

D W Argo Brigstanes Farm

Operator-Initiated Substantial Variation

PPC/A/1016817

CONTENTS

1	NON TECHNICAL SUMMARY OF DETERMINATION.....	2
2	EXTERNAL CONSULTATION AND SEPA'S RESPONSE	3
3	ADMINISTRATIVE DETERMINATIONS.....	4
4	INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	5
4.1	Historical Background to the activity and variation	5
4.2	Description of activity.....	5
4.3	Outline details of the Variation applied for.....	6
4.4	Guidance/directions issued to SEPA by the Scottish Ministers under Reg.60 or 61.	6
4.5	Identification of important and sensitive receptors.....	6
5	KEY ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES.....	6
5.1	Summary of significant environmental impacts	6
5.2	Implications of the Variation on - Point Sources to Air	6
5.3	Implications of the Variation on - Point Source Emissions to Surface Water and Sewer	7
5.4	Implications of the Variation on - Point Source Emissions to Groundwater	7
5.5	Implications of the Variation on - Fugitive Emissions to Air.....	7
5.6	Implications of the Variation on - Fugitive Emissions to Water.....	8
5.7	Implications of the Variation on - Odour	8
5.8	Implications of the Variation on - Management	8
5.9	Implications of the Variation on - Raw Materials	8
5.10	Implications of the Variation on - Raw Materials Selection.....	9
5.11	Implications of the Variation on - Waste Minimisation Requirements.....	9
5.12	Implications of the Variation on - Water Use.....	9
5.13	Implications of the Variation on - Waste Handling	9
5.14	Implications of the Variation on - Waste Recovery or Disposal	9
5.15	Implications of the Variation on - Energy.....	9
5.16	Implications of the Variation for - Accidents and their Consequences.....	10
5.17	Implications of the Variation for - Noise.....	10
5.18	Implications of the Variation for - Monitoring	10
5.19	Implications of the Variation for - Closure	10
5.20	Implications of the Variation for - Site Condition Report (and where relevant the baseline report)	11
5.21	Implications of the Variation for - Consideration of BAT	11
6	OTHER LEGISLATION CONSIDERED	11
7	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND COMAH	12
8	DETAILS OF PERMIT	13
9	EMISSION LIMIT VALUES OR EQUIVALENT TECHNICAL PARAMETERS/ MEASURES	13
10	PEER REVIEW	Error! Bookmark not defined.
11	FINAL DETERMINATION.....	13
12	REFERENCES AND GUIDANCE	13

1 NON TECHNICAL SUMMARY OF DETERMINATION

PPC requires that where the draft determination of an application or a SEPA initiated variation is to be subject to public consultation (this is usually referred to as PPD consultation) the decision document will contain a non-technical summary of the determination. There is no need to have a non-technical summary if the application is no subject to PPD

Will the draft determination be subject to public consultation? Yes

This application to vary Permit PPC/A/1016817 is to enable D W Argo to expand their current pig production operation at Brigstanes Farm situated to the south of Stonehaven by increasing the number of finisher pig numbers by 5832 in 1 new shed. This is a Substantial Variation to the current Permit under the Pollution Prevention and Control (Scotland) Regulations 2012. Please see Associated Document 1 for the application and supporting documentation.

As a Permitted installation, Brigstanes Farm is covered by The Standard Farming Installation Rules (SFIR) issued by SEPA; this document is based on the Best Available Techniques (commonly known as BAT) Reference Document (abbreviated to BREF) for Intensive Livestock Installations. Please see Section 5 for more information on BAT at this site.

The new shed is to be built to meet BAT and has under-slat storage of the slurry. When the shed is cleaned the wash water is directed to the under slat tank in order to be contained. The pigs shall be reared on wet feed, stored within appropriate bunds adjacent to the new shed. The run-off from the roof shall be directed to a suitable drainage system that has been approved by SEPA.

