SITE CONDITION REPORT

For full details, see H5 *SCR guide for applicants* v2.0 4 August 2008

COMPLETE SECTIONS 1-3 AND SUBMIT WITH APPLICATION

DURING THE LIFE OF THE PERMIT: MAINTAIN SECTIONS 4-7

AT SURRENDER: ADD NEW DOC REFERENCE IN 1.0; COMPLETE SECTIONS 8-10; & SUBMIT WITH YOUR SURRENDER APPLICATION.

1.0 SITE DETAILS	
Name of the applicant	Mr Karl Calton, Mr Will Calton trading as Calton Brothers
Activity address	EPR/TP3130QY Old Hall Farm, Burston, Diss, Norfolk, IP22 5TF
National grid reference	Study area for SCR centred on TM 13102 84502 in the permit.
Document reference and dates for Site Condition Report at permit application and surrender.	1. Updated the SCR for Application Variation V003 to increase the installation boundary to enclose more land (the study areas) to apply for additional houses and places for pigs, details in Section 4 Changes to the Activity. 2. Used desk top study to identify and examine in broad terms readily available information without intrusive investigation and a site walkover on 31st October 2025.
Document references for site plans (including location and boundaries)	3. Groundsure; *Old Hall Farm, Hall Road, Burston, Norfolk, IP22 5TF 13/11/2025*; 1:1250 scale

Note:

In Part A of the application form, you must give us details of the site's location and provide us with a site plan. We need a detailed site plan (or plans) showing:

- Site location, the area covered by the site condition report, and the location and nature of the activities and/or waste facilities on the site.
- Locations of receptors, sources of emissions/releases, and monitoring points.
- Site drainage.
- Site surfacing.

If this information is not shown on the site plan required by Part A of the application form, then you should submit the additional plan or plans with this site condition report.

2.0 Condition of the land at permit issue	
Environmental setting including: • geology • hydrogeology • surface waters	**Landscape setting** 1. Study areas located in National Character Area Profile: 83 South Norfolk and High Suffolk Claylands[5]. Area characterised by relatively flat topography, incised by stream and river valley corridors that drain the plateau and are mostly small in scale. The underlying bedrock is Late Cretaceous Chalk overlain by a chalky glacial till (also known as boulder clay) on the plateau and with bands of glacial outwash sands and gravels on the valley sides. In the north the deposits are typically less chalky and include far-travelled erratics of igneous rock brought here by the ice sheets. The underlying chalk forms the principal aquifer which supplies East Anglia. The principal river, the Waveney, flows into the southern part of The Broads at Earsham on its route out to the North Sea. 2. The till gives rise to typical stagnogley soils on the plateau, which difficult to work when wet, are extremely fertile when drained. The area is predominantly agricultural with arable farming dominating, particularly cereals, sugar beet, and oilseed rape. Intensive pig and poultry rearing takes place in large units. **Topography** 3. The study areas are at an altitude of around 53m. The land onsite and the surrounding land offsite rises to slightly higher ground to the north and falling to the south. **Geology** 4. Artificially modified landscaped ground is to be expected result of earthworks for construction of pig houses including removed a limited amount of topsoil and granular subsoil. 5. Natural superficial deposit onsite is Lowestoft Formation – Diamicton (chalky boulder clay). Sedimentary superficial deposit formed between 480 and 423 thousand years ago during the Quaternary period[1]. 6. Bedrock geology onsite is Lewes Nodular Chalk, Seaford Chalk, Newhaven Chalk, Culver Chalk and Portsdown Chalk Formations – Chalk. Sedimentary bedrock formed between 93.9 and 72.1 million years ago during the Cretaceous period[1]. 7. Local geology has been logged below ground level (bgl) at 0.74km to the west at Back Heywood Road BGS borehole reference TM18SW2 and at 1.09km to the southeast of the

study area at Wood Cottage Farm BGS borehole reference TM18SW86[2]: -

BGS borehole reference TM18SW2	Depth bgl
Chalky boulder clay	13.4m
Glacial sand and gravel	21.0m
Upper Chalk	45.7m
Chalk with flints	48.8m

