

Scottish Environment Protection Agency	Document Number	IED-DD-02
Pollution Prevention and Control (Scotland) Regulations 2012 Application for a Permit or Variation to a PPC Part A Permit Decision Document	Issue Number	V2.0
	Document Owner	
	Date of Issue	10/03/2025
	Page Number	Page 1 of 22

Scott Eggs Limited Scott Eggs Limited – Free Range Hen Sheds

Permit Application

PPC/A/5011881

Contents

1	Non-Technical Summary of Determination	3
2	External Consultation and SEPA's response	4
3	Administrative determinations	6
4	Introduction and Background	7
4.1	Historical Background to the activity and variation	7
4.2	Description of activity	7
4.3	Outline details of the Variation applied for	7
4.4	Guidance/directions issued to SEPA by the Scottish Ministers under Reg.60 or 61	7
4.5	Identification of important and sensitive receptors	7
5	Key Environmental Issues	8
5.1	Summary of significant environmental impacts	8
5.2	Emissions to Air	8
5.3	Emissions to Water	11
5.4	Noise	13
5.5	Resource Utilisation	13
5.6	Waste Management and Handling	14
5.7	Management of the site	15
5.8	Site Condition report	16
5.9	Monitoring	17
5.10	Consideration of BAT and compliance with BAT-Cs if appropriate	18
6	Other Legislation Considered	18
7	Environmental Impact Assessment and COMAH	21
8	Details of the permit	21
9	Emission Limit Values or Equivalent Technical Parameters/Measures	21
10	Peer Review	21
11	Final Determination	22

Part A Permit Application or Variation Dec. Doc (sec 2 Technical)	Form: IED-DD-02	Page no: 1 of 22

Draft for Consultation

1 Non-Technical Summary of Determination**Provide a non-technical summary of the process and determination**

This application by Scott Eggs Ltd is for a new PPC permit (PPC/A/5011881) due to the expansion of the free-range egg business and the corresponding increase in bird numbers. There is currently an operational hen shed on site with a capacity for 30,000 free range hens, the proposal is to add two additional sheds each with a capacity of 16,000 bringing the total on site capacity to 62,000 free range layers.

Scott Eggs Ltd is based at Howden Farm. The owner of Howden Farm is [REDACTED] who has allocated different areas of Howden Farm to each of his three sons and there are three separate poultry businesses at Howden Farm, (Scott Eggs, East Lothian Eggs and Howden Eggs). Planning consent has been sought individually. For the purposes of PPC these farms will all be separate installations however SEPA understands that once all the permits are granted the intention of the applicant is to apply for a variation to amalgamate all the permits under one. SEPA proposed that the entirety of Howden Farm should be one Permitted Installation at the outset prior to any PPC application being made but were advised that as there were no technical connections each site would apply for an individual permit.

The sheds are designed to minimise ammonia emissions; they are insulated to retain heat; concrete floored with a damp proof membrane; and with walls and roofs insulated to reduce the risk of condensation. Temperature and humidity are monitored continuously and adjusted where necessary to achieve optimal conditions for flock welfare and to maintain a low moisture content of the litter within the sheds.

Ventilation is by means of passive inlets on the side of the sheds and roof and gable end extraction fans. Passive air flow will also occur when pop holes along the side walls, which allow hen access to the range area, are open. The ventilation system will be fully computer monitored, automated and regularly adjusted to control the climate within the sheds.

Power will be supplied by a combination of mains electricity and renewable sources. Roof mounted solar photovoltaic panels are in place on the existing shed offsetting some of the requirement for mains electricity. There will be a standby diesel generator for backup power supply in the event of an emergency. Low energy lighting will be used within the sheds.

No feed mixing or milling will be carried out on site and feed specification is prepared by a nutrition specialist and supplied by accredited mills so that only approved ingredients are used. This will ensure that the correct feed is given in regard to the weight and age of hens. Water consumption is monitored and delivered by low leak nipple drinkers with cups to prevent spills.

Following delivery, chicks will be kept inside the sheds for approximately 12 weeks until they are mature enough to range. Daily access is provided to the birds, with pop holes open to the external ranging area. Internally, there is a multi-tiered system, allowing hens to roost, with the eggs collected on conveyor belts and sorted daily. The hens are in place for approximately 60 weeks, upon which they are removed from the sheds onto wagons and exported off-site.

Manure will be dried by forced air drying on the manure belts in the new houses this technology will help to reduce ammonia emissions to air. The existing shed will not have forced air drying installed. Manure will be removed from buildings every 2-3 days via belts direct to tractors with covered trailers to be transported off site and spread to land as an agricultural fertiliser in compliance with water GBR18 of the Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 (as amended).

The company operates a dry clean system at the end of the cycle therefore wash down does not occur regularly. Where washout is required, water will be stored in two 600 gallon tanks adjacent to the end of the buildings. Water will then be removed offsite for application to land outwith the PPC site boundary.

Applicant: Scott Eggs Limited

Permit/Application number: PPC/A/5011881

Glossary of Terms

BAT - Best Available Techniques
BREF – Best Available Techniques Reference Document
BAT-C – Best Available Technique Conclusions
CO – Coordinating Officer
ELV – Emission Limit Value
GBR – General Binding Rule

2 External Consultation and SEPA's response

Is Public Consultation Required?

(if no delete rows below)

Yes

Advertisement Check:

Date

Compliance with advertising requirements

East Lothian Courier

13/11/2025

Yes

Edinburgh Gazette

11/11/2025

Yes

Officer Checking advert: CO

**No of
responses
received**

None.

Is PPC Statutory Consultation Required?

(if no delete rows below)

Yes

Food Standards Agency:

No response received.

Health Board:

NHS Lothian – Response received 20/11/2025 – No objections :

The proposed facility is largely conveniently located well away from residential facilities. This suggested that the chances of significant adverse impact on human health are going to be limited. Provided the applicant put in place all the proposed measures to ensure that members of the public are not permitted to access the site for 'biosecurity' reasons then they should not come into contact with any hazardous materials.

