-43-2	200
Benzo(a)pyrene	50-32-8	1
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	205-99-2	1
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	207-08-9	1
Chlordane	57-74-9	1
Chlordecone	143-50-0	1
Chlorfenvinphos	470-90-6	1
Chlorpyrifos	2921-88-2	1
Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT)	50-29-3	1
Dichloromethane [DCM, Methylene chloride]	75-09-2	10
Dieldrin	60-57-1	1
Di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (DEHP)	117-81-7	1
Diuron	330-54-1	1
Endosulfan	115-29-7	1
Endrin	72-20-8	1
Ethylbenzene (Reportable if sum of BTEX ⁵ exceeds 200 kg)	100-41-4	200
Ethylene dichloride [1,2-Dichloroethane]	107-06-2	10
Ethylene oxide [1,2-Epoxyethane]	75-21-8	10
Heptachlor	76-44-8	1
Hexabromobiphenyl	36355-1-8	0.1
Hexachlorobenzene (HCB)	118-74-1	1
Hexachlorobutadiene	87-68-3	1
Hexachlorocyclohexane - all isomers	608-73-1	1

³ Annex I of the Waste Framework Directive 2008/98/EC contains a list of disposal operations, which includes category D2 "Land treatment (e.g. biodegradation of liquid or sludgy discards in soils, etc.)";

⁴ Annex I of the Waste Framework Directive 2008/98/EC contains a list of disposal operations, which includes category D3 "injection (e.g. injection of pumpable discards into wells, salt domes or naturally occurring repositories, etc.)";

⁵ BTEX is benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes

Reportable Substance: common name [alternative name]	CAS no.	Reporting threshold in kg
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	193-39-5	1
Isoproturon	34123-59-6	1
Lindane	58-89-9	1
Mirex	2385-85-5	1
Naphthalene	91-20-3	10
Pentachlorobenzene	608-93-5	1
Pentachlorophenol (PCP)	87-86-5	1
Simazine	122-34-9	1
Toluene (Reportable if sum of BTEX ^{Error! Bookmark not defined.} exceeds 200 kg)	108-88-3	200
Toxaphene	8001-35-2	1
Trifluralin	1582-09-8	1
Vinyl chloride	75-01-4	10
Xylene – all isomers (Reportable if sum of BTEX ^{Error! Bookmark not defined.} exceeds 200 kg)	1330-20-7	200
Metals and compounds expressed as mass of the metal only		
Arsenic and compounds – as As	7440-38-2	5
Cadmium and compounds – as Cd	7440-43-9	5
Chromium and compounds - as Cr	7440-47-3	50
Copper and compounds – as Cu	7440-50-8	50
Lead and compounds – as Pb	7439-92-1	20
Mercury and compounds – as Hg	7439-97-6	1
Nickel and compounds - as Ni	7440-02-0	20
Zinc and compounds – as Zn	7440-66-6	100
Other substance groups reported as total mass unless otherwise stated		
Brominated diphenylethers – penta-, octa- and deca-BDE	-	1
Chlorides – as Cl	16887-00-6	2 million
Cyanides – as CN	57-12-5	50
Dioxins and furans (PCDDs/PCDFs) – as I-TEQ	-	0.0001
Dioxins and furans (PCDDs/PCDFs) as WHO-TEQ	-	0.0001
Fluorides – as F	16984-48-8	2,000
Halogenated organic compounds – as AOX	-	1,000
Nitrogen – total	-	50,000
Nonylphenols and nonylphenol ethoxylates	-	1
Organotin compounds - as Sn	-	50
Phenols – phenol and simple substituted phenols as C	108-95-2	20
Phosphorus – total	-	5,000
Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs)	1336-36-3	0.1
Polychlorinated biphenyls as WHO-TEQ	-	0.0001
Short chain (C ₁₀₋₁₃) chlorinated paraffins (SCCPs)	85535-84-8	1
Tributyltin and compounds – as TBT	56573-85-4	1
Triphenyltin and compounds – as TPT	668-34-8	1

Parts 4 and 5 Releases to controlled waters & transfers in wastewater

The figures for releases to controlled waters and transfers in wastewater should be compared separately to the reporting threshold.

Reportable Substance: common name [alternative name]	CAS no.	Reporting threshold in kg
Inorganics		
Asbestos	1332-21-4	0.1
Organics		
Alachlor	15972-60-8	0.1
Aclonifen	74070-46-5	To be advised
Aldrin	309-00-2	0.0005
Anthracene	120-12-7	0.1
Atrazine	1912-24-9	0.05
Benzene (Reportable if sum of BTEX ^{Error! Bookmark not defined.} exceeds 200 kg)	71-43-2	10
Benzo(a)pyrene	50-32-8	1
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	205-99-2	1
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	191-24-2	0.1
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	207-08-9	1
<i>Bifenox</i>	42576-02-3	To be advised
Carbon tetrachloride [Tetrachloromethane]	56-23-5	1
Chlordane	57-74-9	0.1
Chlordecone	143-50-0	0.1
Chlorfenvinphos	470-90-6	0.1
Chloroform [Trichloromethane]	67-66-3	5
Chlorpyrifos	2921-88-2	0.1
<i>Cybutryne</i>	28159-98-0	To be advised
Cypermethrin	52315-07-8	0.005
Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT)	50-29-3	0.0005
Dichloromethane [DCM, Methylene chloride]	75-09-2	10
<i>Dichlorvos</i>	62-73-7	To be advised
<i>Diclofenac</i>	15307-86-5	To be advised
<i>Dicofol</i>	115-32-2	To be advised
Dieldrin	60-57-1	0.0005
Di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (DEHP)	117-81-7	0.1
Diuron	330-54-1	0.05
<i>17-beta-estradiol (E2)</i>	50-28-2	To be advised
<i>17-alpha-ethinylestradiol (EE2)</i>	57-63-6	To be advised
Endosulfan	115-29-7	0.0005
Endrin	72-20-8	0.0005
Ethylbenzene (Reportable if sum of BTEX ^{Error! Bookmark not defined.} exceeds 200 kg)	100-41-4	10
Ethylene dichloride [1,2-Dichloroethane]	107-06-2	10
Ethylene oxide [1,2-Epoxyethane]	75-21-8	1
Fluoranthene	206-44-0	0.1
Heptachlor (<i>and heptachlor epoxide</i>)	76-44-8	0.1
Hexabromobiphenyl	36355-1-8	0.1
Hexabromocyclododecane	25637-99-4	0.1
Hexachlorobenzene	118-74-1	0.01
Hexachlorobutadiene	87-68-3	0.1
Hexachlorocyclohexane – all isomers	608-73-1	0.01
Isodrin	465-73-6	0.0005
Isoproturon	34123-59-6	0.01
Lindane	58-89-9	0.1
Mirex	2385-85-5	0.1
Naphthalene	91-20-3	1