As part of the determination process SEPA is required to consult with a number of external public bodies and to address any concerns raised. Only one consultation was returned expressing concerns. The Habitats Regulations (Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994) and the Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004 introduced duties for SEPA for the protection of designated sites. When carrying out screening of the impacts of emissions as a result of the increase in pig numbers the contribution of ammonia, acid and nitrogen to deposition at two designated sites breached guideline limits. In such cases SEPA carried out an Appropriate Assessment with Scottish Natural Heritage in order to clarify whether the habitats and species at the designated sites would be significantly impacted by the increase in deposition. Following this assessment SNH confirmed that there were concerns about possible nutrient enrichment at one of the designated sites, Loch of Lumgair SSSI. The applicant was required to engage an agent to carry out site-specific modelling of the ammonia impacts at the SSSI. SEPA then assessed this modelling report to find that no significant adverse effects on the relevant Designated Site would be result due to the increase in pig numbers. This is discussed further in Sections 4.5, 5.2 and 6 of this Decision Document.

Finally in order to ensure consistency across the Scottish Agricultural Sector SEPA has consulted both with its internal agricultural permitting group and the Partnership to ensure the permit is consistent with other intensive agriculture permits issued in Scotland.

Glossary of terms

AEL	-	Associated Emission Limit
BAT	-	Best Available Techniques
BREF	-	Best Available Techniques Reference Document issued by EU
CO	-	Coordinating Officer
ELV	-	Emission Limit Value
SCAIL	-	Simple Calculation of Atmospheric Impact Limits
SSSI	-	Site of Special Scientific Interest

SAC - Special Area of Conservation
 SPA - Special Protected Area
 SuDS - Sustainable Drainage System

2 EXTERNAL CONSULTATION AND SEPA'S RESPONSE

Is Public Consultation Required - Yes

Advertisements Check:	Date	Compliance with advertising requirements
Edinburgh Gazette	11/04/2017	Yes
Mearns Leader	12/05/2017	Yes

Officer checking advert: CO

No. of responses received: None

Summary of responses and how they were taken into account during the determination:
 N/A

Is PPC Statutory Consultation Required – Yes

Food Standards Agency: FSA Aberdeen considers that “provided ... the Applicant complies with relevant Regulations... it is unlikely that there will be any unacceptable effects on the human food chain from emissions and waste from the installation [due to the proposed variation]”. No objections.

Grampian NHS Health Board: No response received.

Aberdeenshire Council Local Auth: No response received.

Scotland East Health and Safety Executive: No response received.

Scottish Natural Heritage (PPC Regs consultation): SNH has no objection in principle but following the Appropriate Assessment of likely significant effect from the increase at the installation it was highlighted that there were concerns about possible nutrient enrichment at one of the designated sites, Loch of Lumgair SSSI. The applicant was required to engage an agent to carry out site-specific modelling of the ammonia impacts at the SSSI. SEPA then assessed this modelling report to find that no significant adverse effects on the relevant Designated Site would be result due to the increase in pig numbers. Following the submission of this report and SEPA's assessment SNH confirm that there is no objection to the proposals in the application to vary the permit. This is discussed further in Sections 4.5, 5.2 and 6 of this Decision Document.

Discretionary Consultation – Yes

Consultee: Rural Payments and Inspection Division (Scheme and Inspection Management – Pollution Officer)

Justification: The RPID officer has expertise in slurry management and capacity consideration.

Response and actions taken:

06/06/2017 – requests further information regarding freeboard, rainfall figures and calculation of wash water volumes.

15/06/2017 – CO sends these queries to Consultant.

29/06/2017 – Consultant submits required information.
 17/07/2017 – On returning from holiday CO sends this information to Pollution Officer.
 06/09/2017 – RPID Officer confirms there is no objection.

Enhanced SEPA public consultation - No

'Off-site' Consultation - No

Transboundary Consultation - No

Public Participation Consultation - Yes

STATEMENT ON THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS

The Pollution Prevention and Control (Scotland) Regulations 2012 (schedule 4, para 22) requires that SEPA's draft determination of this application be placed on SEPA's website and public register and be subject to 28 days' public consultation. The dates between which this consultation took place, the number of representations received and SEPA's response to these are outlined below.