In conclusion the potential exposure to the facility's emission with consideration to background exposure, will not pose unacceptable risk to the residential receptors identified in the vicinity of the proposed facility provided the mitigation measures for the emissions are put in place as recommended and appropriately monitored.

Local Authority

East Lothian Council – Response received 04/11/2025:

The Pollution Prevention and Control (Scotland) Regulations 2012 (PPC Regulations) applies to large agricultural installations used for the intensive rearing of poultry that exceed 40,000 places. The cumulative operating capacity on site exceeds this threshold. As such, the site will be controlled under the PPC Regulations

	<p>regulated by SEPA. I have reviewed the submitted technical assessments in relation to noise, odour & air-quality. These reports assess the potential impacts from the proposed development of two additional hen sheds alongside existing operations and conclude that significant impacts on human sensitive receptors is unlikely. The submitted noise and odour management plans have also been appraised and found to be satisfactory. I would point out that the submitted assessments do not appear to include potential impacts from the proposed development of a further additional shed to the South East, which, if granted planning consent, will accommodate an additional 4000 birds.</p> <p>SEPA Comment: The applicant is aware that re modelling will be required for the additional 400 birds which are not part of this proposal.</p>
Scottish Water	N/A
Health and Safety Executive	N/A
NatureScot	<p>Response received 21/11/2025 –</p> <p>There are natural heritage interests of national importance within 10km of this site. Advice in relation to this and other aspects of the application is provided below.</p> <p>With regard to ammonia emissions we note additional mitigations have reduced the PC of the proposal to give an overall cumulative concentration that does not exceed the critical limit at Danskin Loch SSSI.</p> <p>The background total N deposition (kgN/ha/yr) figures given in Table 7.8 of the provided 'Air Quality and Odour Impact Assessment Report No.: 445586-01' seem to differ from that given on APIS.ac.uk. Our understanding is that the appropriate background kgN/ha/yr figures should be; Danskin Loch SSSI (Fen woodland feature) 17.1, Papan Water SSSI (Upland mixed ash woodland feature) 16.8 and Lammer Law SSSI (Blanket bog feature) 10.7. Table A5 of the same document does not use the standard units of kgN/ha/yr.</p> <p>Lammer Law SSSI currently exceeds the critical load of nitrogen deposition by over 200%. The habitats on Lammer Law SSSI are particularly sensitive to N deposition. Bog habitats, such as those found at Lammer Law SSSI, are adapted to nutrient poor environments. Excess nitrogen favours nitrogen tolerant vascular plants, out competing mosses, leading to a reduction in overall biodiversity and detrimental impacts in the functioning of the blanket bog habitat. It is not possible from the information provided to understand what impact the proposal will have on the</p>

Applicant: Scott Eggs Limited
Permit/Application number: PPC/A/5011881

	protected areas within 10kms of the development with regard to N deposition. Following this response subsequent discussions were held with SEPA/Nature Scot on 10/12/2025. See section 6 of this decision document for further information
Discretionary Consultation required? (if yes provide justification and details below, otherwise delete row)	No
Enhanced SEPA Consultation required? (if yes provide justification and details below, otherwise delete row)	No
“Off site” consultation required (if yes provide justification and details below, otherwise delete row)	No
Transboundary Consultation required? (if yes provide justification and details below, otherwise delete row)	No
Is Public Participation Consultation Required? (if yes provide justification and details below, otherwise delete rows below)	Yes
Date SEPA notified applicant of draft determination	
Date draft determination placed on SEPA’s Website	13/02/2026
Details of any other ‘appropriate means’ used to advertise the draft. Seek advice from the communication department	
Date public consultation on draft permit opened	13/02/2026
Date public consultation on draft permit consultation closed	
Number of representations received to the consultation	
Date final determination placed on the SEPA’s Website	
Summary of responses and how they were taken into account during the determination:	
Summary of responses withheld from the public register on request and how they were taken into account during the determination:	
REMOVE THIS BOX FROM ANY VERSION OF THIS DOCUMENT TO BE PLACED ON THE WEBSITE OR PUBLIC REGISTER. RETAIN IN THE VERSION FOR THE WORKING FILE.	
Officer:	

3 Administrative determinations		
Determination of the Schedule 1 Activity		
As detailed in the application and supporting documentation.		
Determination of the Stationary Technical Unit to be permitted		
As detailed in the application and supporting documentation.		
Determination of Directly Associated Activities		
Part A Permit Application or Variation Dec. Doc (sec 2 technical)	Form: IED-DD-02	Page no: 6 of 22

Applicant: Scott Eggs Limited

Permit/Application number: PPC/A/5011881

As detailed in the application and supporting documentation.

Determination of Site Boundary

As detailed in the application and supporting documentation.

Officer: CO

4 Introduction and Background

4.1 Historical Background to the activity and variation

Scott Eggs Ltd currently has an operational hen shed with a capacity for 30,000 places for free range hens.

This application for a PPC permit is sought due to the business proposing to expand their free-range egg business by construction of two additional sheds each with capacity of 16,000 places bringing the total capacity on the farm to 62,000 places for free range hens.

4.2 Description of activity

Rearing of poultry intensively in an installation with more than 40,000 places is described in Part A of Section 6.9 (a) of Schedule 1 of the Regulations. There is currently an operational hen shed on site with a capacity for 30,000 free range hens, the proposal is to two additional sheds each with a capacity of 16,000 bringing the total on site capacity to 62,000.

4.3 Outline details of the Variation applied for

N/A – New permit application

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

There are no SAC's or SPA's within the screening distance

The following 6 SSSI's were within the screening distance of the site:

Site	Designation	Approx. distance from site (km)	Location	
			X	Y
Lammer Law	SSSI	5.87	352279	662582
Danskine Loch	SSSI	6.63	356459	667996
Keith Water	SSSI	7.35	345312	663799
Bangley Quarry	SSSI	7.86	348866	675015
Garleton Hills	SSSI	8.51	350665	675692
Papana Water	SSSI	8.74	358510	668615

Lammer Law – Blanket bog, juniper scrub, subalpine dry heath and upland assemblage

Danskine Loch – Fen woodland

Keith Water – Quarternary geology and geomorphology

Bangley Quarry – Mineralogy

Garleton Hills - Geology – Igneous petrology

Papana Water – Upland mixed ash woodland

Keith Water, Bangley Quarry and Garleton Hills SSSI's are designated solely for geological interest therefore no further assessment is required.