Reportable Substance: common name [alternative name]	CAS no.	Reporting threshold in kg
Pentachlorobenzene	608-93-5	0.1
Pentachlorophenol	87-86-5	0.05
Perfluorooctane sulphonic acid and its derivatives (PFOS)	1763-23-1	0.1
Quinoxifen	124495-18-7	To be advised
Simazine	122-34-9	0.01
Terbutryn	886-50-0	To be advised
Tetrachloroethylene (PERC)	127-18-4	1
Toluene (Reportable if sum of BTEX ^{Error! Bookmark not defined.} exceeds 200 kg)	108-88-3	10
Toxaphene	8001-35-2	0.1
Trichlorobenzene – all isomers	12002-48-1	0.01
Trichloroethylene	79-01-6	1
Trifluralin	1582-09-8	0.001
Vinyl chloride	75-01-4	1
Xylene – all isomers (Reportable if sum of BTEX ^{Error! Bookmark not defined.} exceeds 200 kg)	1330-20-7	10
Metals and compounds expressed as mass of the metal only		
Arsenic and compounds - as As	7440-38-2	5
Cadmium and compounds - as Cd	7440-43-9	1
Chromium and compounds - as Cr	7440-47-3	20
Copper and compounds - as Cu	7440-50-8	20
Iron and compounds – as Fe (FOR WALES ONLY)	7439-89-6	1000
Lead and compounds - as Pb	7439-92-1	20
Mercury and compounds - as Hg	7439-97-6	0.1
Nickel and compounds - as Ni	7440-02-0	20
Zinc and compounds – as Zn	7440-66-6	100
Other substance groups reported as total mass unless otherwise stated		
Brominated diphenylethers – tetra-, penta-, hexa-, hepta-, octa- and deca-BDE	-	0.1
Chlorides – as Cl	16887-00-6	2 million
Cyanides – as CN	57-12-5	50
Dioxins and furans (PCDDs/PCDFs) as I-TEQ	-	0.0001
Dioxins and furans (PCDDs/PCDFs) as WHO-TEQ	-	0.0001
Fluorides – as F	-	2,000
Halogenated organic compounds - as AOX	-	1,000
Nitrogen – total	-	50,000
Nonylphenols and nonylphenol ethoxylates	-	1
Octylphenols and octylphenol ethoxylates	1806-26-4	1
Organotin compounds - as Sn	-	5
Phenols – phenol and simple substituted phenols as C	108-95-2	20
Phosphorus – total	-	5,000
Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs)	-	0.001
Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) as WHO-TEQ	-	0.0001
Short chain (C ₁₀₋₁₃) chlorinated paraffins (SCCPs)	85535-84-8	0.1
Total organic carbon (TOC)	-	50,000
Tributyltin and compounds - as TBT	-	0.005
Triphenyltin and compounds – as TPT	668-34-8	0.1

For other information required in respect of the 'total releases' of each reportable substance, please refer to the section 'Purpose of Parts 2, 3, 4 and 5 of this Schedule'.

Part 6 Off-site waste transfers

Part 6 should include all off-site transfers of activity-related wastes **except** wastewaters which should be reported in Part 5 as chemical-specific transfers.

For off-site transfers of activity-related wastes, the following information should be provided:

- Weight, in tonnes;
- 6-figure European Waste Catalogue (EWC) code⁵;
- Waste Framework Directive (WFD) disposal and recovery (D&R) codes⁶;
- Identification of the method used to generate the reported data, that is *M = Measurement*, *C = Calculation* or *E = Estimation*, including further details of any *Measurement* or *Calculation* method used.

The following points should also be noted:

- Any wastes already reported in Part 3 - Releases to land (i.e. disposal activities D2 - Land treatment and D3 - Deep injection) should be excluded;
- All hazardous waste transfers should be reported regardless of tonnage;
- Other wastes transferred off-site should be reported where the total transferred exceeds 5 tonnes, otherwise report 'brt' (below reporting threshold) for each category where a transfer occurs;

For any transfers involving the Transfrontier Shipment of Waste (TFS) for recovery additional details, including the name and address of the recoverer and the address of the actual recovery site receiving the transfer, are required. Please refer to PI reporting guidance for more information about how to report TFS.

Part 7 – Overseas Waste Transfer

Part 7 should include any activity-related hazardous waste that is sent overseas for disposal or recovery.

The following information should be provided:

- Total Weight in tonnes
- Identification of the method used to generate the reported data, that is *M = Measurement*, *C = Calculation* or *E = Estimation*, including further details of any *Measurement* or *Calculation* method used.
- Name and address of the recoverer/dispenser and the address of the site that is receiving the waste.

⁵ EWC codes: these represent the types of waste as defined in the European Waste Catalogue (EWC);

⁶ WFD disposal and recovery (D&R) codes: these represent the methods of disposal and recovery as defined operations listed in Annex II to the Directive.

Determination of an Application for an Environmental Permit under the Environmental Permitting (England & Wales) Regulations 2010.

Decision document recording our decision-making process

The Permit Number is: **EPR/TP3035EW**
The Applicant is: **Crown Waste Management Limited**
The Installation is located at: **Crown Stables Poultry Unit
Nuneaton Road
Mancetter
North Warwickshire
CV9 1RF**

Application consultation commenced on: 13 May 2015
Application consultation ended on: 25 June 2015

Draft decision consultation commenced on: 29 September 2015
Draft decision consultation ended on: 26 October 2015

Environment Agency permitting decisions

What this document is about

This is a decision document, which accompanies a permit.

It explains how we have considered the Applicant's Application, and why we have included the specific conditions in the permit we are proposing to grant. It is our record of our decision-making process, to show how we have taken into account all relevant factors in reaching our position. Unless the document explains otherwise, we have accepted the Applicant's proposals.

We have made our final decision only after carefully taking into account any relevant matter raised in the responses we received.

Preliminary information and use of terms

We gave the application the reference number EPR/TP3035EW/A001. We refer to the application as "the **Application**" in this document in order to be consistent.

The number we propose to give to the permit is EPR/TP3035EW. We refer to the proposed permit as "the **Permit**" in this document.

The Application was duly made on 28 April 2015.

The Applicant is Crown Waste Management Limited. We refer to Crown Waste Management Limited as "the **Applicant**" in this document. Where we are talking about what would happen after the Permit is granted (if that is our final decision), we call Crown Waste Management Limited "the **Operator**".

The proposed facility is located at Crown Stables, Nuneaton Road, Mancetter, North Warwickshire, CV9 1RF. We refer to this as "the **Installation**" in this document.

This Application became designated as High Public Interest during the determination and towards the end of the initial consultation period when we became aware of the level of public interest in the site.

