

DESIGN, ACCESS AND PLANNING STATEMENT

**PROPOSED FREE RANGE EGG UNIT
AT
GRAVEL PIT FARM
SAND HUTTON
NORTH YORKSHIRE
YO41 1LH**

APPLICANT: D & J A JONES

MAY 2016

Report Prepared By: Ian Pick BSc (Hons) MRICS
Ian Pick Associates Limited
Station Farm Offices
Wansford Road
Nafferton
Driffield
YO25 8NJ

Tel: 01377 253363
mail@ianpick.co.uk

IAN PICK ASSOCIATES LTD.
SPECIALIST AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

INTRODUCTION

This report has been commissioned by D & J A Jones of Landmoth Hall, Kirby Sigston, Northallerton, DL6 3TF.

Section 42 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires a Design and Access Statement to be submitted with the majority of planning applications. The purpose of this report is to satisfy the requirements of Section 42 of the aforementioned Act.

This report has been prepared to illustrate the process that has led to the development proposal and to explain and justify the proposal in a structured way.

This report has been prepared by Ian Pick. Ian Pick is a specialist agricultural and rural planning consultant. He holds a Bachelor of Science with Honours Degree in Rural Enterprise and Land Management and is a Professional Member of Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors, being qualified in the Rural Practice Division of the Institution.

Ian Pick has 17 years experience in rural planning whilst employed by MAFF, ADAS, Acorus and most recently Ian Pick Associates Limited.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The applicants operate an existing mixed arable and livestock enterprise from Gravel Pit Farm. The farm extends to 800 acres of owner occupied land with an additional 1200 acres owned elsewhere in North Yorkshire.

The arable enterprise consists of combinable and root crops, whilst the existing livestock enterprise extends to 1000 head of cattle, approximately 400 sheep and a separate broiler unit.

IAN PICK ASSOCIATES LTD.
SPECIALIST AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

The applicants are proposing to diversify their existing operations through the erection of a free range egg laying unit.

Planning permission was granted in February 2015 for the construction of an anaerobic digester, this is currently undergoing construction and will aid this application as all poultry manure will be disposed of via the AD plant.

THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The applicants propose to expand and diversify their existing livestock enterprise through the erection of a new building to house 16000 free range laying hens.

The proposed building extends to 76m x 19.5m with a ridge height of 5.5m. The proposed development includes 2 No. feed bins and external hardstandings and concrete aprons. The site will be access from the existing farm entrance and parking and turning provision for HGV's will be available.

AMOUNT

The proposal seeks full planning permission for the erection of 1 No. Free Range Egg unit to house 16,000 free range laying hens. The proposed building extends to 76m x 19.5m.

USE

The use of the proposed building is for the housing of free range laying hens, together with associated egg collection and packing facilities and feed bins.

A free range egg production system is an extensive and welfare friendly form of egg production. The proposed buildings include an egg store and packing area together

IAN PICK ASSOCIATES LTD.
SPECIALIST AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

with accommodation for 16,000 hens. The bird area includes a scratch area and a perchery, together with nest boxes.

The bird housing area within the building includes tiered perches which are located over manure belts.

Nest boxes are situated within the buildings adjacent to an egg collection conveyor. The nest boxes are angled towards the conveyor and the hens lay their eggs in the nest boxes. The eggs then roll onto the conveyor and are brought to the packing area at the end of the building.

The feeding system within the building is based on an automated chain feeding system which operates every 2 hours between the hours of 6.00am and 9.00pm. Water supply is provided by non drip nipple drinkers.

The lighting within the building is on a timeswitch, providing the birds with 14 hours of daylight per day.

Ventilation within the buildings is automatic using ridge fans and side inlet vents and is thermostat controlled.

Pop holes are situated in the north side of the building. These pop holes provide the birds with direct access to the range area. Pop holes are opened at 8.00am daily and closed at 9.00pm (or dusk).

IAN PICK ASSOCIATES LTD.
SPECIALIST AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS



Photo: Pop Holes.

The range area extends to 1 hectare for every 2000 birds, and is enclosed by a post and wire stock fence.



Photo: Typical Range Perimeter Fencing.

Odour

The Free Range Egg Unit is designed, and proven in practice, to produce negligible environmental consequences.

