# Site Condition Report

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| **Farm Name:** Weavers Meadow Farm | **Applicant:** Chris Down |
|  |  |

**Date:** 30/08/2022

**Prepared by:** Harry Edwards of the Farm Consultancy Group with information prepared by Chris Down.

|  |
| --- |
| **1.0 SITE DETAILS** |
| Name of the applicant | Chris Down  |
| Activity address |  Weavers Meadow Farm, Langford, Cullompton, Devon, EX15 1RQ  |
| National grid reference | ST 02698, 03535 |

Document reference and dates for Site Condition Report at permit application and surrender

30/08/2022

Document references for site plans (including location and boundaries)

004 Site Layout Plan

005 Site Boundary Plan

|  |
| --- |
| **2.0 Condition of the land at permit issue**  |
| Environmental setting including:* geology
* hydrogeology
* surface waters
 | The installation covers approximately2.06 hectare. The surrounding land is predominantly used for a mixture of arable and grass farming.**Soilscape 8:**Slightly acid loamy and clayey soils with impeded drainage**Texture:**Loamy some clayey**Coverage:**England: 10.6%    Wales: 1.9%England & Wales: 9.4%**Selected area:**5.2km2**Drainage:**Slightly impeded drainage**Fertility:**Moderate to high**Habitats:**Wide range of pasture and woodland types**Landcover:**Arable and grassland**Carbon:**Low**Drains to:**Stream network**Water protection:**Farmed land is drained and therefore vulnerable to pollution run-off and rapid through-flow to streams; surface capping can trigger erosion of fine sediment**General cropping:**Reasonably flexible but more suited to autumn sown crops and grassland; soil conditions may limit safe groundwork and grazing, particularly in spring.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | According to the postcode search facilities on the Environment Agency website, the site is not in a Groundwater Catchment Area, nor is it within a Source Protection Zone. However, the site is within a Nitrate Vulnerable Zone, classified as NVZ Area G18 (Mid Devon- Groundwater). Pre-application screening showed that ammonia modeling was not required for the site.  |
| Pollution history including:* pollution incidents that may have affected land
* historical land-uses and associated contaminants
* any visual/olfactory evidence of existing contamination
* evidence of damage to pollution prevention measures
 | The site is currently a pig rearing unit and is to expand to above the EPR permit threshold. The site has an existing SSAFO complaint slurry lagoon. Prior to the site being used for pig production the land was used for the agricultural purposes, grass and cereals rotation. None of the land has previously been built on.No history of pollution problems have been reported. |
| Evidence of historic contamination, for example, historical site investigation, assessment, remediation and verification reports (where available) | Not applicable. |
| Baseline soil and groundwater reference data | No formal assessments have been made of the soils on the site. |
| **Supporting information** | None  |

|  |
| --- |
| **3.0 Permitted activities** |
| Permitted activities | Weavers Meadow Farm will have a capacity for:Sows and Farrowers: 1771Pigs 7-15 kg – 1460 Production Pigs above 30kg – 432The site is run as a fully slatted or part slatted based system with vacuum slurry removal, the existing housing and the proposed housing to all be operated as per BAT with frequent slurry removal. A BAT assessment has been carried out for both the existing pig buildings and the proposed new building. This BAT assessment has not identified a need for an improvement program based on the buildings utilising biofilters. As the existing buildings are built to the same specification as the proposed new building both of which are to comply with BAT AELS with the use of biofilters. Biofilters are referenced in the BAT Conclusions document under BAT 30, technique 0 as a way to comply with BAT AELS. The majority of buildings are ventilated using variable spend roof fans with some buildings operating natural ventilation. Slurry is collected underneath the buildings and pumped out at least every 12 weeks to ensure slurry depth is maintained below 800mm. The unit operates a mostly dry feed system, the diets fed to all the pigs throughout all stages are balanced nutritionally and formulated in such a way to minimise the production and emissions of ammonia, odours, dust and the overall environmental impact of the farming activities. Nipple drinkers are used throughout to prevent water wastage. Meter readings will be taken on a regular basis to monitor water consumption and to detect the presence of any leakages, the site utilises borehole water and has mains water as a backup. All lorries are washed out and disinfected regularly, maintaining cleanliness to a high standard. Each lorry is equipped with a shovel, bag and brush for instant clean up of accidental spillages, thus reducing emissions of both dust and odour. Washings are captured and drain back into the contained slurry system. These measures are intended to reduce the production and emission of ammonia odours and to prevent dust and liquids escaping into the environment. The batch system enables the housing to be cleaned out on a regular basis, ensuring all pig housing is as clean as possible. All dead stock will be disposed on via on site incineration. Data sheet in appendix 1.  |
| Non-permitted activities undertaken | None |
| Document references for:* plan showing activity layout; and