BGS borehole reference TM18SW86	Depth bgl
Boulder clay and gravel	3.0m
Boulder clay and chalk	9.0m
Clay, chalk, and some flint	12.0m
Clay and chalk	18.0m
Clay, chalk, and sand/gravel	24.0m
Chalk	51.0m

(Create table at bottom of page, copy & paste in)

Soil vulnerability classification - leaching potential

8. Soilscape 18 onsite, characterised as slowly permeable seasonally wet slightly acid but base-rich loamy and clayey soils. Impeded drainage. Main risks are associated with overland flow from compacted or poached fields. Organic slurry, dirty water, fertiliser, pathogens, and fine sediment can all move in suspension or solution with overland flow or drain water[10].

Hydrogeology

9. Principal bedrock aquifer onsite[8]. Geology of high intergranular and/or fracture permeability usually providing a high level of water storage and may support water supply (drinking waste supply) and/or rivers base flow on a strategic scale[7].

10. Secondary (undifferentiated) superficial drift aquifer onsite[8]. In general, these layers have been designated as both minor and non-aquifer in different locations due to the variable characteristics of the rock type.

11. Secondary superficial drift aquifer has medium groundwater vulnerability[8]. Assessment of the vulnerability of groundwater to a pollutant discharged at ground level based on the hydrological, geological, hydrogeological and soil properties within a one-kilometre square grid. Groundwater vulnerability is described as High, Medium, or Low as follows: -

High	Areas able to easily transmit pollution to groundwater. They are likely to be characterised by high leaching soils and the absence of low permeability superficial deposits.

Medium	Intermediate, between high & low vulnerability
Low	Areas that provide the greatest protection from pollution. They are likely to be characterised by low leaching soils and/or the presence of superficial deposits characterised by a low permeability.

12. Study area located inside a Drinking Water Safeguard Zone for surface water[4]. Catchment areas that influence the water quality for their respective Drinking Water Protected Area (Surface Water). They are identified where the protected area has been assigned at being "at risk" of failing the drinking water protection objectives of the Water Framework Directive (WFD). Safeguard zones are one of the main tools for delivering the objectives where actions and measures will be targeted to address water contamination and avoid or minimise extra purification treatment needed by water companies in the production of drinking water.

13. Study area located inside a nitrate vulnerable zone[4]. Areas designated as being at risk from agricultural nitrate pollution. Farmers operating within these areas must follow mandatory rules to tackle nitrate loss from agriculture including when land spreading manure and slurry from pig houses.

14. There are no groundwater abstractions onsite.

Surface waters, hydrology & catchment

15. Study area located within the Frenze Brook water body, a tributary of the River Waveney operational catchment and Broadland Rivers management catchment[3]. The Water Framework Directive (WFD) is an EU led framework for the protection of inland surface waters, estuaries, coastal waters, and groundwater through river basin-level management planning. In terms of surface water these basins are broken down into small units known as management, operational and water body catchments.

16. Overall ratings for the Frenze Brook water body and the Waveney (Frenze Beck to Dove) water body are Moderate and Bad Ecological Status[3], respectively as recently as 2022. To achieve purpose of the WFD, environmental objectives have been set and are reported on by the Environment Agency at the end of each six-year cycle.

17. Study area located in the Broadland Rivers Chalk and Crag groundwater body and overall rating was Poor as recently as 2019[3]. Groundwater bodies are also covered by the Directive and the same regime of objectives and reporting.

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. There are no surface water features or networks in the study areas.

<u>Sources of flooding</u>

19. Study areas located in Flood Zone 1[6]. Present day chance of flooding from rivers and the sea is very low staying at very low between 2036 and 2069. Less than 0.1% chance of a flood each year[5]. Low lying areas that are close to rivers or the sea are more likely to flood when water levels rise.