IAN PICK ASSOCIATES LTD.
SPECIALIST AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

The design of the Unit incorporates tiered perches which are located over manure belts. The manure belts are emptied on a twice weekly basis to prevent any build up of manure within the building. The twice weekly removal of manure ensures that there is never any volume of manure on the site which could create an odour nuisance.

Site Waste Management

In terms of disease precautions, storage or spreading manure on the range is prohibited. Manure is removed from the building on a twice weekly basis and will be fed into the adjacent anaerobic digestion system. Some manure may be retained on site for use as a sustainable fertiliser on the applicant's agricultural land.

The exporting of farmyard manure is an acceptable practice under the Nitrate Pollution Prevention Regulations 2015 (NVZ Regulations). The regulations require the applicant to keep records of the tonnage of manure exported and the details of the recipient, together with their holding number.

Flies

Within the egg collection area of the unit any flies that are present normally come from outside the Unit. They are controlled using fly tape, which is replaced regularly.

Where manure belts are used, and the manure removed from the site on a twice weekly basis there is no potential for the unit to be a breeding ground for flies. Flies can breed in poultry litter, and the frequent removal of the litter breaks the breeding cycle and removes this potential.

IAN PICK ASSOCIATES LTD.
SPECIALIST AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

Rodents

The Unit will be professionally baited and regularly inspected for rodents under a formal control contract.

Problems are not allowed to occur on these Units as any droppings or taint found on the eggs will lead to the whole batch of production being rejected at the packing station, at considerable financial loss to the producer.

Feral

The birds are secure in the houses at night, which prevents problems from foxes, feral cats, etc.

Fallen Stock

Any dead bird will be collected daily and stored in a freezer. Dead birds will be collected and disposed of by a licensed fellmonger.

LAYOUT

The proposed building has been located to the north of the existing farmstead, south east of the approved AD plant. The overall site layout includes the proposed building, feed bins and associated hardstandings and concrete aprons. The site layout can be seen in more detail on the attached site plan (drawing No. IP/DJ/02).

SCALE

The scale of the development is one building of dimensions 76m x 19.5m, with an eaves height of 3.050m and a ridge height of 5.5m.

IAN PICK ASSOCIATES LTD.
SPECIALIST AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

The size of the buildings is linked to the size of the enterprise. Free range egg production legislation dictates that stock levels cannot exceed 15 birds per square metre and the range area requirement is 1 hectare per 2000 birds. The size of the building is dictated by the size of the proposed enterprise.

Large buildings are necessary for free range egg production units, rather than a number of smaller buildings due to the substantial set up costs of the enterprise and the equipment that it necessary for the units to operate. A 16,000 bird free range egg unit has a set up cost of approximately £480,000, with the internal equipment such as feeding, lighting, conveyors and egg packing machinery forming large part of the project cost. Smaller buildings are not viable because the fitting out and equipment cost is preclusive.

LANDSCAPE

The application site will be seen as an extension to the existing farmyard area. The site is screening from the south by farm buildings, from the east and west by a mature hedgerows and shelter belts. Views to the north may be possibly in places from a long distance, however these will be seen in the context of the existing built development (along with the proposed AD plant).

The proposed free range hen house is of agricultural appearance, with polyester coated profile sheet walls and roof. The eaves and ridge height of the proposed building are relatively low (eaves 3.05m and ridge 5.5m) which helps to mitigate any landscape impact. The proposed hen house will not be prominent within the landscape.

Large agricultural buildings are a modern feature of actively farmed areas and often form part of the public perception of the countryside. In that sense, given its generally agricultural appearance, it is not considered that the egg production unit

IAN PICK ASSOCIATES LTD.
SPECIALIST AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

would be out of character or an intrusion in the landscape. The function and purpose of the building is clearly linked to an agricultural use of the surrounding land.

APPEARANCE

The proposed building is a purpose built poultry unit and the design is purely functional for the proposed use as a free range egg laying unit. The building is of steel frame construction and the external cladding being polyester coated profile sheeting.

ACCESS

Access to the proposed free range egg laying units is required by HGV and other commercial non HGV traffic.

| Activity | Vehicle Size | Frequency |
|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Bird Delivery | 16.5m articulated lorry | 2 lorries every 14 months |
| Egg Collection | 16.5m articulated lorry | 2 per week |
| Feed Delivery | 16.5m articulated lorry | 1 per fortnight |
| Bird Collection | 16.5m articulated lorry | 2 lorries every 14 months |

The proposed commercial traffic from the proposed free range egg unit is limited to a feed delivery every 14 days and 2 egg collections per week.

