SITE CONDITION REPORT

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

COMPLETE SECTIONS 1-3 AND SUBMIT WITH APPLICATION

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

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

1.0 SITE DETAILS	
Name of the applicant	Gissing Pigs Ltd
Activity address	Grove Farm, Grove Road, Gissing, Diss, Norfolk, IP22 5XA
National grid reference	Study area centred on TM 15497 85233. Area 1.48ha.
Document reference and dates for Site Condition Report at permit application and surrender.	1. Created site condition report to accompany application for permission for 4no. houses for rearing pigs intensively with a total capacity for 4,000 pigs over 30 kilogrammes. 2. Used desk top study to identify and examine in broad terms readily available information without intrusive investigation and a site walkover on 7th October 2026.
Document references for site plans (including location and boundaries)	3. Grove Farm Pig Unit Drainage Schematic 1:1250 scale.

Note:

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

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

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

2.0 Condition of the land at permit issue	
Environmental setting including: • geology • hydrogeology • surface waters	**Landscape setting** 1. Study area located in National Character Area Profile: 83 South Norfolk and High Suffolk Claylands[5]. Area characterised by relatively flat topography, incised by stream and river valley corridors that drain the plateau and are mostly small in scale. The underlying bedrock is Late Cretaceous Chalk overlain by a chalky glacial till (also known as boulder clay) on the plateau and with bands of glacial outwash sands and gravels on the valley sides. In the north the deposits are typically less chalky and include far-travelled erratics of igneous rock brought here by the ice sheets. The underlying chalk forms the principal aquifer which supplies East Anglia. The principal river, the Waveney, flows into the southern part of The Broads at Earsham on its route out to the North Sea. 2. The till gives rise to typical stagnogley soils on the plateau, which difficult to work when wet, are extremely fertile when drained. The area is predominantly agricultural with arable farming dominating, particularly cereals, sugar beet, and oilseed rape. Intensive pig and poultry rearing takes place in large units. **Topography** 3. The study area is at an altitude of 47m. The land onsite and in the surrounding land rises to slightly higher ground to the north and falling to the south. **Geology** 4. Artificially modified landscaped ground is to be expected result of earthworks for construction of pig houses including removed a limited amount of topsoil and granular subsoil. 5. Natural superficial deposit onsite is Lowestoft Formation – Diamicton (chalky boulder clay). Sedimentary superficial deposit formed between 423 and 480 thousand years ago during the Quaternary period[1]. 6. Bedrock geology onsite is Lewes Nodular Chalk, Seaford Chalk, Newhaven Chalk, Culver Chalk and Portsdown Chalk Formations – Chalk. Sedimentary bedrock formed between 72.1 and 93.9 million years ago during the Cretaceous period[1]. 7. Local geology has been logged below ground level (bgl) at approx. 120m to the south-west at Grove Farm[2]: -

BGS borehole reference TM18NE2	Depth bgl
Chalky boulder clay	23.0m
Glacial sand and gravel	42.2m
Upper Chalk	54.9m

Soil vulnerability classification - leaching potential

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

Hydrogeology

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

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

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

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

12. Study area located inside a Source Protection Zone Type 3 Total Catchment[8]. Source Protection Zones define the sensitivity of an area around a potable abstraction site to contamination.

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

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

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

16. There are no groundwater abstractions inside the study area.

Surface waters, hydrology & catchment

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

18. Overall ecological rating for the Dickleburgh Stream water body is Moderate as recently as 2022. Water bodies are classified as being at high, good, moderate, poor or bad ecological status. To achieve purpose of the WFD, environmental objectives have been set and are reported on by the Environment Agency at the end of each six-year cycle.

19. There is an existing pond inside the study area.

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>

Sources of flooding

20. Study area not located in a Flood Zone 2 or 3[6]. Present day chance of flooding from rivers and the sea is very low staying at very low between 2036 and 2069 with climate change. Less than 0.1% chance of a flood each year[7]. Low lying areas that are close to rivers or the sea are more likely to flood when water levels rise.

