A Dispersion Modelling Study of the Impact of Odour from the Broiler Chicken Rearing Houses on Star Carr Lane, near Wrawby in Lincolnshire

AS Modelling & Data Ltd.
www.asmodata.co.uk

Prepared by Steve Smith

stevesmith@asmodata.co.uk
07523 993370
23rd October 2025

Reviewed by Sally Young

sally@asmodata.co.uk
07483 345124
28th October 2025

1. Introduction

AS Modelling & Data Ltd. has been instructed by Mr. James Whilding of Acorus Rural Property Services Ltd., on behalf of AREIL, to use computer modelling to assess the impact of odour emissions from the the existing and proposed poultry houses on Land near Star Carr Lane, Wrawby, Brigg, Lincolnshire. DN20 8SG.

Odour emission rates have been assessed and quantified based upon an emissions model that takes into account the likely internal odour concentrations and ventilation rates. The emission rates so obtained have then been used as inputs to an atmospheric dispersion model which calculates odour exposure levels in the surrounding area.

This report is arranged in the following manner:

- Section 2 provides relevant details of the site and potentially sensitive receptors in the area.
- Section 3 provides some general information on odour, details of the method used to estimate odour emissions from the poultry houses, relevant guidelines and legislation on exposure limits and where relevant, details of likely background levels of odour.
- Section 4 provides some information about ADMS, the dispersion model used for this study and details the modelling parameters and procedures.
- Section 5 contains the results of the modelling.
- Section 6 provides a discussion of the results and conclusions.

2. Background Details

The site of the existing and proposed broiler rearing houses is in an isolated rural area, approximately 950 m to the north of the market town of Brigg in Lincolnshire. Outwith towns and villages, the surrounding land is used almost exclusively for arable farming. The site is at an altitude of around 4 m on level drained fenland, with the land rising towards higher ground to the south, west and east.

It is understood that the existing poultry houses on Star Carr Lane are used to provide accommodation for up to 400,000 broiler chickens. The poultry houses are ventilated by cowled side mounted fans and gable end wall mounted fans. For modelling purposes, it is assumed that, similarly to current industry standard practices, the chickens are reared from day old chicks for a period of around 38 days and houses would be empty for around 10 days at the end of each crop.

It is proposed that six new poultry houses be constructed on land to the south-west of the existing poultry unit. The new houses would be ventilated primarily by uncapped high-speed ridge/roof mounted fans, each with a small chimney, with gable end fans for supplementary ventilation during periods of warmer weather only. Under the proposal the existing and proposed houses would accommodate up to 571,000 broiler chickens under a new stocking density of 30 kg/m^2. The chickens would be reared from day old chicks for a period of around 42 days and houses would be empty for around 10 days at the end of each crop.

There are some residences and commercial/industrial properties in the area around the poultry unit. The closest residences, not including dwelling associated with the poultry unit, are on Star Carr Lane approximately 430 m to the east-south-east of the existing poultry houses. There are several other residential and commercial properties and isolated farmsteads further afield.

A map of the surrounding area is provided in Figure 1, where the positions of the existing and proposed poultry units are outlined in blue.

Figure 1. The area surrounding the existing and proposed poultry units



3. Odour, Emission Rates, Exposure Limits & Background Levels

3.1 Odour concentration, averaging times, percentiles and FIDOR

Odour concentration is expressed in terms of European Odour Units per metre cubed of air (ou_E/m^3). The following definitions and descriptions of how an odour might be perceived by a human with an average sense of smell may be useful, however, it should be noted that within a human population there is considerable variation in acuity of sense of smell.

- 1.0 ou_E/m^3 is defined as the limit of detection in laboratory conditions.

- At 2.0 - 3.0 ou_E/m^3, a particular odour might be detected against background odours in an open environment.

- When the concentration reaches around 5.0 ou_E/m^3, a particular odour will usually be recognisable, if known, but would usually be described as faint.