20. Yearly chance of surface water flooding is Very Low staying at Very Low between 2040 and 2060. Less than 0.1% chance of a flood each year[7]. Note, outside study areas there is present day potential for localised ponding around pig houses F2&F3, and future potential for ponding around houses G1-G4 between 2040 and 2060 with climate change[7]. Surface water flooding is sometimes known as flash flooding happens when rainwater cannot drain away through normal drainage systems.

21. Highest risk of groundwater flooding is Low[7]. Study areas are outside of a groundwater flood alert area[7]. Groundwater flooding is caused by unusually high groundwater levels when the water table rises above the ground surface or within underground structures such as basements or cellars. Groundwater flooding tends to exhibit a longer duration than surface water flooding, lasting weeks, or months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td><u>Pollution incidents that may have affected land.</u>

22. No records for any potentially contaminative land uses[8] or pollution incidents that may have affected land within the study areas.

<u>Historical land-uses and associated contaminants</u>

23. Established historical land-uses from OS maps at the 1:2,500 and 1:1,250 scale[9] and aerial photographs[8]: -

<table>
<tr><td>1884</td><td>Greenfields with field boundaries with mature trees, arable agriculture or pasture for grazing animals, a pond and one small building.</td></tr>
<tr><td>1905</td><td>Greenfields with field boundaries although the mature trees appear to have been removed, arable agriculture or pasture for grazing animals, the pond has been enlarged and one small building.</td></tr>
<tr><td>1928</td><td>Greenfields with field boundaries, arable agriculture or pasture for grazing animals and a pond. Approx a third of the land appears to have</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
</tr>
</table>

	scrubby vegetation and the small building has been removed.
1977	Greenfields with field boundaries for arable agriculture. Some fields have been enlarged and much like present-day with a single boundary across the centre of the site. The pond has been infilled. Erected 4no. buildings including pig houses F1&G1 and another on same location as G2 in the present-day but smaller, the grain store and the base slab for the workshop. There is a track crossing the site diagonally from south-east to north-west and continues offsite.
1994	Unchanged.
1999	Aerial photograph shows greenfield for arable agriculture has been reduced and now limited to the west side owing to further developments across three-quarters of the site. Erected a further thirteen buildings including pig houses F2&F5, G2-G5, W1-W3 and an earth-banked slurry lagoon, straw barn, machinery store, fuel store, workshop, and a concrete apron around most buildings. Manure heaps are visible in the same location as present-day. The track crossing the site has been removed.
2003	Unchanged.
2005	Aerial photograph shows the straw barn has been extended otherwise generally unchanged.
2017	Aerial photograph shows greenfield for arable agriculture on west side has been reduced owing to further developments having erected pig house F3 and extended the concrete apron and extended W3. The smaller pig house next to G2 has been removed.
2020	Aerial photograph shows greenfield for arable agriculture on west side has been further reduced owing to further development having erected pig house F4 and extended the concrete apron. Manure heap appears to have been extended or very full.
2022	Aerial photograph shows further development having erected another pig house alongside F4 and extended the concrete apron. Hardly any greenfield for arable agriculture remaining on west side and overall, the installation appears much as it does in the present-day.

24. Record of a slurry bed for waste storage, processing and disposal[8] close to the study areas appears to be consistent with the location of a manure heap on concrete hardstanding in the same place. Otherwise, not found evidence for any historical land use that may have affected land inside the study areas prior to development of Old Hall Farm for intensively rearing pigs[8].