<i>Date SEPA notified applicant of draft determination</i>	27/11/2017
---	------------

<i>Date draft determination placed on SEPA's Website</i>	TBC
---	-----

<i>Details of any other 'appropriate means' used to advertise the draft.</i>	N/A
---	-----

<i>Date public consultation on draft permit opened</i>	TBC
---	-----

<i>Date public consultation on draft permit consultation closed</i>	TBC
--	-----

<i>Number of representations received to the consultation</i>	TBC
--	-----

<i>Date final determination placed on the SEPA's Website</i>	TBC
---	-----

Summary of responses and how they were taken into account during the determination:
 TBC

3 ADMINISTRATIVE DETERMINATIONS

Determination of the Schedule 1 activity

No change.

Determination of the stationary technical unit to be permitted:

As detailed in the application.

Determination of directly associated activities:

As detailed in the application.

Determination of 'site boundary'

As detailed in the application.

4 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

4.1 Historical Background to the activity and variation

Brigstanes Farm has been permitted under the Pollution Prevention and Control (Scotland) Regulations (2000 then 2012) since 27 September 2007 and has been a pig operation since the 1950s. The compliance with the permit has been classed as Good or better since the current inspection logging system began in 2009.

In the interest of sustaining a viable commercial enterprise the Operator now proposes to increase the number of production pigs over 30kg on site from 4016 to 9858. The number of places for sows shall remain the same.

The application was determined after the publication of the BRef and the BAT conclusions published in February 2017, the applicant was required to demonstrate that the new shed was designed having regard to the following principles outlines in the BREF as Best Available Technique:

- Reducing the emitting manure surface area
- Increase frequency of slurry removal
- Cooling the slurry
- Decreasing the pH of slurry
- Using smooth and easy to clean surfaces
- Controlling air flow, speed and temp
- Steering excretory behaviours to minimise fouled areas
- Litter management

All proposals for new housing should include a comprehensive appraisal of different design options and demonstration of how the chosen design addresses the above principles

The least preferable system is fully slatted floors with deep pit and infrequent removal as significant reductions in emissions can be achieved by alternative systems which increase the removal of manure and slurry to external store, e.g. a vacuum system for frequent slurry removal, a scraper for frequent slurry removal or slurry removal by flushing.

The applicant has indicated that slurry will be removed once or twice per week or as soon as practical.

4.2 Description of activity

Rearing production pigs intensively in an installation with more than 2,000 places and with more than 750 places for sows as described in Part A of Section 6.9 of Schedule 1 of the Regulations. Brigstanes Farm proposes to increase pig numbers by 5832 to have a total of 9858 production pigs at the facility. Other Directly Associated Activities include:

- Feed preparation and storage;
- Slurry storage;
- Fuel storage;
- Water storage;
- Chemical storage;

- Manure handling and storage;
- Storage and disposal of fallen stock.
- Management of lightly contaminated surface water

4.3 Outline details of the Variation applied for

- Increase the number of finishing pigs by 5832 to 9858
- Include new shed and ancillary drainage
- Correct previous variation to include slurry tank in Site Boundary and a third discharge point on the main site.
- New resource efficiency condition shall supersede current reporting conditions
- Baseline report and Groundwater and Soil Monitoring conditions to be included (as variation after revised PPC 2012)
- New Annual Emission Limits shall be included as part of the new BAT Conclusions

4.4 Guidance/directions issued to SEPA by the Scottish Ministers under Reg.60 or 61.

None

4.5 Identification of important and sensitive receptors

The new shed to be erected at Brigstanes Farm will be within 10km of six designated sites (please see Section 6 of this Main Decision Document) and SEPA need to assess whether ammonia from the pigs might impact certain species of flora and fauna. The Simple Calculation of Atmospheric Limits (or SCAIL screening tool) provides an estimate of the amount of nitrogen deposited, in form of NH₃. The tool showed that the critical load may be exceeded as a consequence of the proposed shed at Brigstanes. SEPA and SNH carried out an Appropriate Assessment of the impact on the specific habitats and their species and SNH confirmed that the farm would not adversely affect the designated sites.

The nearest human receptors is housing over 400m from the new shed; please see Section 5.7 below for more information regarding the impact and management of odour.

5 KEY ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

5.1 Summary of significant environmental impacts

SEPA have identified a number of environmental impacts (not necessarily significant) these are identified as follows:

Emissions to Air	Ammonia, dust and odour
Emissions to Land	Waste, faecal material and nutrient inputs to a Nitrate Vulnerable Zone
Emissions to Water	Surface Water Discharge to Groundwater;
Other Emissions	Noise
Associated risks	Containment of fuel

SEPA aims to control these through the conditions contained in the permit and by the requirement on the operator to comply with BAT as indicated in the SFIR.