- At 10.0 ou_E/m^3, most would describe the intensity of the odour as moderate or strong and if persistent, it is likely that the odour would become intrusive.

The character, or hedonic tone, of an odour is also important; typically, odours are grouped into three categories.

Most offensive:
- Processes involving decaying animal or fish remains.
- Processes involving septic effluent or sludge.
- Biological landfill odours.

Moderately offensive:
- Intensive livestock rearing.
- Fat frying (food processing).
- Sugar beet processing.
- Well aerated green waste composting.

Less offensive:
- Brewery.
- Confectionery.
- Coffee roasting.
- Bakery.

Dispersion models usually calculate hourly mean odour concentrations and Environment Agency guidelines and findings from UK Water Industry Research (UKWIR) are also framed in terms of hourly mean odour concentration.

The Environment Agency guidelines and findings from UKWIR use the 98th percentile hourly mean; this is the hourly mean odour concentration that is equalled or exceeded for 2% of the time period considered, which is typically one year. The use of the 98th percentile statistic allows for some consideration of both frequency and intensity of the odours.

At some distance from a source, it would be unusual if odour concentration remained constant for an hour and in reality, due to air turbulence and changes in wind direction, short term fluctuations in concentration are observed. Therefore, although average exposure levels may be below the detection threshold, or a particular guideline, a population may be exposed to short term concentrations which are higher than the hourly average. It should be noted that a fluctuating odour is often more noticeable than a steady background odour at a low concentration. It is implicit that within the model's hourly averaging time and the Environment Agency guidelines and findings from UKWIR that there would be variation in the odour concentration around this mean, i.e. there would be short periods when odour concentration would be higher than the mean and lower than the mean.

The FIDOR acronym is a useful reminder of the factors that will determine the degree of odour pollution:

- **F**requency of detection.
- **I**ntensity as perceived.
- **D**uration of exposure.
- **O**ffensiveness.
- **R**eceptor sensitivity.

3.2 Environment Agency guidelines

In April 2011, the Environment Agency published H4 Odour Management guidance (H4). In Appendix 3 - Modelling Odour Exposure, benchmark exposure levels are provided. The benchmarks are based on the 98th percentile of hourly mean concentrations of odour modelled over a year at the site/installation boundary. The benchmarks are:

- 1.5 ou_E/m^3 for most offensive odours.
- 3.0 ou_E/m^3 for moderately offensive odours.
- 6.0 ou_E/m^3 for less offensive odours.

Any modelled results that project exposures above these benchmark levels, after taking uncertainty into account, indicates the likelihood of unacceptable odour pollution.

3.3 UK Water Industry Research findings

The main source of research into odour impacts in the UK has been the wastewater industry. An in-depth study of the correlation between modelled odour impacts and human response was published by UKWIR in 2001. This was based on a review of the correlation between reported odour complaints and modelled odour impacts in relation to nine wastewater treatment works in the UK with on-going odour complaints. The findings of this research and subsequent UKWIR research indicated the following, based on the modelled 98^{th} percentile of hourly mean concentrations of odour:

- At below 5.0 ou_E/m^3, complaints are relatively rare at only 3% of the total registered.
- At between 5.0 ou_E/m^3 and 10.0 ou_E/m^3, a significant proportion of total registered complaints occur, 38% of the total.
- The majority of complaints occur in areas of modelled exposures of greater than 10.0 ou_E/m^3, 59% of the total.

3.4 Choice of odour benchmarks for this study

Odours from poultry rearing are usually placed in the moderately offensive category. Therefore, for this study, the Environment Agency's benchmark for moderately offensive odours, a 98^{th} percentile hourly mean of 3.0 ou_E/m^3 over a one year period, is used to assess the impact of odour emissions from the poultry unit at potentially sensitive receptors in the surrounding area.