	Licensed industrial activities (Part A(1)) 25. Not found evidence for any previous licensed industrial activities inside the study areas proposed to be enclosed in the environmental permit for intensively rearing pigs. Part A(1) installations are regulated under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 for release of substances to the environment. 26. Most recent pollution inventory substances released to the environment included ammonia, methane, nitrogen oxides (NO and NO2) as NO2[8]. The pollution inventory (substances) includes reporting on annual emissions of certain regulated substances to air, controlled waters, and land. Impacts on the study areas to be enclosed inside the boundary are considered to have been insignificant. 27. Most recent pollution inventory waste transfers included plastics (except packaging), metal, paper and cardboard packaging, engine and gear and lubricating oils (hazardous waste)[8]. The pollution inventory (waste transfers) includes reporting on annual transfers offsite and recovery/disposal of controlled wastes from a site. Impacts on the study areas to be enclosed inside the boundary are considered to have been insignificant. 28. Activities involving the storage, treatment, use or disposal of wastes that are exempt from needing a permit. Impacts on the study areas to be enclosed inside the boundary are considered to have been insignificant. **Visual/olfactory evidence of existing contamination** 29. No visual/olfactory evidence of existing contamination inside the study areas during the site walkover on 31st October 2025. **Evidence of damage to pollution control measures** 30. No evidence of damage to any pollution control measures inside or outside the study areas during the site walkover on 31st October 2025.
Evidence of historic contamination, for example, historical site investigation, assessment, remediation, and verification reports (where available)	31. No evidence of historic contamination or records for any historical site investigation, assessment, remediation, or verification.

Baseline soil and groundwater reference data	32. Based on the information available intrusive investigation to establish baseline soil and groundwater reference data in the study areas was not considered warranted.
References & supporting information	1. British Geological Survey; *Geology Viewer*. Available at https://www.bgs.ac.uk/map-viewers/bgs-geology-viewer/ 2. British Geological Survey; *Onshore borehole records*. Available at https://www.bgs.ac.uk/information-hub/borehole-records/ 3. Defra website; Catchment Data Explorer. Available at https://environment.data.gov.uk/catchment-planning 4. Government website; *Drinking Water Safeguard Zones (Surface Water) (England), Nitrate Vulnerable Zones 2017 Designations (England)*. Available at https://magic.defra.gov.uk/ 5. Government website *National Character Area Profiles: information for local decision making.* Available at https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-character-area-profiles-information-for-local-decision-making 6. Government website; at https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/ 7. Government website; at https://www.gov.uk/check-long-term-flood-risk 8. Groundsure Enviro Insight*; Old Hall Farm, Hall Road, Burston, Norfolk, IP22 5TF, Date 04/11/2025;* Available at https://insights.groundsure.io/ 9. Groundsure Map Insight*; Old Hall Farm, Hall Road, Burston, Norfolk, IP22 5TF, Date 04/11/2025;* Available at https://insights.groundsure.io/ 10. Landis; *Soilscapes Viewer*. Available at https://www.landis.org.uk/soilscapes/

3.0 Permitted activities.

Permitted activities.	Schedule 1; Part 2; Section 6.9; Part A(1)(a) Rearing poultry or pigs intensively in an installation with more than - (ii) 2,000 places for production pigs (over 30kg).
Non-permitted activities undertaken.	Waste exemptions. Adverse impacts in the study areas to be enclosed inside the boundary are considered to have been insignificant.
Document references for: • plan showing activity layout; and • environmental risk assessment.	Groundsure; *Old Hall Farm, Hall Road, Burston, Norfolk, IP22 5TF 04/11/2025*; 1:1250 scale Application Variation V003 Environmental risk assessment

Note:

In Part B of the application form, you must tell us about the activities that you will undertake at the site. You must also give us an environmental risk assessment. This risk assessment must be based on our guidance (*Environmental Risk Assessment - EPR H1*) or use an equivalent approach.

It is essential that you identify in your environmental risk assessment all the substances used and produced that could pollute the soil or groundwater if there were an accident, or if measures to protect land fail.

These include substances that would be classified as 'dangerous' under the Control of Major Accident Hazards (COMAH) regulations and raw materials, fuels, intermediates, products, wastes, and effluents.

If your submitted environmental risk assessment does not adequately address the risks to soil and groundwater, we may need to request further information from you or even refuse your permit application.

Sections 4.0-10.0 not required for the permit application.