The consultation period ran initially from 13 May 2015 to 11 June 2015 and was subsequently extended by 10 working days, providing further opportunity for comments to be submitted. Although comments continue to be received and considered up to the point this decision document is issued.

Many of the comments received were resubmissions of comments made for a previous Planning application, and do not relate directly to issues that the Environment Agency regulate or can consider as part of the determination of the Application.

The resulting comments have been considered and are addressed in Annex 1 of this document.

We have summarised the consultation responses received in respect of the consultation on our draft decision; the main change from the draft decision document is an update to the site drainage in section 3 of this document.

We are minded to grant the permit for Crown Stables Poultry Unit operated by Crown Waste Management 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 a high level of protection for the environment and human health 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

- Details of the proposal
- Environmental issues and their control
- Annex 1 – A) consultation on the application
B) consultation on the draft decision

Details of the proposal

The installation comprises a single broiler unit providing capacity for 40,001 broiler places (broilers are chickens bred specifically for meat production).

This unit meets the threshold for requiring an environmental permit under listed activity: Section 6.9 A(1)(a)(i) Rearing of poultry intensively in an installation with more than 40,000 places.

The Application has been assessed in line with our guidance: EPR 6.09 Sector Guidance Note – How to comply with your environmental permit for intensive farming (EPR 6.09). The techniques proposed by the Applicant meet the requirements set out in this guidance and are considered to be the best available techniques (BAT) for a broiler unit of this size. It is a requirement of the permit that the poultry unit is operated in line with this guidance.

Day old chicks are brought into the unit and fed and watered until they reach around 37 days of age, at which point they are removed from the site and taken to a meat processing facility. There is a 7 day cleaning period plus the stocking and destocking time resulting in an average cycle length of 48 days.

The chicks are bedded on wood shavings to a minimum depth of 2cm, fresh bedding is added throughout the cycle. Non-leaking drinking systems will be used so that the litter does not get too wet, and reducing the likelihood of run off to the underground reception pit.

The clean out process takes place generally within 24 hours of destocking (maximum 48 hours), and comprises removing the manure / bedding from the building, steam cleaning and washing down the internal surfaces and applying disinfectant. Once the unit is fully dry, new bedding will be added and the building restocked with chicks.

Building ventilation will be reduced to a minimum during the clean out process to contain dust and particulate within the confines of the building.

All manure is exported from the installation on covered trucks for use in an energy recovery facility. No manure will be stored on site outside of the building.

Water from the wash out of poultry houses, and condensate from the heat exchanger, will drain to a covered underground reception pit to await collection and export off site by road tanker.

There will be no emissions to sewer.

The broiler unit is ventilated by 18 high speed roof fans with emission points 7 metres above ground level and an efflux speed greater than 7 metres per second. In addition to the fans, windows on the sides of the building allow for natural ventilation.

Other associated infrastructure includes two feed silos, a heat exchanger to regulate the temperature in the building, the underground reception pit located within the concrete yard and an attenuation pond for collection of uncontaminated rainwater from the yard within the installation boundary.

Roof water and yard rain water is directed via the surface water drainage system into an attenuation pond before being released under controlled conditions to an adjacent watercourse that runs towards the River Anker. All water released from the pond will be uncontaminated, if there is a likelihood of contaminated water getting into the pond, the outlet from the pond to the watercourse can be closed by means of a hydraulic brake. The pond will then be emptied with the contents being tankered away for appropriate disposal. The capacity of the pond is 145 m³.

The dirty water drainage system collects wash down water from the broiler unit, directing it to the underground reception pit. The storage capacity of the pit is 31.6m³. The pit will be emptied at the end of each cleaning operation. Water levels within the pit will be monitored at all times, and it will be emptied more frequently if necessary.

The broiler feed is stored in sealed feed bins, filled via a closed delivery system from a truck. Feed will be delivered weekly, during daylight hours. The feed will be supplied by a UKASTA accredited feed mill. UKASTA is the UK Agricultural Supply Trade Association (now operating as Agricultural Industries Confederation (AIC)).

Carcasses are collected once a week and stored in a secure container on site prior to removal by a licensed waste disposal contractor.

The operator has provided a site plan which we consider is satisfactory, showing the extent of the site of the facility. The plan is included in the permit and the operator is required to carry on the permitted activities within the site boundary.

Environmental issues and their control

Receptors

There are a number of sensitive receptors within 400 metres of the installation and therefore a noise management plan and an odour management plan have been prepared in accordance with EPR 6.09 and Annex B of H1 guidance which forms part of the Environment Agency risk assessment framework. Annex B is the technical annex relating to risks associated with intensive farming.

The receptors situated within 400m are as follows:

1. Residences and equestrian centre approximately 40m to the north of the installation boundary at the top of the entrance road; approximately 100m from the broiler house. (NGR: SP 32441 96158).
2. A residence / farm approximately 110m west of the installation boundary (NGR: SP 32215 96003).
3. Residences on the outskirts of Mancetter village, approximately 280m north west of the installation boundary (NGR: SP 32265 96356).
4. A residence / farm approximately 370m east of the installation boundary (NGR: SP 32790 95863).

Note: where documents such as the Odour Management Plan, Risk Assessment, Technical Standards are referred to below; operating in accordance with these is a requirement of the permit. We have specified that the Operator must operate the permit in accordance with process and procedures described in the application, including all additional information received during the determination process.

These documents are specified in the Operating Techniques table in the permit (Table S1.2).

1. Air Emissions

Human Health

The Applicant is aware of the potential impacts on human health from air emissions from the broiler unit, (dust / bioaerosols, ammonia) and the risk of disease from birds; and has identified measures to prevent or minimise these emissions, as set out in their risk assessment and technical standards document, and as described in further detail below.

- Dust / bioaerosols

The housekeeping practices employed on site to protect the staff and as part of the disease control strategy, will also benefit the wider community in that minimising dust around the unit will reduce the potential for dust / bioaerosol emissions to disperse into the atmosphere.

These practices include feed delivered premixed and kept in covered silos; clearing of dust to prevent build up on buildings and surfaces; use of appropriate bedding and correct storage of fresh bedding supplies. In addition as part of the biosecurity (disease management) measures no manure will be stored on site.

The best available evidence in relation to bioaerosol emissions from an intensive farm is that they return to existing levels, i.e. usual background levels, at about 100m from the source. Most of the receptors are much further away than this, the nearest receptor being the equestrian centre, at about 100m from the actual broiler unit. Therefore at this distance it is considered that there will be no discernible impact on local residents or receptors.

- Ammonia

The Health Protection Agency (now Public Health England) has stated (Position Statement, Intensive Farming 2006) that it is unlikely that ammonia emissions from a well run and regulated farm would be sufficient to cause ill health. Whilst the potential adverse effects of ammonia include respiratory irritation and may also give rise to odour complaints, levels of ammonia in ambient air will decrease rapidly with distance from a source.