3.5 Quantification of odour emissions

Odour emission rates from broiler housing depend on many factors and are highly variable. At the beginning of a crop cycle, when chicks are small, litter is clean and only minimum ventilation is required, the odour emission rate may be relatively small. Towards the end of the crop, odour production within the poultry housing increases rapidly and ventilation requirements are greater, particularly in hot weather, therefore emission rates are considerably greater than at the beginning of the crop.

The main source of odour from the existing housing is from the wall mounted/gable end fans. The main source of odour from the proposed housing would be from the high-speed roof mounted fans and also occasionally from the gable end fans, which would provide additional ventilation during warm/hot weather.

Peak odour emission rates are likely to occur when the housing is cleared of spent litter at the end of each crop. There is little available information on the magnitude of this peak emission, but it is likely to be greater than any emission that might occur when there are birds in the house. The time taken to perform the operation is usually around two hours per shed and it is normal to maintain ventilation during this time. There are measures that can be taken to minimise odour production whilst the housing is being cleared of spent litter and there may be some discretion as to when the operation is carried out; therefore, to avoid high odour levels at nearby sensitive receptors, it may be possible to time the operation to coincide with winds blowing in a favourable direction.

To calculate an odour emission rate, it is necessary to know the internal odour concentration and ventilation rate of the poultry house. For the calculation, the internal concentration is assumed to be a function of the age of the crop and the stocking density.

The internal concentrations used in the calculations increase exponentially from 300 ou_E/m^3 at day 1 of the crop, to approximately 700 ou_E/m^3 at day 16 of the crop, to approximately 1,800 ou_E/m^3 at day 30 of the crop and approximately 2,300 ou_E/m^3 at day 34 of the crop. These figures are based primarily on Robertson *et al.* (2002); however, other available literature and olfactometric measurements[1] available to AS Modelling & Data Ltd. are also considered.

1. The reports on the olfactometric measurements are not used explicitly in the formulation of the emissions model, but can be made available to regulators for inspection upon request.

The target internal temperature is 33 Celsius at the beginning of the crop and is decreased to 22 Celsius by day 34 of the crop. If the external temperature is 7 Celsius, or more, lower than the target temperature, minimum ventilation only is assumed for the calculation. Above this, ventilation rates are increased in proportion to the difference between ambient temperature and target internal temperature. A maximum transitional ventilation rate (35% of the maximum possible ventilation rate) is reached when the ambient temperature is equal to the target temperature. A high ventilation rate (70% maximum possible ventilation rate) is reached when the temperature is 4 degrees above target and if external temperature is above 33 Celsius the maximum ventilation rate is assumed.

At high ventilation rates, it is likely that internal odour concentrations fall because odour is extracted much faster than it is created. Therefore, if the calculated ventilation rate exceeds that required to replace the volume of air in the house every 5 minutes, internal concentrations are reduced (by a factor of the square root of 7.5 times the house volume divided by the ventilation rate as an hourly figure). Based upon these principles, an emission rate for each hour of the period modelled is calculated by multiplying the concentration by the ventilation rate. Both the crop length and period the housing is empty can be varied. An estimation of the emission during the cleaning out process can also be included. In this case, it is assumed that the houses are cleared sequentially and each house takes 2 hours to clear.

For the existing scenario, it is assumed for the calculations that the crop length is 38 days and that there is an empty period of 10 days after each crop. To provide robust statistics, three sets of calculations were performed, with the first day of the meteorological record coinciding with day 1 of the crop cycle, the second coinciding with day 16 of the crop and the third coinciding with day 32 of the crop cycle.

For the proposed scenario, it is assumed for the calculations that the crop length is 42 days and that there is an empty period of 10 days after each crop. To provide robust statistics, three sets of calculations were performed, with the first day of the meteorological record coinciding with day 1 of the crop cycle, the second coinciding with day 17 of the crop and the third coinciding with day 34 of the crop cycle.

As examples, the odour emission rates over 2021 for each of the three crop cycles for one of the existing houses ventilated by wall mounted/gable end fans as currently stocked and one of the proposed poultry houses ventilated by high-speed ridge mounted fans are shown in Figures 2a (baseline scenario) and 2b (proposed scenario).