The site itself has been laid out to facilitate access for the type of vehicles which are required to access the development, with a hardstanding to allow for lorry turning at the eastern end of the proposed building.

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework

Paragraph 18 and 19 of the NPPF set the Governments position on economic growth, and provide evidence of the Governments commitment securing economic growth in order to create jobs and prosperity. The proposed development will create additional employment on the site in the form of an additional full time job.

Paragraph 28 provides support for economic growth in rural areas, providing clear support for the proposed development as farm diversification and sustainable growth and expansion of businesses in rural areas. The proposal is clearly supported by paragraph 28.

FLOOD RISK AND SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT

Introduction

The changes to the NPPF in March 2015 require a flood risk assessment be provided for all development which exceeds 1000 sq m of floor space.

Paragraph 31 of the National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance states that site specific flood risk assessment should always be proportionate to the degree of flood risk and make optimum use of information already available, including information in a strategic flood risk assessment for the area and the interactive flood risk maps available and the Environment Agency's website.

Flood Risk

A review of the risk of flooding on the site has shown the site to be in Flood Zone 1. The Environment Agency Flood Map is shown below. The application site is shown in red.

IAN PICK ASSOCIATES LTD.
SPECIALIST AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS



The Location within Flood Zone 1 the risk of flooding taken from the Environment Agency website is shown below.

The location you have selected is in an area that has a very low chance of flooding from rivers or the sea.



What does 'very low' mean?

Very low means that each year, this area has a chance of flooding of less than 1 in 1000 (0.1%).

The Environment Agency's Flood Map for Land Use Planning confirms that the site is located within Zone 1.

* Flood Zone 1 - land assessed as having a less than 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river or sea flooding (<0.1%)

Flood Risk Conclusion

The site is confirmed by the Environment Agency as being located within Flood Zone 1 and hence has a risk of flooding of less than 1 in 1000 annual probability of flooding. The main flood risk issues associated with this site are the management of surface water to ensure that the proposed development does not contribute to flooding beyond the site boundaries.

Surface Water Management

Paragraph 51 of the NPPF Planning Practice Guidance advocates the use of sustainable drainage systems for new developments in order to reduce the cause impacts of flooding.

This application is for an agricultural development and creates impermeable surfaces which will in turn create surface water runoff.

The application site is underlain by sand. The site is free draining and as such the proposal will utilise soakaways for the disposal of surface water.

IAN PICK ASSOCIATES LTD.
SPECIALIST AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

AMMONIA DEPOSITION

Ammonia, Nitrogen and Acid Deposition impacts of the proposed development have been assessed using SCAIL (Simple Calculation of Ammonia Impact Limits). A search of receptors revealed 2 No. SSSI's within 5km and 3 SAC's within 10km. The receptor search is shown below.

| Site No. | Name | Distance(km) | Designation | Easting | Northing |
|----------|--------------------------|--------------|-------------|---------|----------|
| 1 | Strensall Common | 2.553 | SSSI | 466154 | 460107 |
| 2 | Strensall Common | 2.553 | SAC | 466154 | 460107 |
| 3 | River Derwent | 4.125 | SSSI | 471428 | 456063 |
| 4 | River Derwent | 4.125 | SAC | 471423 | 456058 |
| 5 | Kirkham Park & Riverside | 8.668 | SSSI | 473253 | 465971 |
| 6 | Newton Mask | 8.713 | SSSI | 470582 | 450393 |
| 7 | Lower Derwent Valley | 8.716 | SAC | 470589 | 450392 |
| 8 | Lower Derwent Valley | 8.716 | SPA | 470589 | 450392 |
| 9 | Mount Pleasant Quarry | 9.561 | SSSI | 473294 | 467006 |
| 10 | Bishop Wilton Poorland | 9.82 | SSSI | 477711 | 455825 |

The impact of the proposed development has been assessed using SCAIL and the results pages are shown overleaf. The results show a maximum process contribution to ammonia and nitrogen deposition of 1%, against a threshold of 20%.

Ian Pick

March 2016.

IAN PICK ASSOCIATES LTD.
SPECIALIST AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

IAN PICK ASSOCIATES LTD.