There have been no changes to the potential environmental impacts identified due to this proposed variation to the permit.

5.2 Implications of the Variation on - Point Sources to Air

This variation shall introduce new point source emissions from the ventilation at the proposed shed.

SEPA has identified that the major environmental input from the extension to the pig farm will be ammonia. Ammonia can be carried on the air and deposited in lakes and ponds causing eutrophication. It is assessed that the main point source of ammonia at the new finishing shed at Brigstanes Pig Unit will come from the ventilation points along the roof of the shed.

SEPA has a duty to prevent and, where that is not practicable, to reduce emissions and the impact on the environment as a whole. This is done through ensuring compliance with BAT and by carrying out screening of ammonia, nitrogen and acid deposition at nearby Designated Sites to assess their impacts. This screening is done using an online tool called the Simple Calculation or Atmospheric Impact Limits (SCAIL). SCAIL gives a conservative indication of whether emissions breach the relevant loads or limits for each Designated Site.

Four of the six Designated Sites within a 10km radius of the new shed showed potential breaches. Of these, two could be discounted as they had “no sensitive habitat or species” that would be negatively impacted by the increase in ammonia, nitrogen and acid as a result of the new shed.

An Appropriate Assessment was carried out by SEPA and SNH with regard to the Loch of Lumgair SSSI and the Garron Point SAC. SNH found that the habitat and species at the Garron SAC would not be adversely affected by the increase in emissions at Brigstanes. However, SNH assessed that the Loch of Lumgair SSSI could be impacted with nutrient enrichment due to the proposal. As such the Applicant was required to undertake site-specific ammonia modelling of the potential emissions from the new shed. This was carried out and submitted to SEPA in September 2017. SEPA determined that there would be no significant adverse effects on the relevant Designated Site would be result due to the increase in pig numbers.

On reaching the above decision SEPA sent the modelling report and SEPA’s findings to SNH in order for the organisation to assess whether to remove its objection. This was confirmed on 9 November 2017.

More information of the consultation with SNH and the results of the Appropriate Assessment can be found in Section 6 of this Decision Document.

5.3 Implications of the Variation on - Point Source Emissions to Surface Water and Sewer

There are no implications on point source emissions to surface water and sewer due to the proposed variation.

5.4 Implications of the Variation on - Point Source Emissions to Groundwater

The plan provided in the application ensures that surface water run-off from the new shed are directed to swale (there are no concrete aprons to consider). The lightly contaminated water is directed to this swale for which a SUDS calculation has demonstrated adequate storage for this purpose.

The new shed shall connect to the swale in two places as the sandy soils may not attenuate sufficiently if the surface water run-off is directed to one location only. The roof water is conveyed to the swale *via* a perforated collector pipe that draws in water from the relevant area and discharges by gravity.

The SuDS meet the requirements of the *Rural Sustainable Drainage Systems – A practical design and build guide for Scotland’s farmers and landowners (2016)* which is considered BAT.

5.5 Implications of the Variation on - Fugitive Emissions to Air

There are a number of potential fugitive emissions to air. These include the release of ammonia during cleaning or opening of the pigs sheds for fallen stock removal and also from the pigs themselves. Whilst SEPA accepts that some fugitive releases are unavoidable e.g. odour from

unplanned releases due to an unforeseen incident; others such as poor cleaning out practices can be controlled through the relevant management procedures.

SEPA has assessed that there is a slight possibility of emissions from feed or dust from cleaning however providing good housekeeping techniques are employed these should pose no risk to the environment.

5.6 Implications of the Variation on - Fugitive Emissions to Water

There are a number of potential sources which could lead to fugitive emissions to water, these include: poorly maintained drainage systems, lack of care during cleaning of the sheds and diesel tank filling and associated bund emptying.

SEPA views fugitive releases as avoidable and can usually link these incidents to either operational error or negligence. SEPA seeks to reduce these occurrences in the permit by requiring the operator to provide training to relevant staff in environmental issues and exercising a high degree of environmental management over the activities they undertake.