Figure 2a. Emission rates in 2021 for each of the three crop cycles - Existing House 1, 40,000 birds (as currently stocked in baseline scenario)



Figure 2b. Emission rates in 2021 for each of the three crop cycles - Proposed House 1, 44,000 birds stocked (proposed scenario)



4. The Atmospheric Dispersion Modelling System (ADMS) and Model Parameters

The Atmospheric Dispersion Modelling System (ADMS) ADMS 6 is a new generation Gaussian plume air dispersion model, which means that the atmospheric boundary layer properties are characterised by two parameters; the boundary layer depth and the Monin-Obukhov length rather than in terms of the single parameter Pasquill-Gifford class.

Dispersion under convective meteorological conditions uses a skewed Gaussian concentration distribution (shown by validation studies to be a better representation than a symmetrical Gaussian expression).

ADMS has a number of model options that include: dry and wet deposition; NO_x chemistry; impacts of hills, variable roughness, buildings and coastlines; puffs; fluctuations; odours; radioactivity decay (and γ-ray dose); condensed plume visibility; time varying sources and inclusion of background concentrations.

ADMS has an in-built meteorological pre-processor that allows flexible input of meteorological data both standard and more specialist. Hourly sequential and statistical data can be processed and all input and output meteorological variables are written to a file after processing.

The user defines the pollutant, the averaging time (which may be an annual average or a shorter period), which percentiles and exceedance values to calculate, whether a rolling average is required or not and the output units. The output options are designed to be flexible to cater for the variety of air quality limits, which can vary from country to country and are subject to revision.

4.1 Meteorological data

Computer modelling of dispersion requires hourly sequential meteorological data and to provide robust statistics the record should be of a suitable length; preferably four years or longer.

The meteorological data used in this study is obtained from assimilation and short-term forecast fields of the Numerical Weather Prediction (NWP) system known as the Global Forecast System (GFS)[1].

The GFS is a discrete model. The physics/dynamics model has a resolution or had a resolution of approximately 7 km over the central UK; terrain is understood to be resolved at a resolution of approximately 2 km, with sub-7 km terrain effects parameterised. Site specific data may be extrapolated from nearby archive grid points or a most representative grid point chosen. The GFS resolution adequately captures major topographical features and the broad-scale characteristics of the weather over the UK. Smaller scale topological features may be included in the dispersion modelling by using the flow field module of ADMS (FLOWSTAR[2]). The use of NWP data has advantages over traditional meteorological records because:

- Calm periods in traditional observational records may be overrepresented, this is because the instrumentation used may not record wind speeds below approximately 0.5 m/s and start up wind speeds may be greater than 1.0 m/s. In NWP data, the wind speed is continuous down to 0.0 m/s, allowing the calms module of ADMS to function correctly.

- Traditional records may include very local deviations from the broad-scale wind flow that would not necessarily be representative of the site being modelled; these deviations are difficult to identify and remove from a meteorological record. Conversely, local effects at the site being modelled are relatively easy to impose on the broad-scale flow and provided horizontal resolution is not too great, the meteorological records from NWP data may be expected to represent well the broad-scale flow.

- Information on the state of the atmosphere above ground level which would otherwise be estimated by the meteorological pre-processor may be included explicitly.

A wind rose showing the distribution of wind speeds and directions in the GFS derived data is shown in Figure 3a. Wind speeds are modified by the treatment of roughness lengths (see Section 4.7) and where terrain data is included in the modelling, the raw GFS wind speeds and directions will be modified. The terrain and roughness length modified wind rose for the site is shown in Figure 3b. Please note that FLOWSTAR[2] is used to obtain a local flow field, not to explicitly model dispersion in complex terrain as defined in the ADMS User Guide; therefore, the ADMS default value for minimum turbulence length has been amended [3].