There were 18 residential receptors identified within 1 km of the site. There are no identified sensitive human health receptors identified within 250 m of the site. The closest of these was Howden Farm Lodge at 437m.

Receptor ID	OS Grid reference		Height (m)	Description
	X	Y		
Howden Farm Lodge	349980	667658	1.5	Residential
Howden Farmhouse	349905	667610	1.5	Residential
Howden Cottage 1	350009	667635	1.5	Residential
Muirwood	350118	667519	1.5	Residential
End Cottage	350061	667606	1.5	Residential
Middle Cottage	350071	667598	1.5	Residential
Struie Cottage	350085	667590	1.5	Residential
Bankrugg Cottage	350316	667407	1.5	Residential
Bankrugg House	350284	667432	1.5	Residential
Bankrugg	350322	667474	1.5	Residential
Howburn House	350269	667454	1.5	Residential
The Granary	350286	667472	1.5	Residential
The Storehouse	350271	667485	1.5	Residential
Newhall	350301	667502	1.5	Residential
The Old Dairy	350281	667510	1.5	Residential
Mountpleasant Cottage	350398	668371	1.5	Residential
Balfours House	350413	667611	1.5	Residential
Greenlaw Farm Cottage	349134	668090	1.5	Residential

When assessing the impacts of the proposed unit on sensitive receptors the AQIA uses a central point on the installation and the range area was not modelled explicitly. SEPA agreed a factor of 0.108 for the central point.

Officer: CO

5 Key Environmental Issues

5.1 Summary of significant environmental impacts

SEPA have identified a number of potential environmental impacts which need to be assessed. These are identified as follows:

Emissions to Air: Ammonia, dust (PM10) and odour.

Emissions to Land: Waste, faecal matter and nutrient inputs to land.

Emissions to Water: Surface water discharge to surface water and indirect to groundwater.

Other emissions: Noise

Associated risks: Fuel and chemical storage

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.

5.2 Emissions to Air

Point Source emission to air:

Ammonia released from livestock manures and slurries and the nitrogen deposition resulting from ammonia emissions, can negatively affect biodiversity. When atmospheric ammonia is emitted from agricultural sources, it can either be deposited directly (dry deposition) or transported within the atmosphere and be later deposited through rain or snow (wet deposition). At locations close to the source the predominant is for dry while wet is predominant further away.

Certain habitats and species are particularly susceptible. Bog and peatland habitats are made up of sensitive lichens and mosses which can be damaged even at low concentrations. The direct toxic effect

on vegetation can result in the loss of such sensitive species which can then cause changes in animal and insect species composition. Deposition can also lead to soil acidification and leaching of excess nitrogen into the ground and surface waters causing eutrophication. The main point source ammonia emission will come from the ventilation exhaust fans on each shed.

Ammonia from poultry housing can give rise to adverse impacts to sensitive habitats located downwind. Ammonia is emitted via ventilation outlets. The following measures relating to housing unit design will be adopted to prevent or minimise emissions to air:

- Walls and roofs are insulated, and concrete floors lined with an impermeable membrane (DPM)
- An automated system dispenses feed into feeders to minimise feed wastage through spillage.
- Non drip, low pressure nipple drinkers used to reduce wastage and maintain dry manure, thus reducing emissions of ammonia and odours
- Computer controlled automated exhaust fans to ensure the internal environment is kept stable and at optimum. Aside from flock requirements, automated control of ventilation and humidity also helps to keep manure dry.

Using the detailed modelling results presented in the air quality impact assessment, SEPA completed an appropriate assessment of likely significant effect at pre application stage for this proposal.

The cumulative results from the detailed modelling were as follows:

Table 7:7 Maximum Cumulative Modelled Process Contributions to the Annual Mean NH₃ Concentrations at Designated Habitat Sites

Designated site	CL (µg/m ³)	Site PC, µg/m ³	PC as % of CL	Background µg/m ³	PEC (µg/m ³)	PEC as % of CL
Lammer Law	1	0.05	4.97%	0.67	0.71	71.5%
Danskine Loch	1	0.09	8.87%	0.92	1.01	101%
Papana Water	3	0.07	2.17%	0.86	0.93	30.9%

Table 7:8 Maximum Cumulative Modelled Nutrient Nitrogen Deposition at Habitat Sites, Compared to minimum CLs

Designated site	Critical load	Site PC NH ₃ Dry deposition flux (kg.N.ha ⁻¹ .year ⁻¹)	Site PC NO _x Dry deposition flux (kg.N.ha ⁻¹ .year ⁻¹)	Total nitrogen Site PC Dry deposition flux (kg.N.ha ⁻¹ .year ⁻¹)	Site PC % of minimum Critical load	Background total N deposition (kg N/ha/year)	Site PEC Dry deposition flux (kg.N.ha ⁻¹ .year ⁻¹)	Site PEC % of minimum load
Lammer Law	5	0.258	1.05E-04	0.26	5.17%	11.1	11.3	227%
Danskine Loch	10	0.461	2.60E-04	0.46	4.61%	7.32	7.78	77.8%
Papana Water	10	0.339	2.14E-04	0.34	3.39%	7.74	8.08	80.8%

Table 7:9 Maximum Cumulative Modelled Acid Deposition at Habitat Sites, Compared to Acid Critical Load Functions

Designated site	CL Function (keq/ha/yr) Minimum CL _{max} N	Site Acidity PC (keq/ha/yr)	Site PC % of CLF	Site Acidity PEC (keq/ha/yr)	Site PEC % of CLF
Lammer Law	0.648	1.50E-05	0.0023%	0.830	128%
Danskine Loch	1.529	3.71E-05	0.0024%	0.567	37.1%
Papana Water	1.095	3.06E-05	0.0028%	0.597	54.5%

The modelling indicated levels which may lead to minor adverse effects and potential damage. These sites have been assessed previously under applications for East Lothian Eggs and Howden Eggs at that point it was assessed that there would be no likely significant effect. With the addition of Scott Eggs proposal the process contribution has increased and SEPA could not rule out a likely significant effect.