The Operators' measures to manage particulate emissions which will minimise ammonia emissions from the site are included in their Environmental Risk Assessment and Odour Management Plan. It is a requirement of the permit that the site is operated in accordance with the OMP.

We have assessed these measures and have determined they represent best available techniques for this activity. The measures do include operating ventilation systems to achieve appropriate conditions for the age and weight of the birds and controlling litter moisture levels. This would mean not running the ventilation systems when not required (i.e. during periods of low temperatures), and ensuring the litter does not become too dry in order to minimise the potential for emissions.

Other measures include the feed formulation designed to match broiler requirements and minimise the amount of manure (ammonia) produced; maintaining sufficient wood shavings as bedding to bind nitrogen; regular monitoring of broiler house and maintenance of equipment; manure removal to take place quickly, and transported in covered trucks.

Overall, emissions will be prevented, and where this is not practicable, minimised; and will not cause any significant harm to human health.

Odour

The poultry unit will comprise high speed, ridge-mounted chimney fans for ventilation and to disperse odour (as well as dust / bioaerosols and ammonia – see sections above).

An Odour Management Plan (OMP) has been submitted with this application. The OMP consists of:

- An initial OMP submission and H1 risk assessment Table 1.
- Duly making response with updated OMP (April 2015).
- An updated version dated July 2015.

The OMP covers feed selection, feed storage and containment, ventilation design, wash down and manure management and contingency measures.

The Operator acknowledges that cleaning out the manure from a broiler unit is a potential source of odour; vehicles will be loaded at a low level immediately outside the doors at the south east end of the building, and sheeted before leaving the site to minimise dust and odour emissions.

Broiler litter has the potential to produce sulphurous compounds. The same management techniques as for minimising production and emission of ammonia (refer section above) are applied to minimise sulphurous compounds forming and producing odour; as described in the OMP.

Given the nature of the proposed activity there is the potential for odour pollution from the installation. However the risk of odour pollution beyond the installation boundary is considered insignificant provided operations are undertaken in accordance with the OMP as submitted (July 2015). This is a requirement of the permit and will prevent and where that is not practicable minimise odorous emissions.

Feed and diet

The broiler feed is formulated to match each stage of growth and development to reduce wastage, (3 different feed formulations). The feed comprises mainly grain including varying levels of protein and phosphorous nutrients. The phosphorous content is reduced over the production cycle in line with industry practice. This satisfies the requirements of EPR 6.09 which states that the broiler diet should minimise the excretion of nitrogen and phosphorous.

The feed will be supplied by a UKASTA accredited feed mill; it will comprise of cereals, seeds, soya beans, pulses, along with protein supplements and vitamins and other additives to increase the feed conversion ratio.

Maintenance

Monthly checks will be carried out on the ventilation system in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions to ensure efficient operation.

Ammonia emissions - impact on habitats

We assess the potential impact of emissions on conservation sites and species which are protected in law by legislation (e.g. Habitats Directive, Environment Act). We cannot permit something that will result in significant pollution to sites, habitats or species.

The Habitats Directive provides the highest level of protection for Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Special Protected Areas (SPAs), domestic legislation provides a lower but still important level of protection for Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs). Finally the Environment Act provides more generalised protection for flora and fauna rather than for specifically named conservation designations. It is under the Environment Act that we assess other sites (such as Local Wildlife Sites - LWS) which offers levels of protection proportionate with other European and national legislation. However, it should not be assumed that because levels of protection are less stringent for these other sites, that they are not of considerable importance. Local sites link and support EU and national nature conservation sites together and hence help to maintain the UK's biodiversity resilience.

The emissions from Intensive Farming installations that could impact on a conservation site are ammonia in the form of an atmospheric gas, or acid or nitrogen in the form deposition onto the ground.

We use a Critical Level (CL_e) as a measure of the gaseous concentration of pollutants (ammonia) in the atmosphere; above this level direct adverse effects on the receptor (habitat / species) may occur.

We use a Critical Load (CL_o) as a measure of the quantity of pollutant (acid or nitrogen) deposited from air to ground; exposure of the receptor to concentrations below this CL_o will not experience significant harmful effects.

This approach to assessing emissions from an Intensive Farming Installation such as this poultry unit, are supported by data from the Air Pollution Information System (www.apis.ac.uk) and has been agreed with Natural England.

Critical levels and loads are set to protect the most vulnerable habitat types. Thresholds change in accordance with the levels of protection afforded by the legislation (see above). Therefore the thresholds for SACs and SSSIs are more stringent than those for other nature conservation sites; e.g. LWS and Ancient Woodlands (AW).

There is 1 SAC located within 10 kilometres of the installation. There are 4 SSSIs located within 5 km of the installation. There are also 16 LWS' and AWs, within 2 km of the installation.

Ammonia assessment – SAC

The following trigger threshold is applied for the assessment of SACs (in agreement with Natural England):

- where the process contribution (PC), i.e. the amount of potential pollutant emitted, is below 4% of the relevant critical level (CLE) or critical load (CLo) then the farm can be permitted with no further assessment.

Screening using the ammonia screening tool (version 4.3) has determined that the PC on the SAC for ammonia from the proposed site is under the 4% significance threshold and can be screened out as having no likely significant effect. Results shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1 – Ammonia emissions

Site	Critical level ammonia $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	Predicted PC $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	PC % of Critical level
Ensor's Pool (habitat for crayfish)	1	0.07	0.7

A precautionary approach is taken, choosing the lowest critical level of $1 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. Where the precautionary level of $1 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ is used, and the PC is assessed to be less than the 4% threshold, it is not necessary to further consider nitrogen deposition or acid deposition, as the lowest critical level represents the most sensitive habitat, no other pollutant would have a greater impact. We are satisfied that there will be no likely significant effect on the interest features of the SAC.

Ammonia assessment – SSSIs

The following trigger threshold has been applied for assessment of SSSIs (in agreement with Natural England):

- where 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.

Screening using the ammonia screening tool (version 4.3) has indicated that the PCs for the SSSIs in the table below are predicted to be less than 20% of the critical level for ammonia therefore it is possible to conclude no damage. Results are given in Table 2 below.

Table 2 – Ammonia emissions

Name of SSSI	Ammonia CLe ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	PC ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	PC as % of Critical level
Bentley Park Wood (broad leaved, mixed & yew woodland)	1	0.028	2.8
Illing's Trenches (geological interest)	1	0.051	5.1
Boon's Quarry (geological interest)	1	0.069	6.9
Woodlands Quarry (geological interest)	1	0.084	8.4

A precautionary approach is taken, choosing the lowest critical level of $1 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. Where the precautionary level of $1 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ is used, and the process contribution is assessed to be less than the 20% threshold it is not necessary to further consider nitrogen deposition or acid deposition.