1. The GFS data used is derived from the high-resolution operational GFS datasets, the data is not obtained from the lower resolution (0.5 degree) long-term archive.
2. Note that FLOWSTAR requirements are for meteorological data representative of the upwind flow over the modelling domain and that single site meteorological data (observational or from high resolution modelled data) that is representative of the application site is not generally suitable (personal correspondence: CERC 2019 and UK Met O 2015). If data are deemed representative of a particular application site, either wholly or partially, then these data cannot also be representative of the upstream flow over the modelling domain. Furthermore, it would be extremely poor practice to use such data as the boundary conditions for a flow-solver, such as FLOWSTAR.

3. When modelling complex terrain with ADMS, by default, the minimum turbulence length has 0.1 m added to the flat terrain value (calculated from the Monin-Obukhov length). Whilst this might be appropriate over hill/mountain tops in terrain with slopes > 1:10 (and quite possibly only in certain wind directions) in lesser terrain it introduces model behaviour that is not desirable where FLOWSTAR is simply being used to modify the upwind flow. Specifically, the parameter sigma z of the Gaussian plume model is overly constrained, which for elevated point sources emissions, may on occasion cause over prediction of ground level concentrations in stable weather conditions and light winds (Steven R. Hanna & Biswanath Chowdhury, 2013), conversely for low level emission sources, this will cause gross under prediction. Note that this becomes particularly important overnight and if calm and light wind conditions are not being ignored, as they often are when using traditional observational meteorological datasets. To reduce this behaviour, where terrain is modelled, AS Modelling & Data Ltd. have set a minimum turbulence length of 0.025 m in ADMS. This approximates the normal behaviour of ADMS with flat terrain.

Figure 3a. The wind rose. Raw GFS derived data for 53.573 N, 0.482 W, 2021-2024



Figure 3b. The wind rose. FLOWSTAR modified GFS derived data for NGR 500500, 409550, 2021-2024



4.2 Emission sources

Emissions from the side/gable end fans that are used for the ventilation of the existing poultry houses are characterised by a single volume source within ADMS (EX_SIDE).

Details of the existing volume source parameters are shown in Table 1a.

Table 1a. Volume source parameters – baseline scenario

Source ID	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Base height (m)	Emission temperature (°C)	Emission rate (ou_E/s)
EX_SIDE	128	210	3.0	0.0	Ambient	Variable [1]

1. Dependent on ambient temperature and crop stage.

Emissions from the chimneys of the uncapped high-speed ridge/roof fans that would be used for the primary ventilation of the proposed poultry houses are characterised by three point sources per house within ADMS (H1 to H6; 1, 2 & 3). Emissions from the gable end fans that would be used to supplement the primary ventilation have been represented by a single volume source within ADMS (H1TO6_GAB).

The emissions from the gable end fans are assumed to be zero unless the ventilation requirement within the poultry houses exceeds the capacity of the ridge fans. As a precautionary measure, it is assumed this occurs whenever the ambient temperature exceeds 23 Celsius and the proportion of emissions is 50:50 between ridge fans and gable end fans.

Details of the proposed point and volume source parameters are shown in Tables 1b and 1c.

Table 1b. Point source parameters – proposed scenario

Source ID	Height (m)	Diameter (m)	Efflux velocity (m/s)	Emission temperature (˚C)	Emission rate per source (ou_E/s)
H1 to H6; 1, 2 & 3	7.0	0.8	11.0	Variable [1]	Variable [1 & 2]

Table1c. Volume source parameters – proposed scenario

Source ID	Length (m)	Width (m)	Depth (m)	Base height (m)	Emission temperature (°C)	Emission rate (ou_E/s)
EX_SIDE	128.0	210.0	3.0	0.0	Ambient	Variable [1]
H1TO6_GAB	167.3	10.0	3.0	0.0	Ambient	Variable [1&3]

2. Dependent on ambient temperature and crop stage.
3. Reduced by 50% when ambient temperature exceeds 23 Celsius.
4. 50% of total only emitted when ambient temperature exceeds 23 Celsius.