environmental risk assessment | Appendix 1 Location and Site Plan and Appendix 1 H1 Assessment |

|  |
| --- |
| **4.0 Changes to the activity** |
| **Have there been any changes to the activity boundary?** | If yes, provide a plan showing the changes to the activity boundary. |
| **Have there been any changes to the permitted activities?** | If yes, provide a description of the changes to the permitted activities |
| **Have any ‘dangerous substances’ not identified in the Application Site Condition Report been used or produced as a result of the permitted activities?** | If yes, list of them |
| **Checklist of supporting information** | * Plan showing any changes to the boundary (where relevant)
* Description of the changes to the permitted activities (where relevant)
* List of ‘dangerous substances’ used/produced by the permitted activities that were not identified in the Application Site Condition Report (where relevant)
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **5.0 Measures taken to protect land** |
| Use records that you collected during the life of the permit to summarise whether pollution prevention measures worked. If you can’t, you need to collect land and/or groundwater data to assess whether the land has deteriorated. |
| **Checklist of supporting information** | * Inspection records and summary of findings of inspections for all pollution prevention measures
* Records of maintenance, repair and replacement of pollution prevention measures
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **6.0 Pollution incidents that may have had an impact on land, and their remediation** |
| Summarise any pollution incidents that may have damaged the land. Describe how you investigated and remedied each one. If you can’t, you need to collect land and /or groundwater reference data to assess whether the land has deteriorated while you’ve been there. |
| **Checklist of supporting information** | * Records of pollution incidents that may have impacted on land
* Records of their investigation and remediation
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **7.0 Soil gas and water quality monitoring (where undertaken)** |
| Provide details of any soil gas and/or water monitoring you did. Include a summary of the findings. Say whether it shows that the land deteriorated as a result of the permitted activities. If it did, outline how you investigated and remedied this. |
| **Checklist of supporting information** | * **Description of soil gas and/or water monitoring undertaken**
* **Monitoring results (including graphs)**
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **8.0 Decommissioning and removal of pollution risk** |
| Describe how the site was decommissioned. Demonstrate that all sources of pollution risk have been removed. Describe whether the decommissioning had any impact on the land. Outline how you investigated and remedied this. |
| **Checklist of supporting information** | * **Site closure plan**
* **List of potential sources of pollution risk**
* **Investigation and remediation reports (where relevant)**
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **9.0 Reference data and remediation (where relevant)** |
| Say whether you had to collect land and/or groundwater data. Or say that you didn’t need to because the information from sections 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the Surrender Site Condition Report shows that the land has not deteriorated.If you did collect land and/or groundwater reference data, summarise what this entailed, and what your data found. Say whether the data shows that the condition of the land has deteriorated, or whether the land at the site is in a “satisfactory state”. If it isn’t, summarise what you did to remedy this. Confirm that the land is now in a “satisfactory state” at surrender. |
| **Checklist of supporting information** | * Land and/or groundwater data collected at application (if collected)
* Land and/or groundwater data collected at surrender (where needed)
* Assessment of satisfactory state
* Remediation and verification reports (where undertaken)
 |

**10.0 Statement of site condition**

Using the information from sections 3 to 7, give a statement about the condition of the land at the site. This should confirm that:

* the permitted activities have stopped
* decommissioning is complete, and the pollution risk has been removed
* the land is in a satisfactory condition.