Following initial consultation response from Nature Scot highlighting that cumulative levels of NH₃ and N dep were above the critical level, discussions with the applicant resulted in agreement to remodel to include mitigation in the form of forced air drying on the two new proposed sheds at Scott Eggs. The update to the AQIA was received by SEPA on 10 January 2025. And the results were as follows:

Table A4: Maximum Modelled Annual Mean NH₃ Process Contributions (PC) at Select Designated Habitat Sites for the Cumulative Assessment

Designated Site	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$					
	CLe	All sites PC	PC as % of CLe	Background	PEC	PEC as % of CLe
Lammer Law SSSI	1	0.0466	4.7%	0.665	0.71	71%
Danskine Loch SSSI	1 to 3 ¹	0.0841	8.4%	0.919	1.00	100%
Papana Water SSSI	3	0.0619	2.1%	0.863	0.92	31%

Note 1. As APIS indicates bryophytes and lichens are integral to the habitats, a Critical Level (CLe) of 1 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ has been used.

Table A5: Maximum Modelled Nutrient Nitrogen Deposition Flux Process Contributions (PC) at Select Designated Habitat Sites for the Cumulative Assessment

Designated Site	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$					
	Critical Load (CLO)	All sites PC ^{1,2}	PC as % of CLO	Background	PEC	PEC as % of CLO
Lammer Law SSSI	5	0.24	4.9%	11.09	11.33	227%
Danskine Loch SSSI	10	0.44	4.4%	7.315	7.75	78%
Papana Water SSSI	10	0.32	3.2%	7.742	8.06	81%

Note 1. Assumes an ammonia grassland deposition value of 0.02 m/s. As used within the previous assessment.

Note 2. This includes the nitrogen deposition from NO₂ emissions associated with biomass boiler emissions. As presented in Table 7.8 of the previous report.

Table A6: Maximum Modelled Acid Deposition Flux Process Contributions (PC) at Select Designated Habitat Sites for the Cumulative Assessment

Designated Site	$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$					
	Critical Load (CLO) ³	All sites PC ^{1,2}	PC as % of CLO	Background	PEC	PEC as % of CLO
Lammer Law SSSI	0.581	0.017	3.0%	0.83	0.85	146%
Danskine Loch SSSI	1.529	0.031	2.0%	0.60	0.60	39%
Papana Water SSSI	1.095	0.023	2.1%	0.63	0.62	57%

Note 1. Assumes an ammonia grassland deposition value of 0.02 m/s. As used within the previous assessment.

Note 2. This includes the acid deposition from NO₂ emissions associated with biomass boiler emissions. As presented in Table 7.8 of the previous report.

Note 3. The lowest MinCLmaxN for each designated site taken from APIS. Updated since the previous assessment.

The updated results were run with “terrain off” and so presented the worst-case scenario. On a cumulative basis belt drying reduced ammonia and nitrogen deposition process contributions on the receptors in a range of 7-12%. Overall, the Process Contributions were low and exceedances of Critical Levels and Loads were mainly driven by the background which were not effected by the mitigation.

On the basis of the aforementioned reductions in Process Contribution SEPA consider the implementation of belt drying to be BAT for reducing emissions at source and are minded to issue a permit on that basis. NatureScot made no objection.

Fugitive emissions to air:

(BAT 1 & 11)

There are a number of potential fugitive emissions to air. These include the release of dust and ammonia during cleaning or opening of the poultry sheds for fallen stock removal and also from the birds

themselves. Whilst SEPA accepts that some fugitive releases are unavoidable e.g. unplanned releases due to an unforeseen incident: others such as poor cleaning out practices can be controlled through the relevant management techniques. SEPA views fugitive releases to air from these activities as an indication of process or maintenance issues and would require any defects to be reported and rectified as soon as possible.

Although not specifically covered by conditions within the permit, maintenance issues are covered by the PPC Regulations under Regulation 22 which requires the use of BAT. SEPA seeks to reduce these occurrences by requiring operators to record maintenance issues and demonstrate a high degree of environmental management over the activities they undertake.

Bioaerosols:

SEPA does not have any specific policies in relation to bioaerosols from IA processes, there are currently no health criteria values available for interpreting the results of bioaerosol monitoring. Routine monitoring would be required at receptors within 250m should appropriate criteria for assessment be identified.

Odour:**(BAT 1, 12 & 13)**

SEPA acknowledges that odour from intensive agriculture installations can give rise to complaints and requires operators to formulate and implement an Odour Management Plan to reduce the impact on the local environment.

SEPA has identified that the potential odour issues from the existing sheds and the proposed new shed are ammonia and general poultry smells, with secondary odours from the use of any chlorinated cleaning materials or disinfectants to clean the sheds.

BAT 1 requires the permit holder to produce an Odour Management plan having regard to BAT 12 detailing odour techniques and reduction of odour emissions in accordance with BAT 13.

An Odour Management Plan has been submitted with the application and will be implemented on site. The permit will require that offensive odours are not emitted beyond the site boundary.

5.3 Emissions to Water**Point Source Emissions to Surface Water and Sewer:**

There are no public sewers in the vicinity of the installation and therefore there will be no discharges to sewer.

A package treatment plant is proposed to treat domestic foul drainage from the packing house, tertiary treatment is proposed in the form of a reed bed system prior to discharge. This system should be authorised and regulated under The Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011. The foul effluent system is not considered part of the Permitted Installation. The onus is on the applicant to ensure that all drainage to the foul effluent system complies with regulatory requirements and does not cause environmental harm or impede the function of the system.