The positions of the emission sources used are shown in Figure 4 (the point sources are marked by green circles and the volume sources are marked by blue shaded rectangles).

4.3 Modelled buildings

The structure of the poultry houses may affect the odour plumes from the point sources in the proposed scenario. Therefore, the buildings are modelled within ADMS. The positions of the modelled buildings may be seen in Figure 4 (marked by grey rectangles).

4.4 Discrete receptors

Thirty-three discrete receptors have been defined at a selection of nearby residences and commercial properties. The receptors are defined at 1.5 m above ground level within ADMS and their positions may be seen in Figure 5 (marked by enumerated pink rectangles).

4.5 Nested Cartesian grid

To produce the contour plots presented in Section 5 of this report, a nested Cartesian grid has been defined within ADMS. The grid receptors are defined at 1.5 m above ground level within ADMS. The positions of the grid receptors may be seen in Figure 5 (marked by green crosses).

4.6 Terrain data

Terrain has been considered in the modelling. The terrain data are based upon the Ordnance Survey 50 m Digital Elevation Model. A 22.0 km by 22.0 km domain has been resampled at 100 m horizontal resolution for use within ADMS for the modelling. The resolution of FLOWSTAR is 64 x 64 grid points; therefore, the effective resolution of the wind field for the terrain runs is approximately 340 m.

4.7 Roughness Length

In this case, a spatially varying roughness length file has been defined, this is based upon the Defra living Landscapes land use database, with permission. The GFS meteorological data is assumed to have a roughness length of 0.152 m (arithmetic average of the spatially varying roughness over the modelling domain). The sample of the central area of the spatially varying roughness length field is shown in Figure 6.

Figure 4. The positions of modelled buildings and sources



Figure 5. The discrete receptors and nested Cartesian grid receptors



Figure 6. The spatially varying surface roughness field



5. Details of the Model Runs and Results

For this study, the model was run with the calms and terrain modules in ADMS. ADMS was effectively run twenty-four times: once for each year of the four year meteorological record; for both the existing and proposed scenarios and for each of the three crop cycles. Statistics for the annual 98th percentile hourly mean odour concentration at each receptor were compiled for each of the runs.

A summary of the results at the discrete receptors is provided in Table 2, where the maximum annual 98th percentile hourly mean odour concentration is shown. Predicted exposures that exceed the Environment Agency's threshold are highlighted in blue; exposures in the range where UKWIR research suggests that complaints become increasingly likely are highlighted in orange and those where UKWIR research suggests complaints are likely are highlighted in red.

Contour plots of the maximum annual 98th percentile hourly mean odour concentrations are shown in Figures 7a (baseline scenario) and 7b (proposed scenario).

Table 2. Predicted maximum annual 98th percentile hourly mean odour concentrations at the discrete receptors