5.7 Implications of the Variation on - Odour

SEPA acknowledges that Odour from intensive agriculture installations can give rise to complaints. Conditions within the permit require the operator to produce an Odour Management Plan detailing how odour issues will be resolved having regard to BAT contained within Section 2.8 of SEPA's Standard Farming Installation Rules which deals with odour management.

An odour complaint received in 2016 was not substantiated and when investigated the source was found likely to be nearby spreading of slurry and not the farm itself.

The new shed meets BAT for its housing system as stated in the recently published *BAT Conclusions for the Intensive Rearing of Poultry or Pigs* (A vacuum system for frequent slurry removal (in case of a fully or partly slatted floor). Such systems are BAT in order to reduce ammonia emissions thereby reducing the impact of odour on nearby receptors.

5.8 Implications of the Variation on - Management

Permit condition 2.1.5 requires that the permitted activity is operated in accordance with an environmental management system (EMS). The BREF requires that in order to improve the overall environmental performance, the EMS should incorporate the following key features:

- Management commitment
- Environmental policy
- Financial planning and investment
- Relevant procedures (training, record keeping, maintenance, emergency procedures)
- Checking performance (monitoring, preventative action, auditing)
- Review
- Continual improvement
- Benchmarking
- Noise Management Plan
- Odour management Plan

5.9 Implications of the Variation on - Raw Materials

The increase in pig numbers will mean an increase in wet feed of approximately 9 tonnes per day and disinfectant use will increase. Please also see Sections 5.10 and 5.12 below.

Use of raw materials will be considered in the resource efficiency assessment required under the standard permit condition.

5.10 Implications of the Variation on - Raw Materials Selection

There will be no implications for raw material selection as a result of this variation as there will be no change in selection.

Selection of raw materials will be considered in the resource efficiency assessment required under the standard permit condition.

5.11 Implications of the Variation on - Waste Minimisation Requirements

There will be no implications for the requirements to minimise waste as a result of this variation.

The permit conditions regulating this requirement shall alter as the four-yearly reports are superseded by one four-yearly report considering resource efficiency.

5.12 Implications of the Variation on - Water Use

The application states that water use shall increase by 12,830m³ per year (35m³ per day). The Applicant currently has three abstraction consents serving the Brigstanes Pig Unit and the Aberdeen Registry Department carried out variations to all to increase the volumes adequately to permit the increase in abstraction rates.

BAT regarding water use at washing and drinking water infrastructure (*i.e.* nipple drinkers) has been followed.

Water use is monitored and will be considered in the relevant section of the resource efficiency assessment required under the standard permit condition.

5.13 Implications of the Variation on - Waste Handling

The types of waste generated at the new shed shall not differ from those already produced on site. However the increase in pig numbers shall see a significant increase in the amount of slurry generated. The permit was last varied in 2010 and the application for that variation stated that the total slurry produced would be 9,438m³. The final slurry figures submitted as part of this variation now put that figure at 31,941.7m³.

Wash and waste water shall similarly increase. The capacity of slurry storage has been calculated and the Rural Payments and Inspection Division have found it satisfactory with more than 6 months' storage for the whole site.

Removal of the slurry under the slats of the new shed shall be done through frequent vacuum removal to the slurry store which meets the new BAT Conclusions of the recently published BAT Reference Document [BREF] for Intensive Rearing of Pigs and Poultry.

Wastes produced through general maintenance shall be minimal as the shed shall meet BAT and will be modern infrastructure.

Fallen stock is likely to rise proportionate to the increase in finishing pigs on site but the handling and disposal of this waste shall not differ to that already on site. The capacity of the current fallen stock storage facility is sufficient to accommodate this increase.

The volume of other wastes stored on the site is minimal and all will be considered in the relevant section of the resource efficiency assessment required under the standard permit condition. The onus of Duty of Care shall apply to all waste management at the installation.

5.14 Implications of the Variation on - Waste Recovery or Disposal

There are no implications for methods of waste recovery or disposal due to the proposed variation

5.15 Implications of the Variation on - Energy

The new shed shall increase energy demand at the site by 201,480 kWh per year. Welfare of the pigs largely dictates energy use but the new shed shall be built to BAT including insulation, lighting, and ventilation.