Surface water run-off from the existing and new poultry shed roofs, scratch areas and lightly contaminated yards will be directed to swales for which the relevant capacity calculations have demonstrated adequate storage for this purpose. Drainage will be conveyed to the swale by perforated pipes underlain with an impermeable membrane. The installation of a Sustainable Drainage System to treat surface and yard runoff via a swale adhere to the guidelines in the CREW SuDS Guide, considered BAT for IA permitted installations.

The Swale serving houses B & C has generally been designed in line with the CREW RURAL SUDS Practical Guide however width and depth exceed CREW Guidance. This is due to the requirement to attenuate drainage from the site for a 1 in 200 year storm event plus 45%. The swale will be completely lined with an impermeable geotextile liner. There should be no emission in relation to SUDS treatment and so the permit does not contain discharge conditions or limits.

SEPA asked for more detail on the washdown procedure and protection of the swale from contaminated washwater. The applicant states that penstocks will be used to divert contaminated water to underground tanks which will collect washwater during clean out. The concrete pads at the end of houses B&C will be surrounded by a raised kerb so that washwater will be contained and when the penstocks are closed, washwater will drain into the underground tank and be stored until it is transported off site and applied to land as organic fertiliser. The drainage drawing states that washout is to be done on days without rain to ensure that the capacity of the underground tank is sufficient. When washdown is complete the penstock will be opened directing lightly contaminated surface water from yard areas for treatment in the swale.

Should SEPA become aware of an issue with the SUDS, e.g. evidence that contaminated run off being discharged to the SUDS or discoloration of a nearby watercourse, action will be taken under condition 6.1.5 "Unless specified elsewhere in this authorisation, there must be no individual source emissions from the authorised place to the water environment, air or land."

The following condition will be added to the permit:

3.4.2-The outlet to the surface water drainage system from the collection tanks serving housing units B&C shown on the plan in Appendix 1 must be sealed prior to the commencement of litter removal and cleaning of housing units B & C to prevent any discharge of effluent to the swale.

Point Source Emissions to Groundwater:

There shall be no direct point source emissions to groundwater from any part of the permitted activities. The applicant has demonstrated the swale will be designed in line with SEPA advice and is sufficiently sized. If maintained properly, they will provide sufficient treatment of all lightly contaminated run off so that this is not considered to be a point source discharge to groundwater.

SEPA has assessed as satisfactory the Site & Baseline Report submitted with the application. (please see Section 5.9 of this Decision Document).

Fugitive Emissions to Water:

(BAT 1 & 6)

There are several potential sources which could lead to fugitive emissions to water, these include: poorly maintained surfaces and drainage systems, bird delivery and collection contaminating surface waters, lack of care during cleaning of the chicken 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 by requiring the permit holder to implement BAT and provide training to relevant staff in environmental issues and exercising a high degree of environmental management and continual maintenance of the activities they undertake.

The applicant will install SUDS to treat lightly contaminated drainage which shall be designed to be fit for purpose and meeting BAT.

An automated “mist” type wheel sprayer will be used to disinfect vehicle wheels when arriving at or leaving site. Areas of spraying must be at least 10m away from surface water drains and preparation of spray should be in a bunded area.

5.4 Noise

Noise (BAT 1, 9 & 10)

SEPA acknowledges that noise from intensive agriculture installations may give rise to complaints and requires operators to formulate and implement a Noise Management Plan to reduce the impact on the local environment. The predominant source of noise from poultry units is generated from the ventilation systems. Other sources of noise related to this type of activity can include vehicle movements in and around the site and the placement and removal of birds. The latter two are considered as being unlikely to cause issues as the activities will take place for such short durations as well as being infrequent. Regular maintenance of fans will prevent noise, and the Noise Management Plan will address any issues that should arise and will be regularly reviewed as stipulated by the permit.

Noise at the permitted installation is covered by Section 2.9 of the SFIR which is considered by SEPA to meet BAT Conclusions 9 & 10 which the operator is required to have regard to when operating an intensive agriculture site under the PPC Regulations.

A Noise Management Plan has been submitted with the application and will be implemented on site. Permit condition 2.8.1 requires that ‘emissions from the Permitted Installation shall be free from noise and vibration at levels likely to cause pollution, as perceived by an Authorised Person outside the site boundary.

5.5 Resource Utilisation

Water use

(BAT 5)

Water use within the food production sector is primarily an animal welfare issue as the operator of the installation is required under other legislation to provide an adequate supply of clean water for both the welfare of the birds and to undertake adequate cleaning of infrastructure. It is up to the operator to demonstrate the use of BAT to minimise water usage, but SEPA does directly regulate water use through permit conditions requiring the operator to minimise water consumption and explore options for minimisation. Water meters will be installed and consumption will be recorded and reported to SEPA in line with permit requirements.

The greatest volume of water consumed is drinking water for the birds. Fresh water will be delivered to poultry via low leak nipple drinkers.

Energy use and generation

Welfare of the birds largely dictates energy use, but the new shed will be built to BAT including insulation lighting and ventilation.

A computer-controlled system maintains the temperature within the housing units. Mains supply from the National Grid will be the primary source of energy. Solar panels are installed on the existing shed to support power generation.

A standby generator is provided and maintained for use in emergencies if grid supplied energy fails.

Raw Materials Selection and Use

Annual use of raw materials will be considered in the Resource Utilisation Assessment required under standard permit condition 8.2. The operator will be expected to assess the use of each raw material and identify any major changes, losses or areas where efficiencies can be made and report the assessment and resulting actions taken to SEPA every four years.

Chemicals:

Chemicals used in poultry rearing include cleaning and disinfection chemicals, pesticides, rodenticides, herbicides, insecticides and fungicides. All of these chemicals are required to be DEFRA-approved. The application site report states that all chemicals are stored securely on site in designated stores.