21. Yearly chance of surface water flooding in the study area is High staying at High between 2040 and 2060 with climate change. More than 3.3% chance of a flood each year[7]. Note, chance of surface water flooding will be discrete in the vicinity of the existing pond and proposed pig houses 3-4. Surface water flooding is sometimes known as flash flooding happens when rainwater cannot drain away through normal drainage systems.

22. Highest risk of groundwater flooding in the study area is Low[8]. Groundwater flooding is caused by unusually high groundwater levels when the water table rises above the ground surface or within underground structures such as basements or cellars. Groundwater flooding tends to exhibit a longer duration than surface water flooding, lasting weeks, or months.

</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>

Pollution history including:

- pollution incidents that may have affected land.
- historical land-uses and associated contaminants
- any visual/olfactory evidence of existing contamination
- evidence of damage to pollution prevention measures

</td>
<td>

Pollution incidents that may have affected land.

23. No record for any recent or historical potentially contaminative industrial land uses, tanks, energy features, petrol stations, garages, military land, railway, waste sites historical or active landfill in the study area[8].

Historical land-uses and associated contaminants

24. Established historical land-uses in the study area from OS maps at the 1:10,560, 1:2,500 and 1:1,250 scale[9] and aerial photographs[8]: -

1883	Greenfields, field boundaries with mature trees, arable agriculture or pasture for grazing animals, a pond in same place as today and another near the centre. A broad track in the south of the study area in same place as present day with buildings on north side presumed for agriculture and two dwelling houses with enclosed gardens.
1884	Unchanged
1904	No mature trees marked and minor extension of one of the agricultural buildings.
1929	Unchanged
1951	One agricultural building has been removed.

</td>
</tr>
</table>

	<table><tr><td>1981</td><td>Track narrowed. Both agricultural buildings and dwelling houses have been removed. Possibly retained part of one building or erected a smaller replacement in same place as present day.</td></tr><tr><td>1994</td><td>Unchanged.</td></tr><tr><td>1999</td><td>Aerial photograph shows greenfield for arable agriculture with boundary hedge and trees as present day and a mature tree in the centre. The central pond has been filled and another building erected alongside the other.</td></tr><tr><td>2015</td><td>Unchanged</td></tr><tr><td>2020</td><td>Aerial photograph shows 2no. houses erected with uncovered muck pad and slurry tank for rearing pigs intensively and land cleared for a third house same as present day. Nearly all the greenfield replaced with development for pig houses or covered with excavated soil.</td></tr><tr><td>2025</td><td>Unchanged</td></tr></table> **Licensed industrial activities (Part A(1))** 25. No record for any previous licensed industrial activities in the study area, besides rearing pigs intensively. **Visual/olfactory evidence of existing contamination** 26. No visual/olfactory evidence of existing contamination in the study area on the site walkover on 7th October 2026. 27. Recently removed soil and rubble from a former pond in the centre infilled in the 1990s. Refilling with concrete rubble and crushed concrete to create a solid foundation for a pig house. **Evidence of damage to pollution control measures** 28. No evidence of damage to any pollution control measures in the study area associated with existing pig houses, covered FYM store, slurry storage tank and carcase storage on the site walkover on 7th October 2026
Evidence of historic contamination, for example, historical site investigation, assessment, remediation, and verification reports (where available)	29. No evidence for any previous historical site investigation, assessment, remediation, or verification.
Baseline soil and groundwater reference data	30. Based on the information available intrusive investigation to establish baseline soil and groundwater reference data in the study area was not considered warranted.