SPECIALIST AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

| Site Information site 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|----------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| Region: | England | | | | | | | | | | |
| Site Name: | Strensall Common | | | | | | | | | | |
| Site Code: | 3196 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Designation Status: | SSSI | | | | | | | | | | |
| Distance from Installation (m): | 2553 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Habitat Type: | Habitat | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grid Reference: | 466154.9,460107.6 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Met Site: | CHUR | | | | | | | | | | |
| Run Mode: | Conservative | | | | | | | | | | |
| PM ₁₀ Percentile: | Average | | | | | | | | | | |
| Installation Information | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No. | Name | No. of sources | No. of new sources | PM ₁₀ (t/a) | NH ₃ (t/a) | Odour (kOu/a) | Dep N (kg/ha/yr) | Conc PM ₁₀ (µg/m ³) | Conc NH ₃ (µg/m ³) | Conc Odour (Ou/m ³) | Dep Acid (kEq H ⁺ /ha/yr) |
| 1 | Jones | 1 | 1 | - | 1.3 | - | 0.07 | - | 0.01 | - | 0.004 |
| Total Depositions/Concentrations and Exceedances | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Concentrations/Depositions and Critical Loads | | | | PM ₁₀ (µg/m ³) | NH ₃ (µg/m ³) | Odour (Ou/m ³) | N Dep. (kg N/ha/yr) | Acid Dep. (kEq H ⁺ /ha/yr) | | | |
| Process Contribution (PC) at receptor edge | | | | - | 0.01 | - | - | | | | |
| Background concentration at receptor edge | | | | - | 2.63 | - | - | | | | |
| Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC) | | | | - | 2.64 | - | - | | | | |
| Process Contribution (PC) at receptor edge | | | | | | | 0.05 | 0.004 | | | |
| Background deposition at receptor | | | | | | | 22.54 | 1.87 (N:1.61 S:0.26) | | | |
| Predicted Environmental Deposition (PEC) | | | | | | | 22.59 | 1.87 | | | |
| Environmental Assessment Level or Critical Load / Level | | | | - | 1 or 3 | - | | Acid grassland lowland | | Acid grassland lowland | |
| | | | | | | | 8.0 | | | maxN: 1.24 maxS: 0.80 minN: 0.44 | |
| | | | | Alternative Critical Load Info | | | | | | | |
| % of relevant standard PC | | | | - | 1% or 0% | - | 1% | 0% | | | |
| % of relevant standard PEC | | | | - | 264% or 88% | - | 282% | 151% | | | |
| EXCEEDANCE | | | | - | 1.64 or No exceedance | - | 14.59 | 0.63 | | | |

IAN PICK ASSOCIATES LTD.
SPECIALIST AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

| Site Information site 2 | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|----------------|--------------------|--|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Region: | England | | | | | | | | | | |
| Site Name: | Strensall Common | | | | | | | | | | |
| Site Code: | UK0030284 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Designation Status: | SAC | | | | | | | | | | |
| Distance from Installation (m): | 2553 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Habitat Type: | Habitat | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grid Reference: | 466154.3,460107.6 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Met Site: | CHUR | | | | | | | | | | |
| Run Mode: | Conservative | | | | | | | | | | |
| PM ₁₀ Percentile: | Average | | | | | | | | | | |
| Installation Information | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No. | Name | No. of sources | No. of new sources | PM ₁₀ (t/a) | NH ₃ (t/a) | Odour (kOu/a) | Dep N (kg/ha/yr) | Conc PM ₁₀ (µg/m ³) | Conc NH ₃ (µg/m ³) | Conc Odour (Ou/m ³) | Dep Acid (kEq H ⁺ /ha/yr) |
| 1 | Jones | 1 | 1 | - | 1.3 | - | 0.07 | - | 0.01 | - | 0.004 |
| Total Depositions/Concentrations and Exceedances | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Concentrations/Depositions and Critical Loads | | | | PM ₁₀ (µg/m ³) | NH ₃ (µg/m ³) | Odour (Ou/m ³) | N Dep. (kg N/ha/yr) | Acid Dep. (kEq H ⁺ /ha/yr) | | | |
| Process Contribution (PC) at receptor edge | | | | - | 0.01 | - | | | | | |
| Background concentration at receptor edge | | | | - | 2.63 | - | | | | | |
| Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC) | | | | - | 2.64 | - | | | | | |
| Process Contribution (PC) at receptor edge | | | | | | | 0.05 | 0.004 | | | |
| Background deposition at receptor | | | | | | | 22.54 | 1.87 (N:1.61 S:0.26) | | | |
| Predicted Environmental Deposition (PEC) | | | | | | | 22.59 | 1.87 | | | |
| Environmental Assessment Level or Critical Load / Level | | | | - | 1 or 3 | - | European dry heaths 10.0 | European dry heaths maxN: 1.51 maxS: 0.80 minN: 0.71 | | | |
| | | | | Alternative Critical Load Info | | | | | | | |
| % of relevant standard PC | | | | - | 1% or 0% | - | 1% | 0% | | | |
| % of relevant standard PEC | | | | - | 264% or 88% | - | 226% | 124% | | | |
| EXCEEDANCE | | | | - | 1.64 or No exceedance | - | 12.59 | 0.36 | | | |