Agricultural Fuel Oil:

AFO (also known as red diesel) is stored within the bunded generator itself. The bunded generator will meet the requirements of the Water Environment (Miscellaneous) (Scotland) Regulations 2017. There will be no other fuel storage on site.

Water:

Water is wholly from mains supply. (Scottish Water). Water is used to supply drinking water to the birds.

Feed (BAT 3 & 4):

Feed will be supplied to the site, premixed, into four fully enclosed silos fitted with particle containment and mitigation. Feed will be then transported into the feed systems within the units by augers. No feed mixing or milling is done at site and feed specification is prepared by a nutrition specialist and supplied by UFAS accredited mills so that only approved ingredients are used. This will ensure that the correct feed is given in regard to the weight and age of hens. A record of all feedstuffs used, including manufacturer/miller, ingredients and quantity purchased will be kept by the operator.

Bedding:

Clean wood shavings will be used on the floor of the poultry houses as bedding material for livestock at the start of each flock. Bedding material will not be stored on site and will only be delivered to site for use as required

All applicants applying for PPC Part A permits are required to examine their Raw Material usage and seek ways to reduce their impact on the environment. The standard permit condition requiring the formal assessment of resource utilisation on site will allow the operator to identify where any efficiencies can be made and demonstrate continuing improvement.

5.6 Waste Management and Handling**Waste Minimisation**

As a commercial operation, SEPA believes it is in the interest of both the company and the environment to minimise waste on the site, as a result SEPA encourages all IA PPC sites to examine their Raw Materials usage and seek ways to reduce their impact on the environment. Standard permit conditions require the operator to minimise waste and where possible develop and implement recycling or recovery strategies. Records will be kept on site of all waste streams and the source, quantity and disposal routes taken. This data will be reviewed every 4 years in the resource efficiency report required in the permit.

Waste Handling

The types of wastes generated on site shall not differ from those produced in the existing Free Range Egg business prior to it falling under PPC regulation. However, the additional bird places will see a corresponding increase in both bird mortalities and generation of manure.

Manure will be collected and removed by conventional manure belts, with ambient air drying in the existing sheds and with forced air drying on the belts in the proposed shed (as detailed in the Air Quality impact assessment supplied with this application), to covered trailers. It will then be transported off the permitted installation to neighbouring farms. Once outside the site boundary General Binding Rule 18 of the Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 (as amended) will regulate the materials storage and application as an organic fertilizer.

Applicant: Scott Eggs Limited

Permit/Application number: PPC/A/5011881

Dead stock will be removed daily to a secure, vermin proof freezer in the pack room area and transferred offsite by a licensed contractor to be disposed of in accordance with the Animal By-Products (Enforcement) (Scotland) Regulations 2013.

The volume of other wastes stored on the site is minimal and 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.

Waste Recovery or Disposal

As a commercial operation, SEPA believes it is in the interest of both the company and the environment to minimise waste on the site, as a result SEPA encourages all IA PPC sites to examine their Raw Materials usage and seek ways to reduce their impact on the environment. The permit has conditions requiring the operator to minimise waste and where possible develop and implement recycling or recovery strategies. Records will be kept on site of all waste streams and the source, quantity and disposal routes taken. This data will be reviewed every four years in the resource efficiency report required in the permit.

5.7 Management of the site

Environmental Management System

BAT 1 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
- Odour management plan
- Noise management plan

BAT 2 requires good housekeeping to prevent or reduce the environmental impact and improve overall performance. This includes training, routine maintenance and an emergency plan.

The applicant has indicated that the installation will be operated in full compliance with Section 2.1 of the SFIR's.

Accidents and their Consequences

(BAT1)

The Pollution Prevention and Control (Scotland) Regulations 2012 specifically preclude SEPA from adding conditions to a Permit regarding the Health and Safety of staff or workers on-site; however should an accident or incident occur that is likely to pose a risk to the environment or harm to human health in the wider community then SEPA would require, under the conditions of the permit, that not only must the operator take action to limit the immediate environmental impact, but where necessary implement changes to try to ensure that the event doesn't happen again.

In general, all accidents or incidents likely to cause pollution and all complaints to the site regarding nuisance emissions are required by the Permit to be recorded and dependent on the severity, notified to SEPA. Emergency preparedness and response (incident prevention and mitigation) are required as per BAT 1 as part of the Environmental Management System for the site.

Closure

Standard conditions in the permit will be appropriate for this installation including the production of a Decommissioning Plan. The operator has agreed to meet Section 2.15 of the SFIR for Decommissioning.

The location for the new building is on a greenfield site. The applicant has provided Site and Baseline reports for the proposed extension to the poultry operations.

Surrender of the permit is by an application to SEPA who have to be satisfied that the requirements of Regulation 19 of the PPC Scotland Regulations 2012 (as amended) are complied with.

As per the PPC Regulations the Applicant shall need to remediate the site where required to the levels cited in the baseline report.

See comments in section 5.8 below on baseline report.

5.8 Site Condition report

The applicant has provided a comprehensive Site Condition Report (SCR) and Baseline Report. The SCR identifies all substances held on site and information about the Relevant Hazardous Substances (RHS) contained within each, as well as details of how it is used and stored and the likelihood of release.

4 small diameter hydraulic percussive borehole were sunk in various locations around the site and 10 soil samples. It was only possible to retrieve a sample of ground water from BH01. As the GW flow is anticipated to be to the N/NE this location would be "downstream" of the site.

Results from soil analysis all appear to be low and there was no presence of asbestos containing material identified. The results from BH01 presented are all within acceptable limits.