In these cases the $1 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ level used has not been confirmed, but as it is the strictest level that could apply its use is precautionary. The actual level could be $3 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ depending on the habitat being protected, we have applied the lower limit. We are satisfied that the proposed installation would not damage the special features of any of the SSSIs.

Ammonia assessment - LWS/AW

There are 16 Local Wildlife Sites (LWS)/Ancient Woodland (AW) within 2 km of Crown Stables. The following trigger thresholds have been applied for the assessment of these sites (in agreement with Natural England):

- where the PC is <100% of the relevant critical level or load, then the farm can be permitted with no further assessment.

For the following sites this farm has been screened out as described above, based on the results of the ammonia screening tool (version 4.3).

Screening using ammonia screening tool (version 4.3) has indicated that emissions from Crown Stables will only have a potential impact on sites with a critical level of $1 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ if they are within 250 metres of the emission source; beyond this distance, the PC at conservation sites is less than $1 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$.

In this case all LWS/AW are significantly beyond this distance (see Table 3) and so the PC will be significantly below $1 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for each site.

Table 3 – distance from source

Site	Distance (m)
Quarries Wood LWS	1,654
River Anker Meadows LWS	1,737
Witherley Hedgerow LWS	1,276
Hedgerow North of Witherley LWS	1,650

Mythe Lane Hedgerow LWS	2,088
Drayton Lane Hedgerow LWS	1,372
Chapel Lane Hedgerow LWS	1,628
Chapel Lane Hedgerow 2 LWS	1,618
Kennel Farm Hedgerow and Tree LWS	1,622
Atterton Road Hedgerow LWS	1,979
Rawn Hill LWS	1,240
Purley & Mancetter Quarries LWS	1,165
Unknown AW	1,477
Quarries Wood South AW	1,161
Hartshill Hayes AW	1,138
Upper Coal Spinney AW	1,783

The PC at these sites has been screened as insignificant. It is possible to conclude no significant pollution will occur at these sites and no further assessment is required.

In summary we can conclude that the installation would not cause significant pollution at any of these sites as in each case the predicted PC is less than the relevant critical level.

2. Noise

We have assessed the Noise Management Plan (NMP) and associated H1 Assessment of noise risk; the Applicant has followed the guidance set out in EPR 6.09 and we are satisfied that all sources and receptors have been identified, and the proposed mitigation measures will minimise the risk of noise pollution / nuisance.

The NMP does state that deliveries will be made during daylight hours (06:00 – 19:00); however our interpretation of daylight hours is 07:00 – 23:00 as detailed in EPR 6.09. The Applicant has acknowledged that where they refer to 'daylight' hours in their operating techniques that the Environment Agency will interpret that to mean starting no earlier than 07:00, and this has been incorporated into the permit.

The noise risk assessment confirms that deliveries of feed and fuel will be made during daylight hours; and that animal movements will take place during daylight hours.

The Applicant also submitted a 'Plant noise and vibration assessment' intended to provide information relevant to the local planning authority in support of the planning application for the broiler unit. The assessment mostly refers to National Planning Practice Guidance applicable to location planning, rather than the operational element of the activity under British Standard BS4142.

In this Plant noise and vibration assessment, the noise from the heat exchanger is identified as the having the highest Sound Pressure Level, for which mitigation has been provided by locating it at the furthest point away from receptors, and by the construction of an acoustic barrier around it.

Although this assessment has not been written for the environmental permit application, does not use the latest standard BS4142 and did not include the full

modelling files; we have considered its contents as part of the determination and are satisfied that its conclusions are consistent with the NMP and do not alter our decision.

Based on the information submitted regarding noise, we are satisfied that the plan meets our requirements in respect of noise management and mitigation and that noise will be prevented and where that is not practicable minimised.

3. Water and land pollution, potential to contribute to local flooding

The hard standing areas around the building will be constructed as an impermeable surface which is kerbed to prevent run off to the surrounding area. This area is connected to surface water drainage system which collects uncontaminated rain water from roofs and clean surfaces and directs this to the attenuation pond. Visual inspections of the pond will take place to confirm it contains no contamination before any water is discharged to adjacent watercourse.

If contamination is identified in the pond, the pond will be isolated and the contaminated water removed by tanker for offsite disposal.

Areas that may contain contamination such as the manure loading area, and building wash down will drain to the underground reception pit which is emptied after each cleaning process or earlier as required.

During heavy rainfall events where there is potential for flooding in the surrounding local area the surface water drains will be blocked with sandbags and barrier boards to prevent discharge of excess water into the attenuation pond. Water would be contained within the yard for pumping out for disposal off site. There will be no need to release water through the pond during flooding events, and therefore it would not increase the risk of flooding off site.

The capacity of the pond is 145 m³, if water reaches this level, providing it is uncontaminated, it will be released in a controlled manner to the watercourse preventing sudden surge in flow.

The site is not within a Source Protection Zone and we do not consider that there will be any significant pollution of either ground or surface water or harm to human health.

Change to site drainage

The Applicant has updated their proposals for site drainage based on the pre-operational requirement (PO 1) that was set out in the draft permit. We were satisfied with the original plans subject to some further detail, however these new proposals represent an improvement and have subsequently been agreed.

The attenuation pond (capacity 145m³) has been moved to the west of the access track, further away from the watercourse, a hydraulic brake will be installed to prevent water from the attenuation pond draining to the watercourse.

The underground reception pit (capacity 31.6m³) will be relocated nearer to the pond and will collect dirty water from the washout process and manure loading area via a dedicated drain. A diverter valve will ensure contaminated surface water run-off is directed to the underground reception pit.

The attenuation pond will collect only clean surface water run-off; the water then drains via a sealed pipe to the watercourse.

The previous location for the attenuation pond will be used as a surface water flood storage compensation area, providing an additional 250m³ of storage, and further minimising the risk of flooding offsite during periods of heavy rainfall.

Groundwater and soil monitoring

As a result of the requirements of the Industrial Emissions Directive, all permits are now required to contain a condition requiring periodic monitoring of soil and groundwater. However, the Environment Agency's H5 Guidance states that it is only necessary for the operator to take baseline samples of soil or groundwater and measure levels of contamination where there is evidence that there is, or could be existing contamination and the same contaminants could be released by the proposed activities.

The site condition report (SCR) for Crown Stables (dated January 2015) demonstrates that there are no existing hazards or likely pathways 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 needed to provide base line reference data for the soil and groundwater at the site at this stage.

The decision was taken in accordance with our guidance on site condition reports (H5) and baseline reporting under IED.

4. Operator competence

Operator competence is determined on whether the Applicant can demonstrate technical competence, has any relevant convictions and is deemed to be financially competent, as stated in our Guidance RGN 5 'Operator Competence'.