Receptor	X(m)	Y(m)	Name/Location	Maximum annual 98th percentile odour concentration - (ou_E/m^3)	
				Baseline Scenario (400,000 birds)	Proposed Scenario (571,000 birds)
1	501084	409428	Star Carr Lane	**10.78**	**9.35**
2	501311	409306	Star Carr Lane	**8.79**	**7.52**
3	501356	409282	Star Carr Lane	**4.22**	**4.18**
4	501327	409231	Star Carr Lane	**3.66**	**3.84**
5	501285	409148	Star Carr Lane	**3.69**	**3.59**
6	501442	409308	Star Carr Lane	2.92	**3.35**
7	501635	409579	Star Carr Lane	**3.33**	**3.11**
8	501647	409513	Wrawby (N)	2.34	2.10
9	501557	409345	Wrawby (N)	2.44	2.13
10	501682	409400	Wrawby (N)	2.74	2.51
11	501641	409256	Wrawby (N)	2.33	2.12
12	501605	409128	Wrawby (N)	2.36	2.25
13	501587	409024	Wrawby (N)	2.29	2.17
14	501531	408935	Wrawby (N)	1.80	2.00
15	501738	409309	Wrawby (N)	1.61	1.88
16	501717	409056	Wrawby (N)	2.11	1.90
17	501828	409228	Wrawby (N)	1.79	1.75
18	501836	409028	Wrawby (N)	1.83	1.75
19	501821	408894	Wrawby (N)	1.57	1.52
20	501533	408567	Wravby (S)	1.23	1.42
21	501831	408702	Wravby (S)	0.87	1.09
22	501455	408348	Wravby (S)	0.95	1.07
23	500082	408570	Wravby (S)	0.78	0.91
24	500090	408472	Grammar School Lane	2.23	1.68
25	500070	408401	Grammar School Lane	1.97	1.54
26	500588	408393	Grammar School Lane	1.81	1.41
27	500289	408236	Brigg	2.61	1.87
28	500650	408152	Brigg	2.26	1.65
29	500299	408062	Brigg	1.63	1.20
30	500109	408192	Brigg	1.90	1.48
31	499546	410045	Brigg	1.70	1.28
32	501916	410297	Broughton Cars Farm	1.53	1.84
33	500225	409300	Moor Lane	1.49	1.40

Figure 7a. Predicted maximum annual 98th percentile hourly mean odour concentration – baseline scenario



Figure 7b. Predicted maximum annual 98th percentile hourly mean odour concentration – proposed scenario



6. Summary and Conclusions

Odour emission rates have been assessed and quantified based upon an emissions model that takes into account the likely internal odour concentrations and ventilation rates. The emission rates so obtained have then been used as inputs to an atmospheric dispersion model which calculates odour exposure levels in the surrounding area.

Baseline scenario

The modelling predicts that odour exposures from the existing poultry houses under the current stocking scenario:

- Exceed the Environment Agency's benchmark of 3.0 ou_E/m^3 as a maximum annual 98th percentile hourly mean at several properties on and around Star Carr Lane.
- Currently exceeds the level where UKWIR research would suggest that complaints are likely the closest residence on Star Carr Lane, approximately 430 m to the east-south-east of the existing poultry houses.
- Would be below the Environment Agency's benchmark of 3.0 ou_E/m^3 as a maximum annual 98th percentile hourly mean at all other residential receptors considered.

Proposed scenario

Should the proposal proceed, the modelling predicts that:

- Odour exposures currently exceeding the level where UKWIR research would suggest that complaints are likely at the closest residence on Star Carr Lane would be reduced to below 10.0 ou_E/m^3.
- At several residences on Star Carr Lane odour exposure is predicted to be reduced, though not below the Environment Agency's benchmark of 3.0 ou_E/m^3 as a maximum annual 98th percentile hourly mean.
- Although there are increases in odour exposure predicted at some receptors, the increases are relatively small in comparison to the existing situation and it is unlikely that the changes would be noticeable.

7. References

Environment Agency, April 2007. H4 Odour Management, How to comply with your environmental permit.

Chartered Institution of Water and Environmental Management website. Control of Odour.

R. E. Lacey, S. Mukhtar, J. B. Carey and J. L. Ullman, 2004. A Review of Literature Concerning Odors, Ammonia, and Dust from Broiler Production Facilities.

M. Navaratnasamy. Odour Emissions from Poultry Manure/Litter and Barns.

Fardausur Rahaman et al. ESTIMATION OF ODOUR EMISSIONS FROM BROILER FARMS – AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH.

A. P. Robertson *et al*, 2002. Commercial-scale Studies of the Effect of Broiler-protein Intake on Aerial Pollutant Emissions.

ROSS. Environmental Management in the Broiler House.

Wojciech Rzeznik and Paulina Mielcarek-Bochenska. Odour Emissions from Livestock Buildings.

Defra. Heat Stress in Poultry - Solving the Problem.