Table 9 - Summary of soils results

Determinand	Assessment Criteria	No of samples	Max sample concentration	Assessment Criteria	No of samples	Max sample concentration
		Made ground			Natural soil (incl. Topsoil)	
Arsenic ¹	640	2	<10	640	8	<10
Lead ¹	2300	2	19.0	2300	8	26.0
Nickel ¹	980	2	19.0	980	8	32.0
Cadmium ¹	190	2	0.7	190	8	0.9
Inorganic mercury ¹	1100	2	<2.5	1100	8	<2.5
Chromium (III) ¹	8600	2	9.4	8600	8	11
Chromium (VI) ¹	33	2	<1.0	33	8	<1.0
Selenium ¹	12000	2	<8.0	12000	8	<8.0
Boron ¹	240,000	2	<2.5	240,000	8	<2.5
Copper ¹	68,000	2	8.8	68,000	8	16.0
Zinc ¹	730,000	2	41.0	730,00	8	56.0
Total cyanide	-	2	<1.0	-	8	<1.0
Free cyanide	-	2	<1.0	-	8	<1.0
Phenol ¹	760	2	<1.0	1500	8	<1.0
pH	-	2	7.5 – 7.7	-	8	6.9 – 8.1
OM (%)	-	2	<0.9 – 1.8	-	8	<0.9 – 2.7
Sulphate (mg/l)	-	2	84	-	8	17

Table 10 – Summary of leachate results

Determinant	Maximum sample concentration (µg/l)	Minimum sample concentration (µg/l)
pH	8.4	8.2
Alkalinity (mg/l)	23	5
Arsenic	<0.5	-
Lead	<3.5	-
Nickel	<7.5	-
Cadmium	<0.25	-
Mercury	<0.05	-
Chromium (Total)	1.3	<0.5
Chromium (III)	<5.0	-
Chromium (VI)	<5.0	-
Sulphate (mg/l)	<10	-
Boron	36	25
Copper	<2.5	-
Zinc	<25	-
Selenium	<0.5	-
Cyanide (total)	<5.0	-

Table 11 – Summary of groundwater results

Determinant	Sample concentration (µg/l)
pH	7.9
COD (mg/l)	54
BOD (mg/l)	2.1
Ammoniacal nitrogen (as NH ₃)	45
Phosphorous (total)	<20.0
Total Chlorine (mg/l)	<0.05
Arsenic	0.55
Lead	<0.2
Nickel	1.8
Cadmium	0.03
Mercury	<0.05
Chromium	0.3
Chromium (VI)	<5.0
Chromium (III)	<5.0
Vanadium	0.3
Boron	81

Table 11 – Summary of groundwater results (cont.)

Determinant	Sample concentration (µg/l)
Copper	11
Zinc	5.2
Selenium	2.5
Cyanide (Free)	<1.0
Phenols	<0.5

The site report states that there are no private water supplies within 1km of the proposed development.

Given the low level of risk posed by the installation SEPA agree with the conclusions of the report and have imposed the minimum frequency of soil and ground water monitoring of 10 and 5 years respectively

5.9 Monitoring

Air

SEPA places a lot of emphasis on self-monitoring and record keeping to assess operational conditions and environmental performance.

Various permit conditions require the operator to monitor the level of inputs and the volume of outputs and to consider how changes made benefit the environment these conditions will remain in place following the variation. The 2017 BREF introduces the following additional monitoring requirements:

1. The total nitrogen and total phosphorus excreted in manure
2. Ammonia emissions to air

Applicant: Scott Eggs Limited

Permit/Application number: PPC/A/5011881

3. Dust emissions
4. Process parameters

The European Commission during deliberations around the revised BREF, accepted the proposal from the UK Technical Working Group to estimate emissions by using DEFRA approved emission factors to comply with the monitoring requirements for 1-3 identified above.

Water

No surface water monitoring required. There shall be no direct point source emissions to surface water from any part of the permitted activities. The applicant has demonstrated the swale is designed in line with SEPA advice and are sufficiently sized. If maintained properly, they will provide sufficient treatment of all lightly contaminated run off so that this is not considered to be a point source discharge to surface water.

Soil and Groundwater

There shall be no direct point source emissions to soil or groundwater from any part of the permitted activities. Fuel storage (emergency generator) will be appropriately bunded inspected and maintained.

The applicant has demonstrated the SUDs is designed in line with SEPA advice and is sufficiently sized. If maintained properly, it will provide sufficient treatment of all lightly contaminated run off so that this is not considered to be a point source discharge to soil or groundwater.

Wash water will be collected and contained (if required) in sealed tanks at each wash out cycle.

Routine Soil (every 10 years) and Groundwater (every 5 years) is required by the permit. Any issues highlighted as a result of this routine monitoring would generate further investigation or mitigation.

Waste

As a commercial operation, SEPA believes it is in the interest of both the company and the environment to minimise waste on the site, as a result SEPA encourages all IA PPC sites to examine their Raw Materials usage and seek ways to reduce their impact on the environment. Standard permit conditions require the operator to minimise waste and where possible develop and implement recycling or recovery strategies. Records will be kept on site of all waste streams and the source, quantity and disposal routes taken. This data will be reviewed every 4 years in the resource efficiency report required in the permit.

5.10 Consideration of BAT and compliance with BAT-Cs if appropriate

SEPA published its view of "indicative" BAT relating to intensive agricultural operations in its Standard Farming Rules (SFIR). SFIR's are based on the BAT Reference Document (BREF) for Intensive Agriculture Installations published by the European IPPC Bureau in 2017. These SFIR's have been used throughout this permit to benchmark farming activities. The permit application indicates that the installation will be operated in accordance with Best Available Techniques.

6 Other Legislation Considered

Nature Conservation (Scotland) Act 2004 & Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994

Is there any possibility that the proposal will have any impact on site designated under the above legislation?

Yes

If yes, provide information on the action and justification below:

Screening distance(s) used

10 km

Significant work was undertaken at planning/pre application stage on the AQIA prepared in support of this proposal. These sites have been assessed previously under applications for East Lothian Eggs and Howden Eggs. The results of the AQIA now include the results of all poultry operations at Howden Farm and no additional in combination emissions have been identified.

The modelling indicated levels which may lead to minor adverse effects and potential damage. These sites have been assessed previously under applications for East Lothian Eggs and Howden Eggs at that point it was assessed that there would be no likely significant effect. With the addition of Scott Eggs proposal the process contribution increased and SEPA could not rule out a likely significant effect. The modelling report did not consider any mitigation scenarios.