IAN PICK ASSOCIATES LTD.
SPECIALIST AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

| Site Information site 3 ? | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|----------------|--------------------|--|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--|---|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Region: | England | | | | | | | | | | |
| Site Name: | River Derwent | | | | | | | | | | |
| Site Code: ? | 3002 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Designation Status: ? | SSSI | | | | | | | | | | |
| Distance from Installation (m): ? | 4125 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Habitat Type: | Habitat | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grid Reference: | 471428.1,456063.3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Met Site: ? | CHUR | | | | | | | | | | |
| Run Mode: ? | Conservative | | | | | | | | | | |
| PM ₁₀ Percentile: ? | Average | | | | | | | | | | |
| Installation Information ? | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No. | Name | No. of sources | No. of new sources | PM ₁₀ (t/a) | NH ₃ (t/a) | Odour (kOu/a) | Dep N (kg/ha/yr) | Conc PM ₁₀ (µg/m ³) | Conc NH ₃ (µg/m ³) | Conc Odour (Ou/m ³) | Dep Acid (kEq H+/ha/yr) |
| 1 | Jones | 1 | 1 | - | 1.3 | - | 0.06 | - | 0.01 | - | 0.004 |
| Total Depositions/Concentrations and Exceedances ? | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Concentrations/Depositions and Critical Loads | | | | PM ₁₀ (µg/m ³) ? | NH ₃ (µg/m ³) | Odour (Ou/m ³) | N Dep. (kg N/ha/yr) | Acid Dep. (kEq H+/ha/yr) | | | |
| Process Contribution (PC) at receptor edge | | | | - | 0.01 | - | | | | | |
| Background concentration at receptor edge ? | | | | - | 2.69 | - | | | | | |
| Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC) ? | | | | - | 2.7 | - | | | | | |
| Process Contribution (PC) at receptor edge | | | | | | | 0.08 | 0.005 | | | |
| Background deposition at receptor ? | | | | | | | 40.18 | 1.88 (N:1.62 S:0.26) | | | |
| Predicted Environmental Deposition (PEC) ? | | | | | | | 40.26 | 1.88 | | | |
| Environmental Assessment Level or Critical Load / Level ? | | | | - | 1 or 3 ? | - | | Broad-leaved, mixed and yew woodland | Fen marsh and swamp - lowland | | |
| | | | | | | | 5.0 | maxN: 0.63 maxS: 0.40 minN: 0.22 | | | |
| | | | | Alternative Critical Load Info | | | | | | | |
| % of relevant standard PC ? | | | | - | 1% or 0% | - | 2% | 2% | | | |
| % of relevant standard PEC ? | | | | - | 270% or 90% | - | 805% | 300% | | | |
| EXCEEDANCE ? | | | | - | 1.70 or No exceedance | - | 35.26 | 1.25 | | | |

IAN PICK ASSOCIATES LTD.
SPECIALIST AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