Operation of an intensive farming installation is not a relevant waste activity and as such does not require compliance with an approved scheme. Instead the Operator demonstrates by way of their management system, (condition 1.1 in permit) that staff training and development requirements are met, along with provision for keeping up-to-date with technical and legislative changes.

We consider operator competence in this context throughout the life of the permit.

An Applicant's compliance record includes a review of relevant convictions and can take into account any known breaches of other regulatory regimes. The provisions of the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974, require convictions of individuals to be considered spent after a prescribed period. In this case relevant convictions were identified for the Operator; but were treated as if spent as they would be for an individual.

Financial competence is initially based on whether the applicant has any current or past insolvency and bankruptcy proceedings. We are not aware of any such proceedings against this Applicant.

A credit check has been carried out, and we have no reason to consider that the Operator would not be financially viable to operate and manage the poultry unit appropriately to meet the requirements of the permit.

The operator competence checks have been carried out in line with our guidance (RGN 5) and we are satisfied that the operator meets the requirements.

The Operator is required to operate the unit in accordance with an Environmental Management System (EMS) under condition 1.1 of the permit. The Operator commits to the operating techniques as described in the application and as incorporated into the permit in condition 2.3.1 (table S1.2), any deviation from either of these would be a breach of the permit, and action would be taken in accordance with our usual approach to enforcement.

We are satisfied that the Applicant (now the Operator) is the person who will have control over the operation of the facility after the grant of the permit. The decision was taken in accordance with EPR RGN 1 Understanding the meaning of operator.

5. Accident Management

An accident management plan has been submitted, which includes details of the site infrastructure along with the location and an inventory of all tanks and stores. It also includes a plan of the drainage layout, and details of fire fighting equipment, location of spill kits and diverter valves.

The emergency procedures are set out, giving priority to livestock welfare and avoiding environmental pollution. Procedures are written for different accident scenarios: overflow of drainage system, power outage, fire, disease outbreak, and flood.

The proposal now includes provision of a generator on site in case of power failure.

We are satisfied that the procedures are suitable to prevent or minimise environmental pollution in the event of an accident.

6. Pests

A pest management plan has been submitted outlining the steps for monitoring fly activity, and for managing fly infestations. Fly screens will be fitted to doors and windows where feasible to do so, and so as not to impede ventilation.

Carcasses are removed once a week and stored in sealed containers awaiting removal.

Any manure found to contain flies or maggots will be treated to eradicate them.

Annex 1: Consultation and web publicising responses

Consultation on the Application

The Application has been consulted upon in accordance with the Environment Agency's 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 the Environment Agency public register (unless a request has been made for it to remain confidential).

The Application was advertised on the Environment Agency website from 13/05/2015 – 25/06/2015.

The following statutory and non-statutory bodies were consulted:

North Warwickshire Local Authority – Environmental Protection;
Health & Safety Executive.

1) Consultation Responses from Statutory and Non-Statutory Bodies

Response received from
North Warwickshire Local Authority – Environmental Protection
Brief summary of issues raised
Agree with the findings of the noise assessment that this proposal should not have any adverse impact on nearby properties. Concerns regarding the closeness of the proposed unit to residential properties; closer than the recommended separation distances for this type of agricultural operation. This site may affect the amenity of nearby dwellings.
Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered
The Noise Management Plan submitted demonstrates that suitable control measures and abatement techniques will be in place to minimise noise. Condition 3.4 of the permit relates to noise. The recommended separation distances relate to Planning guidance and will be considered as part of the planning application. We are satisfied that there will not be any significant pollution of the environment or harm to human health at any receptor.

2) Consultation Responses from Members of the Public and Community Organisations / County / Parish / District Councillors

The consultation responses received were wide ranging and a number of the issues raised were outside the Environment Agency's remit in reaching its permitting decisions. Specifically questions were raised which fall within the jurisdiction of the planning system, both on the development of planning policy and the grant of planning permission.

Guidance on the interaction between planning and pollution control is given in the National Planning Policy Framework. It says that the planning and pollution control systems are separate but complementary. We are only able to take into account those issues, which fall within the scope of the Environmental Permitting Regulations. Planning permission will still be required before the proposals can go ahead.

We have received 53 responses from members of the public and community organisations representing local residents, and from County and District Councillors.

Comments:

Some of the comments received referred to the previously withdrawn planning application and contained issues that are outside the Environment Agency's remit as described above.

These issues raised are: location of the site, whether the land use is appropriate, site access, traffic issues, highways suitability, employment opportunities, visual impact of buildings and from lighting, impact on tourism, impact on house prices, proximity to railway, request for a public debate, animal welfare issues.

Issues that the Environment Agency can consider:

1) Human health impacts from: air pollution (emissions from the high velocity fans, including bioaerosols / dust / particulates, disease in birds).

How this has been considered: (see key issues section on human health)

The operator will use high velocity roof mounted fans which effectively disperse emissions into the atmosphere reducing their concentration and impact, and is considered to be BAT under EPR6.09. Emissions from the 7m high fan will rise into the atmosphere and disperse quickly, with the amount of bioaerosols in the air returning to background levels about 100m from the source.

The litter within the building will be maintained at an appropriate level of moisture, not too wet that run off is generated, but not too dry that excess dust and particulate are produced.

Good housekeeping is key, and the operator will be required to keep areas clean and dust free. There will be regular inspections and a cleaning regime to remove dust.

The site will adhere to the detailed biosecurity procedures to prevent disease occurring in the birds as stated in the Environmental Risk Assessment. These procedures are based around maintaining a clean, dust free site. The operator would notify Animal Health of an outbreak of serious disease, and implement procedures as agreed with them, and in conjunction with the Environment Agency if necessary.

In addition, feed is not milled or mixed on site and the feed management procedures in place should ensure that particulate emissions will be minimised from this source.

We are satisfied that the appropriate measures will be taken to minimise the production and emissions of dust / bioaerosols / particulates to the local area and that there will be no significant impact on the health of the local population as a whole.

2) Water pollution – River Anker & local watercourses

How this has been considered: (See the key issues section on Water)

a) We are satisfied that appropriate prevention and control measures will in place to control the flow of water and prevent pollution entering local watercourses and the River Anker.

The Applicant's accident management plan outlines the procedures they would take in the event of a spillage or severe weather events to prevent pollution or excess water reaching the river. See updated section on site drainage.

Severn Trent Water confirm that the drinking water supply to this area is from a surface water supply treated at works in Warwickshire. There will be no pathway for contamination of the local water supply from this activity.

b) Specific concerns were raised about the potential for wash down of the unit to clear diseased or dead birds or other waste (carcasses, feathers, internal organs) and this will collect and lie in the attenuation pond. This would then rot and soak into soil & water course over time, impacting on groundwater.