References & supporting information	1. British Geological Survey; *Geology Viewer*. Available at https://www.bgs.ac.uk/map-viewers/bgs-geology-viewer/ 2. British Geological Survey; *Onshore borehole records.* Available at https://www.bgs.ac.uk/information-hub/borehole-records/ 3. Defra website; Catchment Data Explorer. Available at https://environment.data.gov.uk/catchment-planning 4. Government website; *Drinking Water Safeguard Zones (Surface Water) (England), Nitrate Vulnerable Zones 2017 Designations (England).* Available at https://magic.defra.gov.uk/ 5. Government website *National Character Area Profiles: information for local decision making.* Available at https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-character-area-profiles-information-for-local-decision-making 6. Government website; at https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/ 7. Government website; at https://www.gov.uk/check-long-term-flood-risk 8. Groundsure Enviro+Geo Insight*; Tank 174m from Grove Farm, Grove Road 12m from Unnamed Road, Gissing, Norfolk, IP22 5XA, Date 08/10/2026;* Available at https://insights.groundsure.io/ 9. Groundsure Map Insight*; Tank 174m from Grove Farm, Grove Road 12m from Unnamed Road, Gissing, Norfolk, IP22 5XA, Date 08/10/2026;* Available at https://insights.groundsure.io/ 10. Landis; *National Soil Map*. Available at https://portal.landis.org.uk

3.0 Permitted activities.	
Permitted activities.	1. Applying for a Bespoke Permit for Schedule 1; Part 2; Section 6.9; Part A(1)(a) Rearing poultry or pigs intensively in an installation with more than - (ii) 2,000 places for production pigs (over 30kg). 2. Specifically, 4no. pig houses with capacity for 4,000 places for production pigs (over 30kg). Designed to be operated in accordance with SGN EPR 6.09 and Best Available Techniques (BAT) Conclusions Document – 4.7.5.9 Straw flow system on a solid concrete floor with natural, side ventilation, no ridge ventilation. Dust interception with grassed areas. 3. Feed will be delivered in covered lorries and stored onsite in package silos. Areas around buildings will be kept free from build-up of dust and spilt feed. 4. Dunging & laying areas will be regularly pushed out into a covered FYM store. Pens washed and disinfected between batches. 5. Slurry will be pumped into above ground storage tank(s) which meets requirements under the Water Resources (Control of Pollution) (Silage, Slurry and Agricultural Fuel Oil) Regulations 2010 (SSAFO Regulations). 6. There will be sufficient solid manure and slurry storage capacity for six months. Exported offsite for spreading on land to confer agricultural benefit

	7. Footbaths will be managed so that they do not overflow, and spent disinfectants emptied into the dirty water tanks. Wheel washings prevented from entering into surface water or groundwater. 8. Dead pigs will be removed from houses daily and numbers recorded. Store carcases in secure, covered, vermin-proof containers with frequent collections by an approved transporter under National Fallen Stock Scheme. 9. Buildings & equipment will be well maintained and kept in good repair. Regularly inspected and checked for correct operation and security, visual signs of leakage, corrosion, structural damage. 10. Site will have an accident management plan which will be implemented if an accident occurs. Events or failures that could damage the environment have been identified using the H1 environmental risk assessment for accidents.
Non-permitted activities undertaken.	Not applicable
Document references for: • plan to show activity layout; and • environmental risk assessment.	• Groundsure Custom Plan; *Tank 174m from Grove Farm, Grove Road 12m from Unnamed Road, Gissing, Norfolk, IP22 5XA, Date 08/10/2026* at the 1:1250 scale • Application Bespoke H1 Environmental risk assessment.

Note:

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

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

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

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

Sections 4.0-10.0 not required for the permit application.

4.0 Changes to the activity	
Have there been any changes to the activity boundary?	
Have there been any changes to the permitted activities?	
Have any 'dangerous substances' not identified in the Application Site Condition Report been used or produced as a result of the permitted activities?	
Checklist of supporting information	

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

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

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

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

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

10.0 Statement of site condition
Using the information from sections 3 to 7, give a statement about the condition of the land at the site. This should confirm that: • the permitted activities have stopped. • decommissioning is complete, and the pollution risk has been removed. • the land is in a satisfactory condition.