4.0 Changes to the activity	
Have there been any changes to the activity boundary?	1. Updated the SCR for Application Variation V003 to increase the installation boundary to enclose more land (the study areas) to apply for additional houses and places for pigs: - • Greenfield agricultural land (approx. 0.384ha) adjacent west side of existing boundary to erect 2no proposed pig houses and enclose an existing pig house as built in 2021 (retrospective) • Greenfield land approx. (0.972ha) adjacent east side of existing boundary to include existing drainage features - a ditch acting as a soakaway for uncontaminated roof and surface water runoff and existing concrete apron used for scraping (retrospective) • Total installation to be approx. 3.35ha after enclosures. 2. Used desk top study to identify and examine in broad terms readily available information without intrusive investigation and a site walkover on 31st October 2025.
Have there been any changes to the permitted activities?	3. For Application Variation V003 propose to erect 2no pig houses and permit an existing pig house as built in 2021 (retrospective) to increase capacity for Schedule1; Part 2; Section 6.9; Part A(1)(a) (ii) places for production pigs (over 30kg) from 3,000 to 6,320. Houses designed to be operated in accordance with SGN EPR 6.09 and Best Available Techniques (BAT) Conclusions Document. Also increase places for rearing pigs to 30kg (directly associated activity) from 3,000 to 4,500 in existing housing. 4. Potential sources of ground contamination in the study areas are associated with an existing pig house as built in 2021 (retrospective) - solid feedstuffs storage silos, scraped concrete apron. These sources may have resulted in contamination migrating into soil, surface water runoff, and seepage into groundwater. Potential contaminants associated with these sources include nutrient nitrogen, phosphorous, ammoniacal nitrogen, biological and chemical oxygen demand. Impacts on the study areas to be enclosed inside the boundary are considered to have been insignificant.

	5. Registered waste exemptions, mostly associated with arable operations at Old Hall Farm, since permit issue: - • WEX380722 - D7 Burning waste in the open, S1 storing waste in secure containers, S2 Storing waste in a secure place and U8 using waste for a specified purpose, registration date 02/09/2023, expiry date 06/09/2026. • WEX468632 - D1 Depositing waste from dredging inland waters, D4 Depositing agricultural waste consisting of plant tissue under a Plant Health Notice, D6 Disposal by incineration, D7 Burning waste in the open, T1 Cleaning, washing, spraying or coating relevant waste, U10 Spreading waste to benefit agricultural land, U13 Spreading plant matter to provide benefits, U14 Incorporating ash into the soil, U15 Spreading of pig and poultry ash, U4 Burning of waste as a fuel in a small appliance, U8 Using waste for a specified purpose registration date 09/08/2025, expiry date 08/08/28. National Grid reference for WEX468632 is TM 13133 84452 inside the existing boundary (south of workshop). 33. All the waste exemptions are common on-farm exemptions. Provided operators adhere to relevant wastes and specific conditions deterioration of land and groundwater in the study areas is not expected. Impacts on the study areas to be enclosed inside the boundary are considered to have been insignificant. <u>Visual/olfactory evidence of existing contamination</u> 6. No visual/olfactory evidence of existing contamination inside the study areas during the site walkover on 31st October 2025. <u>Evidence of damage to pollution control measures</u> 7. No evidence of damage to any pollution control measures inside the study areas during the site walkover on 31st October 2025. 8. Most recent pollution inventory waste transfers included engine and gear and lubricating oils (hazardous waste)[8]. Provided operators adhere to relevant wastes and specific conditions for storage in secure containers and consignment to registered carriers' deterioration of land and groundwater in the study areas is not expected. Impacts on the study areas to be enclosed inside the boundary are considered to have been insignificant.

Have any 'dangerous substances' not identified in the Application Site Condition Report been used or produced as a result of the permitted activities?	9. Not found evidence for use or production of any relevant hazardous 'dangerous substances' substances besides those already identified in the SCR.
Checklist of supporting information	Application Variation V003 Environmental risk assessment Application Variation V003 Surface Water Drainage Plan.

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.