| Site Information site 4 | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|----------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Region: | England | | | | | | | | | | |
| Site Name: | River Derwent | | | | | | | | | | |
| Site Code: | UK0030253 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Designation Status: | SAC | | | | | | | | | | |
| Distance from Installation (m): | 4125 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Habitat Type: | Habitat | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grid Reference: | 471423.5,456058 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Met Site: | CHUR | | | | | | | | | | |
| Run Mode: | Conservative | | | | | | | | | | |
| PM ₁₀ Percentile: | Average | | | | | | | | | | |
| Installation Information | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No. | Name | No. of sources | No. of new sources | PM ₁₀ (t/a) | NH ₃ (t/a) | Odour (kOu/a) | Dep N (kg/ha/yr) | Conc PM ₁₀ (µg/m ³) | Conc NH ₃ (µg/m ³) | Conc Odour (Ou/m ³) | Dep Acid (kEq H ⁺ /ha/yr) |
| 1 | Jones | 1 | 1 | - | 1.3 | - | 0.04 | - | 0.01 | - | 0.003 |
| Total Depositions/Concentrations and Exceedances | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Concentrations/Depositions and Critical Loads | | | | PM ₁₀ (µg/m ³) | NH ₃ (µg/m ³) | Odour (Ou/m ³) | N Dep. (kg N/ha/yr) | Acid Dep. (kEq H ⁺ /ha/yr) | | | |
| Process Contribution (PC) at receptor edge | | | | - | 0.01 | - | | | | | |
| Background concentration at receptor edge | | | | - | 2.69 | - | | | | | |
| Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC) | | | | - | 2.7 | - | | | | | |
| Process Contribution (PC) at receptor edge | | | | | | | 0.05 | 0.004 | | | |
| Background deposition at receptor | | | | | | | 22.68 | 1.88 (N:1.62 S:0.26) | | | |
| Predicted Environmental Deposition (PEC) | | | | | | | 22.73 | 1.88 | | | |
| Environmental Assessment Level or Critical Load / Level | | | | - | 1 or 3 | - | | Cottus gobio | Cottus gobio | | |
| | | | | | | | | Alternative Critical Load Info | | | |
| % of relevant standard PC | | | | - | 1% or 0% | - | n/a | n/a | | | |
| % of relevant standard PEC | | | | - | 270% or 90% | - | n/a | n/a | | | |
| EXCEEDANCE | | | | - | 1.70 or No exceedance | - | n/a | n/a | | | |

IAN PICK ASSOCIATES LTD.

SPECIALIST AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

| Site Information site 7 | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|----------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|---|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Region: | England | | | | | | | | | | |
| Site Name: | Lower Derwent Valley | | | | | | | | | | |
| Site Code: | UK0012844 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Designation Status: | SAC | | | | | | | | | | |
| Distance from Installation (m): | 8716 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Habitat Type: | Habitat | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grid Reference: | 470589,450392.3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Met Site: | CHUR | | | | | | | | | | |
| Run Mode: | Conservative | | | | | | | | | | |
| PM ₁₀ Percentile: | Average | | | | | | | | | | |
| Installation Information | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No. | Name | No. of sources | No. of new sources | PM ₁₀ (t/a) | NH ₃ (t/a) | Odour (kOu/a) | Dep N (kg/ha/yr) | Conc PM ₁₀ (µg/m ³) | Conc NH ₃ (µg/m ³) | Conc Odour (Ou/m ³) | Dep Acid (kEq H ⁺ /ha/yr) |
| 1 | Jones | 1 | 1 | - | 1.3 | - | 0.02 | - | 0 | - | 0.001 |
| Total Depositions/Concentrations and Exceedances | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Concentrations/Depositions and Critical Loads | | | | PM ₁₀ (µg/m ³) | NH ₃ (µg/m ³) | Odour (Ou/m ³) | N Dep. (kg N/ha/yr) | Acid Dep. (kEq H ⁺ /ha/yr) | | | |
| Process Contribution (PC) at receptor edge | | | | - | 0.00 | - | - | | | | |
| Background concentration at receptor edge | | | | - | 3.18 | - | - | | | | |
| Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC) | | | | - | 3.18 | - | - | | | | |
| Process Contribution (PC) at receptor edge | | | | | | | 0.00 | 0.000 | | | |
| Background deposition at receptor | | | | | | | 24.50 | 1.99 (N:1.75 S:0.24) | | | |
| Predicted Environmental Deposition (PEC) | | | | | | | 24.5 | 1.99 | | | |
| Environmental Assessment Level or Critical Load / Level | | | | - | 1 or 3 | - | 20.0 | Lowland hay meadows (Alopecurus pratensis, Sanguisorba officinalis) maxN: 4.86 maxS: 4.00 minN: 0.86 | | | |
| Alternative Critical Load Info | | | | | | | | | | | |
| % of relevant standard PC | | | | - | 0% or 0% | - | 0% | 0% | | | |
| % of relevant standard PEC | | | | - | 318% or 106% | - | 123% | 41% | | | |
| EXCEEDANCE | | | | - | 2.18 or 0.18 | - | 4.50 | -2.87 | | | |