Following initial pre application consultation response from Nature Scot highlighting that cumulative levels of NH₃ and N dep were above the critical level, discussions with the applicant resulted in agreement to remodel to include mitigation in the form of forced air drying on the two new proposed sheds at Scott Eggs. The update to the AQIA was received by SEPA on 10 January 2025.

SEPA assessed that the application of belt drying reduced the PC at the 3 receptors at Papana Water SSSI, Danskine Loch SSSI and Lammer Law SSSI in the range of 7-12% and on that basis SEPA considered this to be BAT for reducing emissions at source and were minded to issue a permit on that basis. The mitigation did not seem to have any effect on PEC so we could assume that the impact at the receptors is mainly background levels.

Nature Scot confirmed on 04 February 2025 by email that they had no other information to add that would affect SEPA's decision to permit.

Following the permit application SEPA received the following statutory consultation response from Nature Scot on 21/11/2025:

There are natural heritage interests of national importance within 10km of this site. Advice in relation to this and other aspects of the application is provided below.

With regard to ammonia emissions we note additional mitigations have reduced the PC of the proposal to give an overall cumulative concentration that does not exceed the critical limit at Danskine Loch SSSI.

The background total N deposition (kgN/ha/yr) figures given in Table 7.8 of the provided 'Air Quality and Odour Impact Assessment Report No.: 445586-01' seem to differ from that given on APIS.ac.uk. Our understanding is that the appropriate background kgN/ha/yr figures should be; Danskine Loch SSSI (Fen woodland feature) 17.1, Papana Water SSSI (Upland mixed ash woodland feature) 16.8 and Lammer Law SSSI (Blanket bog feature) 10.7. Table A5 of the same document does not use the standard units of kgN/ha/yr.

Lammer Law SSSI currently exceeds the critical load of nitrogen deposition by over 200%. The habitats on Lammer Law SSSI are particularly sensitive to N deposition. Bog habitats, such as those found at Lammer Law SSSI, are adapted to nutrient poor environments. Excess nitrogen favours nitrogen tolerant vascular plants, out competing mosses, leading to a reduction in overall biodiversity and detrimental impacts in the functioning of the blanket bog habitat. It is not possible from the information provided to understand what impact the proposal will have on the protected areas within 10kms of the development with regard to N deposition.

A further meeting was held with Nature Scot on the 10th of December 2025 to discuss the AQIA. Following the meeting SEPA provided the following clarification:

Further to our meeting on 10 December 2025 there was an action on us to clarify background levels and the units used in the contribution tables.

- We agree that the background figures quoted in the report are incorrect and that the background Nature Scot highlighted should be used (Danskin Loch SSSI (Fen woodland feature) 17.1, Papana Water SSSI (Upland mixed ash woodland feature) 16.8 and Lammer Law SSSI (Blanket bog feature) 10.7.). Therefore, when interpreting the report, the PEC results should be re-calculated with the revised background.*
- With regards to the units used, our modellers agree that it appears to be a typo and that the results in the table are confirmed as kg N/ha/yr.*
- Crucially, the modelled PC's are accurate for the existing and proposed installation.*
- From our discussions we confirmed that any future proposals in the 10 km vicinity of Danskin Loch, Papana water and Lammer Law should not result in an increase above background.*
- Our original assessment on the proposal at pre application stage was that the application of belt drying on the new proposed sheds reduced the PC at the 3 receptors at Papana Water SSSI, Danskin Loch SSSI and Lammer Law SSSI in the range of 7-12% and on that basis SEPA consider it to be BAT for reducing emissions at source and were minded to issue a permit on that basis. The mitigation did not seem to have any effect on PEC so we can assume that the impact at the receptors is mainly background levels.*

Given this updated information, does Nature Scot have any objection to our original assessment of the proposal by Scott Eggs Ltd?

Nature Scot confirmed by email on 17/12/2025 that they did not object to the original assessment of the proposal by Scott Eggs Ltd.

Is there any other legislation that was considered during determination of the permit (for example installations that may be impacted by the requirements of legislation involving Animal By Products, Food Standards, Waste, WEEE regulations etc).

Yes

If yes, provide information on the legislation, action and justification below:

Action Programme for Nitrate Vulnerable Zones (Scotland) Regulations 2008:

The applicant demonstrated that the size of the ranging area is sufficient that deposition is in accordance with the limit of 170 kg N/hectare.

The Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 (CAR) (as amended):

This primarily applies to land spreading activities that will be taking place out with the site boundary and will be regulated under GBR18.

Foul drainage systems will be regulated separately under CAR and will not form part of the permitted installation.

The Water Environment (Miscellaneous) (Scotland) Regulations 2017:

The requirements for the generator oil storage under these Regulations are met. There are no conflicts with ongoing CAR regulation of this process.

Applicant: Scott Eggs Limited

Permit/Application number: PPC/A/5011881

Animal By-Products (Enforcement) (Scotland) Regulations 2013:

Regulates carcass disposal. Carcass storage is a Directly Associated Activity (DAA) in the permit.

The Environmental Authorisations (Scotland) Regulations 2018 (EASR):

From 1st November 2025, water, waste management, and industrial activities are regulated under Environmental Authorisation (Scotland) Regulations 2018. As this application was made prior to this date, it has been determined under the previous regulations

Officer CO

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

Officer: CO

8 Details of the 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?

No

Officer: CO

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?

No

Officer: CO

10 Peer Review

Has the determination and draft permit been Peer Reviewed?

Yes

Comments made:

Request addition in DD02 of detail around surface water protection and sealing of drains.

Officer: Peer Reviewer

11 Final Determination

Issue of a Permit - Based on the information available at the time

Issue a Permit – 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/mobile plant,
- The applicant will ensure that the installation/mobile plant is operated so as to comply with the conditions of the Permit,
- The applicant is a fit and proper person (specified waste management activities only),
- Planning permission for the activity is in force (specified waste management activities only),
- 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.