How this has been considered:

All carcasses will be collected from within the building and stored in sealed containers awaiting removal off site.

Wash down water and debris will not enter the attenuation pond which is for clean roof and yard water collection only. During clean out of the shed, all wash down water will be directed to the reception pit for later collection and removal off site.

3) Odour

How this has been considered: (See key issues section on Odour)

The odour management plan is incorporated into the permit and the operator must adhere to the control measures stated within it. For example, covering vehicles before leaving the site, keeping used bedding contained, keeping doors open for minimum amount of time during cleaning out.

There are fears that there could be a cumulative effect from a local rendering plant located just over 1 km to the south east of this proposed poultry unit.

If there are odour issues from either site, the wind direction at the time could be used to determine where the odour originates, and the source investigated accordingly. Due to locations of the sites and the wind direction, the likelihood of a cumulative impact is low.

Comments have been raised about other sites in the locality which are considered to be well run, but can still cause odour issues. And that if those sites cannot control odours then how can this operator?

How this has been considered:

The regulation of other sites is outside this determination, and whilst we accept that intensive farming has the potential to cause odour we are satisfied that the odour impacts from well run facilities can be managed. If this site operates in accordance with the permit, odour will not be an issue.

4) Noise

How this has been considered: (See key issues section on Noise)

We consider that the noise management plan contains the necessary measures to minimise the impact of noise outside the installation boundary. This is supported by comments from Environmental Health, North Warwickshire Borough Council who agree the proposals should not have any adverse (noise) impact on nearby properties.

5) Proximity to local residents

How this has been considered:

There is no minimum distance criteria against which an environmental permit cannot be granted. The Operator has to satisfy us that all pollution control and

mitigation measures are in place so as not to cause pollution outside of the site boundary. For intensive farms where there are receptors within 400m of the site boundary a site specific odour management plan, and site specific noise management plan have to be submitted by the Applicant and approved by the Environment Agency before a permit can be granted.

The Applicant has submitted these management plans which have been subsequently approved.

6) Operator Competence, previous track record in waste management industry

How this has been considered: (See key issues section on Operator Competence)

We take relevant convictions of an Applicant into account and any previous history of operating permitted sites. In this instance and in accordance with the legislation and our guidance, any relevant convictions held by this applicant are considered to be spent, having passed the appropriate timescale, and therefore are no longer 'relevant' for the purposes of this permit application. The Operator does manage a waste management site and is operating under the terms of the permit. The operator would have to employ staff who are trained and experienced in poultry rearing to operate this site in accordance with the requirements of the permit.

7) Timings for clean down and removal of birds

How this has been considered:

The Operator has stated that they will operate during daylight hours, being between 07:00 and 23:00 as outlined in EPR6.09. This is incorporated into table S1.2 as referenced in condition 2.3.1 and becomes a requirement of the permit. Any activity outside of these hours will then be a breach of the permit.

Animal movements are stated to take place during daylight hours, see Noise section of key issues.

8) Welfare of birds if there is an interruption in the electricity supply.

How this has been considered:

The operator has changed their original proposal, and will now have a generator permanently available on site to provide back up power. The location of the generator and associated equipment have been identified on an updated site plan. An acoustic barrier will be installed around the generator to minimise noise emissions, should the generator be operational.

9) Lack of trust in regulators based on experiences from different local operations.

How this has been considered:

Each permitted site is dealt with by a local Environment Officer who works with the Operator to address any environmental issues that arise. If an incident has taken

place, a permit condition has not been met, or legislation is not complied with then the Officer will normally try to resolve the issues and get the best outcome by providing advice and guidance to the Operator. An alternative option is to use one or more of the various enforcement powers at our disposal to take enforcement action; powers which include prosecution, civil sanctions, or revocation of a permit.

If the breach of the permit is significant, the EA can go straight to the prosecution or revocation stage.

The nature of the enforcement action is site specific, depends on the type of incident and the preparedness of the operator to address the issues. One site cannot be compared to another site in this regard.

The nearby plant is an old facility predating current legislation and guidance; we recognise that it is more difficult to apply the latest pollution control measures to an old plant.

This poultry unit will be a purpose built plant constructed in line with the most recent legislation, current guidance and Best Available Techniques. The potential sources of odour and noise pollution have already been identified and measures will be put in place to minimise pollution beyond the installation boundary. The operation of a poultry unit is well understood, and it is unlikely that there would be any source of pollution that has not already been identified and mitigated against.

This permit would not be granted if we did not consider that the operator could comply with the permit conditions and operate the site without causing pollution.

10) Localised flooding, heavy rain event and attenuation pond capacity

How this has been considered: (See key issues section on Water and land pollution)

Several comments have been received stating that this area can flood, although it is not identified as an EA designated flood zone. Reports suggest that the river water can flow across the road and links back to the River Anker via local watercourses.

The capacity of the reception pit is 31.6 m³, level monitors and visual checks will alert the operator when it reaches capacity and it will be emptied as necessary.

The capacity of the attenuation pond is 145 m³, with releases to the watercourse controlled by hydraulic brake. Kerbing around the hardstanding will direct surface water to the drainage system containing it within the installation boundary.

The Applicant has identified the risks of heavy rainfall and flooding and has covered this in their Accident Management Plan; the techniques described in the Key issues section will be used to control water levels during heavy rainfall or flooding. See updated section on site drainage.

11) Impact on habitats, location of Great Crested Newts

How this has been considered: (See key issues section on Habitats)

The potential impacts on European Statutory sites (SSSI / SAC) have been considered and determined to be not significant, nor likely to cause damage.

If great crested newts are shown to be present, the Planning Authority will take this into consideration during the assessment of the planning application in consultation with the Environment Agency. We have no data to show that there are great crested newts at this location. The site is currently described as for equine use, green field, with no water features within the site boundary. If there were found to be great

crested newts on the site the Applicant would have to apply for a licence to remove them prior to commencing any works.

12) outdoor storage of waste

How this has been considered:

There will be no outdoor storage of waste. We are satisfied that the operator will manage the transport of waste from the site so that outside storage will not be necessary.

13) Flies / Pests

How this has been considered: (see key issues section on Pests)

The fly (pest) management plan has detailed the control measures to minimise nuisance from flies. We are satisfied that with good housekeeping practices and by following the measures described in the plan, that fly nuisance will be minimised.

14) Future expansion of the site

How this has been considered:

This application has been assessed on its own merits based on the information provided, and on the basis that 40,001 broilers can be housed and managed appropriately. We cannot determine this application in anticipation of what the Operator may choose to do in the future with regards to expanding the operation and increasing the number of broiler places.

Any intention to increase the number of broiler places will require a variation to the permit. Any variation application would be considered on its own merits and determined in accordance with our usual procedures.