The operator does not hold a Climate Change Agreement for the site but there is an adjacent wind turbine that generates power for the farm (with mains electricity used as back-up).

5.16 Implications of the Variation for - Accidents and their Consequences

There will be no implications for accidents and their consequences as a result of this variation.

5.17 Implications of the Variation for - Noise

The type of noise already generated at Brigstanes shall not change due to this variation but the increase in pig numbers will see proportionate increases in noise from pig movement and vehicles.

Noise at the permitted installation is covered by Section 2.9 of the SFIR which is considered by SEPA to be BAT which the operator is required to have regard to when operating an intensive agriculture site under the PPC Regulations.

The current Noise Management Plan required by the permit has been updated to include the new shed and notes the potential for some screening of noise as it is to be built directly behind an existing shed.

5.18 Implications of the Variation for - Monitoring

Monitoring is required to assess operational conditions and environmental performance. Various permit conditions require the operator to monitor the level of inputs and the volume of outputs, to consider how changes made benefit the environment. The new BREF introduces the following additional monitoring requirements

- The total nitrogen and total phosphorus excreted in manure
- Ammonia emission to air
- Dust emissions

This will be required annually by condition 3.6 and Table 3.3 in the permit.

Where the BREF stipulates emission limits (AEL's) the operator must monitor to demonstrate compliance. In certain circumstances emission factors can be used to estimate emissions.

For new finisher housing the BAT AEL is 2.6. The relevant emission factor where slurry is frequently removed is 3.11.

Comparing current diets with diets for 2002/3 indicates that over the course of the last 13-15 years crude protein levels in feed have reduced by 20% for finishers, not accounting for the progress in improved feed efficiency gained from improved genetics.

Accepting that every 1% reduction in dietary crude protein will result in a reduction of ammonia emissions of 10% SEPA has agreed that a further reduction can be afforded across the intensive pig industry of 20%. Resulting in an emission factor of 2.48 therefore comfortably achieving the AEL.

5.19 Implications of the Variation for - Closure

There are no implications for closure due to the proposed variation (please see Sections 4.1 and 5.10 for further information on the Baseline Report and its related implications).

5.20 Implications of the Variation for - Site Condition Report (and where relevant the baseline report)

As *per* precedent (please see permits PPC/A/1114003 and PPC/A/1114617) this application was accepted without a baseline report. Since the installation will now extend onto greenfield agricultural land the following statement was accepted by SEPA as part of the Site Condition Report submitted with the application:

“There will be no use, production or release of relevant hazardous substances on this land and as such the operator accepts that at surrender the baseline will be zero.”

Whilst the application was accepted without a baseline report this risk is mitigated by the requirement that all permitted Intensive Agriculture installations have to submit baseline reports as part of the review of all permits due to the publication of the new BAT Reference Document [BREF] for Intensive Agriculture Installations.

The permit shall contain a condition requiring a baseline report to be produced and submitted to SEPA within a time frame agreed with SEPA.

5.21 Implications of the Variation for - Consideration of BAT

SEPA published its view of ‘indicative’ BAT relating to intensive agricultural operations in its Standard Farming Installation Rules (SFIR). Much of the SFIR is based on the BAT Reference Document [BREF] for Intensive Agriculture Installations published by the European IPPC Bureau in 2003. These SFIR have been used throughout this permit to benchmark farming activities. The most recent BREF was published in February 2017 and the site will have to meet revised BAT within 4 years of the issue of this BREF.

6 OTHER LEGISLATION CONSIDERED
<i>Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004 & Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994</i>
Is there any possibility that the proposal will have any impact on site designated under the above legislation? Yes
Screening distance(s) used – 10km as <i>per</i> SEPA Nature Conservation Procedure NCP-P-01.
Are there any SSSIs within the area screened? Yes
Has SNH been consulted under section 15(5) of the 2004 Act? Yes
Date consultation letter sent – 18/05/2017
Summary of response received including date – 07/06/2017:
The following exceedences were highlighted when SCAIL was carried out:
<u>Loch of Lumgair SSSI</u>
Ammonia – PC is 5% of Critical Level
Nitrogen – PC is 8% of Critical Load

Acid – PC is 6% of Critical Load

Following an Appropriate Assessment of these loads and impacts SNH state that the proposal could damage the protected natural features of Loch Lumgair SSSI.

Actions taken including justification – Modelling of the ammonia from the proposal to be undertaken by the Applicant in order to assess more accurately the impacts.

SEPA Ecology Specialist and Air Modelling Specialist find ammonia modelling report and its findings satisfactory. No significant or unacceptable impacts shall be made to the Loch of Lumgair SSSI.

Please see Associated Document 2 for the Appropriate Assessment Record, Associated Document 3 for the Information Notice requiring ammonia modelling and Associated Document 4 for the Ammonia Modelling Report.

Has SEPA reached agreement with SNH on protection of the SSSI? – Yes – 09/11/2017.

Are there any SPA or SAC designated areas within the area screened? Yes

Have you carried out an appropriate assessment? Yes

Date appropriate assessment consultation letter sent – 10/05/2017

Summary of responses received from SNH including date – 07/06/2017

Please see Associated Document 2 for the Appropriate Assessment Record.

Following an Appropriate Assessment of these loads and impacts SNH stated that while the natural heritage interests¹ at the Garron Point SAC are of national importance they will not be affected by the proposed activities at Brigstanes.

Other legislation

The Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 and Groundwater Directive (CAR) – There are no conflicts with ongoing CAR regulation of this process.

Nitrates Directive – This primarily applies to land-spreading activities outwith the process boundary. However the swale system to treat surface water drainage may enrich the ground locally and this enrichment must be considered with respect to the Nitrates Directive when designing.

Carcasses are dealt with under The Animal By-Products Regulations.

7 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND COMAH

How has any relevant information obtained or conclusion arrived at pursuant to Articles 5, 6 and 7 of Council Directive 85/337/EEC on the assessment of the effects certain public and private projects on the environment been taken into account? N/A

How has any information contained within a safety report within the meaning of Regulation 7 (safety report) of the Control of Major Accident Hazards Regulations 1999 been taken into account? N/A

¹ Including the Narrow-mouthed whorl snail

8 DETAILS OF PERMIT

Do you propose placing any non-standard conditions in the Permit: No

Do you propose making changes to existing text, tables or diagrams within the permit? Yes – please refer to draft variation document.

9 EMISSION LIMIT VALUES OR EQUIVALENT TECHNICAL PARAMETERS/ MEASURES

Are you are dealing with either a permit application, or a permit variation which would involve a review of existing ELVs or equivalent technical parameters? Yes

Emission limit values Air

Substance: Nitrogen, phosphorus and ammonia

Relevant emission benchmarks: Table 2.1 of BAT Conclusions for the Intensive Rearing of Poultry or Pigs (2017)

ELV: As stated within Table 2.1 of BAT Conclusions and its associated notes.

Emission point: Diffuse from whole installation.

Rationale: Application submitted after publication of review of the relevant BREF and new BAT must be included in the permit.

10 FINAL DETERMINATION

Issue a variation to the permit PPC/A/1016817 – Based on the information available at the time of the determination SEPA is satisfied that:

- The applicant will be the person who will have control over the operation of the installation,
- The applicant will ensure that the installation is operated so as to comply with the conditions of the Permit,
- That the operator is in a position to use all appropriate preventative measures against pollution, in particular through the application of best available techniques.
- That no significant pollution should be caused.

11 REFERENCES AND GUIDANCE

Standard Farming Installation Rules (SEPA's general sector Guidance)

Nature Conservation Procedure NCP-P-01

The assessment of potential impacts on designated sites of atmospheric emissions of ammonia from PPC intensive agriculture installations NCP-P-02

Sniffer ER26: Final Report on the update of the Simple Calculation of Atmospheric Impact Limits (SCAIL) (2014)

BAT Conclusions for the Intensive Rearing of Poultry or Pigs (2017)

Rural Sustainable Drainage Systems – A practical design and build guide for Scotland’s farmers and landowners (2016).

Associated Supporting Documents

Application to vary Permit PPC/A/1016817 (including supporting reference documents)

Document 1: Application and supporting documents

Document 2: Appropriate Assessment Record following failure of SCAIL screening

Document 3: Schedule 4 Information Notice requiring site-specific ammonia modelling

Document 4: Ammonia Modelling Report