The Operator would have to demonstrate that they were technically and financially competent to manage a larger plant and comply with the permit conditions.

15) Impact on local heritage sites

How this has been considered:

Concerns have been raised on the impact of the broiler unit on local heritage sites, i.e. the Roman settlement and camps to the north of the unit (300m). There will be no direct pathway for pollution from the unit to these heritage sites. Section 7 of the Environment Act 1995 (pursuit of conservation interests), requires us to consider whether we should impose any additional or different requirements for the heritage site, but we are satisfied that the measures proposed for protecting the environment and human health will also ensure there is no adverse effect on the heritage site.

16) The broiler housing techniques

How this has been considered:

Comments were submitted in relation to;

- i) the fan ventilation system, and referred to a ventilation tunnel system as an alternative.
- ii) the flooring system being of raised netting in favour of deep bed.

Housing design and standards for intensive farms are set out in the Reference document on Best Available Techniques (BREF) published by the European IPPC Bureau. This is reproduced in our guidance EPR 6.09, Appendix 3, section A3.2 for broilers.

The options are either a naturally ventilated house with fully littered floor, or a well-insulated fan ventilated house with a fully littered floor (both options include non-leaking drinking systems). The Operator has opted for the well-insulated fan ventilated house with a fully litter floor, which meets the measures included in the BREF. Raised flooring is a deep litter system that can be used for egg layers, but neither tunnel ventilation nor raised net flooring are referred to in the BREF for broilers, and we are satisfied that the most appropriate design of housing ventilation and flooring have been chosen.

B) Consultation on the Draft Decision

This section reports on consultation on our draft decision carried out between 29/09/2015 and 26/10/2015.

A total of 23 additional responses were received from individual members of the public and from Warwickshire County Council.

In some cases the issues raised in the consultation were the same as those raised previously and already reported in section A of this Annex. Where this is the case, the Environment Agency response provided in section A of this Annex has not necessarily been repeated and reference should therefore be made to section A in addition to any response below.

Specific issues raised again and the relevant point in Section A:

- 1) Human health
- 2) Water pollution and 10) localised flooding
- 4) Noise
- 5) Proximity to residents
- 6) Operator competence
- 7) Timings of operations
- 9) Regulation
- 11) Great Crested Newts
- 12) Manure storage
- 13) Pests
- 15) Local heritage

The exception to this relates to further odour concerns from members of the public. We have sought to add to the original text to provide greater clarity below.

Also some of the consultation responses received were on matters which are outside the scope of the Environment Agency's powers under the Environmental Permitting Regulations. Our position on these matters is as described previously.

Response received from
Warwickshire County Council (WCC) 30.10.15
Brief summary of issues raised
WCC submitted a report: Bird Broiler Unit Impact Assessment exploring the potential health impacts a broiler unit may have on local residents within North Warwickshire Borough. The report includes a site description, the planning policy framework, project description and public health profile; the assessment describing the health effects; and conclusions. The conclusions are that there will be specific residences and businesses which may be impacted by the proposed installation. The main impact that will need to be minimised will be in relation to an increase in air pollution. Also that the scheme has the potential to contribute towards exacerbating health conditions and health inequalities for the local community if poorly managed,

or mitigated, or if all relevant public health bodies haven't been consulted.

Point 2.1.1 of the report stated that Public Health Warwickshire is not aware that Public Health England had been consulted on the proposed installation.

Point 2.1.17 of the report states that a manure management plan should be produced.

Two recommendations are made;
to ensure potential health impacts are minimised, the proposed installation complies with any conditions set by the Environment Agency.
to minimise potential health impacts to poultry workers, health assessments are undertaken and regularly reviewed.

Summary of actions taken or show how this has been covered

As part of our Working Together agreement with Public Health England and the Director of Public Health not all installation applications needed to be consulted on at the time this application was received. This intensive farming application did not require consultation with these bodies as it did not meet any of the criteria, for example; it is not a large combustion plant, incinerator, landfill, compost site, a COMAH site or relating to onshore oil and gas extraction.

A manure management plan is not required where manure is collected at the end of each cycle and removed off site. A manure management plan is only required when it is intended to be stored to be spread on the site.

The conditions of the permit require the operator to protect people and the environment. We are satisfied with the measures the Operator has chosen to use to meet these objectives, thereby minimising potential health impacts. The permit requires the Operator to operate the facility in accordance with approved odour and noise management plans, and management system that prevents or minimises the potential for pollution outside of the site boundary.

Health impacts on poultry workers are a matter for the Health & Safety Executive.

Further comments were raised following the consultation on the issue of odour; some of the comments were the same as previously raised so neither the issue nor the response has been repeated here (see point 3 in section A). New concerns were raised about the odour modelling undertaken by the applicant, and we provide the response below for clarification.

The Odour Management Plan (OMP) was reviewed in line with our guidance for Intensive Farming applications and H1 risk assessment. The OMP was updated during the determination and we are satisfied with the measures the OMP proposes for managing odour. Due to the subjective nature of odour detection we consider the

use of an effective OMP as a more useful tool to manage odour at intensive farming installations.

Although the Applicant carried out odour modelling and provided a summary report, the modelling data was not provided as part of the application and has not been audited by us.

The OMP has been assessed against the Poultry Industry Good Practice Checklist covering the appropriate measures considered suitable for controlling odour; the OMP also contains suitable complaints procedures and contingency measures.

The consultation response refers to the exposure benchmark limits of odour units (OU) that apply to different activities and provide a measure of the likely impact of odour at locations around the site, usually shown as odour unit contours on a map.

In our guidance H4 Odour Management, Appendix 3; odour from Intensive Farming is deemed to be moderately offensive with a benchmark limit of 3 OU, the consultation response stated that this limit should be reduced by 0.5 OU to account for the sensitivity of local population to existing odours.

Therefore it would be reasonable to use a reduced benchmark limit of 2.5 OU in a modelling scenario.

However the results of any modelling can only be indicative and there can be uncertainties with the modelled results when receptors are close. A robust OMP is more effective for implementing measures that will minimise the impact of odour beyond the site boundary.

The OMP will be reviewed by the Operator every year or after any complaint or changes to the operations or infrastructure.

Condition 3.3.1 of the permit controls odour.

A comment was received to the effect that the modelling of effluent gases is based upon ammonia rather than hydrogen sulphide. An odour modelling assessment does not refer to a particular gas; the model measures general odour concentrations to assess the likely odour impact.

Section 1.18 of the OMP makes reference to the screening carried out on ammonia emissions; this is a pre-application screening process that each proposed poultry unit has to undertake to assess the likely impact of ammonia emission on habitats, and is described fully in the section above: Ammonia assessment – impacts on Habitats.

It is not related to the assessment of potential odour impacts, and has no bearing on the odour assessment carried out.