



COMMERCIAL KITCHEN ODOUR RISK ASSESSMENT

on behalf of

MSB FOODS LTD

for

1-3 BRIDGE ROAD, CHATBURN

REPORT DATE: 20 MAY 2025

REPORT NUMBER: ODOUR_103338

**Miller Goodall Ltd
Ground Floor
Ashworth House
Deakins Business Park
Blackburn Road
Egerton
Bolton
Lancashire
BL7 9RP**

Tel: 01204 596166

www.millergoodall.co.uk

Company registration number 5201673

Summary

This assessment has been undertaken to accompany a planning application for a new takeaway at 1-3 Bridge Road, Chatburn.

A commercial kitchen odour risk assessment has been undertaken which has concluded that a high level of odour control is required for the development. Therefore, appropriate mitigation measures have been outlined along with recommended installation and maintenance requirements to ensure the system remains efficient and in good condition.

With the implementation of appropriate mitigation, there is no reason for this application to be refused on the grounds of odour.

Date	20 May 2025	Date	20 May 2025

Record of changes

Version	Date	Change	Initials
1	20 May 2025	First issue	MH

Contents

Summary1

Contents0

1 Introduction.....1

2 Site Description.....1

3 Proposed Development1

4 Policy Context2

4.1 National Planning Policy Framework2

5 Methodology2

5.1 EMAQ+ Risk Assessment Methodology - Odour Control2

6 Commercial Kitchen Odour Risk Assessment3

7 Summary of Impacts and Conclusion.....4

APPENDICES5

Glossary of Terms9

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This kitchen odour assessment has been undertaken to accompany a planning application for a takeaway at 1-3 Bridge Road, Chatburn. The site lies within the administrative boundary of Ribble Valley Borough Council (RVBC).
- 1.2 The report provides a commercial kitchen risk assessment and review of the odour associated with the proposed development, in accordance with established guidance from EMAQ+ ^[1] and provides recommendations in respect of odour abatement.
- 1.3 There are a number of factors that influence the magnitude of an odour problem, these include:
- size of the cooking facility – influences the intensity of the odour;
 - type of food being prepared – affects the chemical constituents within the ventilation air;
 - type of cooking appliances used – which the level of fat, water droplets and temperature within the ventilation air; and
 - the location of the premises.
- 1.4 In general, the greater the potential risk of causing harm to amenity or causing a nuisance the more effective the odour abatement must be.

2 Site Description

- 2.1 The site is located within the village of Chatburn centre and was formerly used as a post office.
- 2.2 Residential dwellings are located to the north and east of the site, adjoining the proposed development building as a row of terraced buildings in each direction. Ribble Lane runs along the western site boundary and Bridge Road runs along the southern site boundary. Residential dwellings are located beyond each road. The site location is shown in **Appendix A**.

3 Proposed Development

- 3.1 The development consists of a new takeaway, which will be a fish and chips shop.

¹ EMAQ+, 2022. Control of Odour and Noise from Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Systems

4 Policy Context

4.1 National Planning Policy Framework

- 4.1.1 The National Planning Policy Framework² (NPPF) does not specifically mention odour, but it does refer to air and pollution. Paragraph 187 states:

“Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans.”

- 4.1.2 The role of planning is to ensure that new developments that are capable of creating odour do not cause a significant adverse effect in the local area or impact upon existing sensitive uses nearby. Additionally, the planning system also seeks to ensure sensitive uses introduced at the development would not be adversely affected by existing odorous sources and/or that undue restrictions are not placed on existing odorous businesses that may have operated up to that point without issue.

5 Methodology

5.1 EMAQ+ Risk Assessment Methodology – Odour Control

- 5.1.1 The EMAQ+ guidance includes a risk assessment methodology for odour associated with commercial kitchens, the outcome of which determines the level of odour control required. The risk assessment works on a scoring system based on the sum of the contributions from dispersion, the proximity of receptors, size of kitchen and cooking type. This score is then used to determine the impact risk and level of odour control required, as detailed in **Table 1**.

² Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) (2024) National Planning Policy Framework

Table 1: Determining a Score for Odour Control

Impact Risk	Odour Control Requirement	Significance Score
Low to Medium	Low Level odour control	<20
High	High Level Odour Control	20-35
Very High	Very High Level Odour Control	>35

5.1.2 **Table 2** shows different measures that can be implemented to achieve the level of odour control required. Maintenance must be regularly carried out to ensure that the performance levels are always achieved.

Table 2: Odour Control

Level of Control		
Low to Medium	High	Very High
1. Fine filtration or electrostatic Precipitator (ESP) followed by carbon filtration (carbon filters rated with 0.1 second residence time).	1. Fine filtration or ESP followed carbon filtration (carbon filters rated with 0.2-0.4 second residence time).	1. Fine filtration or ESP followed carbon filtration (carbon filters rated with 0.4-0.8 second residence time).
2. Fine filtration followed by counteractant/neutralising system to achieve the same level of control as 1.	2. Fine filtration or ESP followed by ultraviolet (UV) ozone system to achieve the same level of control as 1.	2. Fine filtration or ESP followed by counteractant/neutralising system to achieve the same level of control as 1.
		3. Fine filtration or ESP followed by UV ozone system to achieve the same level of control as 1.

6 Commercial Kitchen Odour Risk Assessment

6.1 The risk assessment completed for the proposed kitchen extraction system for the development is shown in **Appendix B**. The resulting significance score has been considered in conjunction with **Table 1** to determine the level of odour control required.

- 6.2 The kitchen ventilation flue will discharge 1m above the ridge at 15 m/s, resulting in good dispersion. Highly sensitive receptors are classified as close because there are residential flats on the first floor of the building. The Applicant has confirmed that it will be a small takeaway, the kitchen size is categorised as small. Fish and chips shops are considered very high in terms of odour and grease loading.
- 6.3 The resulting significance score is **26**. The risk assessment concludes that a **high** level of odour control is required for this type of food preparation. Using the data provided in **Table 2**, a **high** level of odour control should include the implementation of one of the following methods:
- Fine filtration or ESP followed by carbon filtration (carbon filters rated with 0.2-0.4 seconds residence time);
 - or
 - Fine filtration followed counteractant/neutralising system to achieve the same level of control as bullet point 1 above.
- 6.4 The Applicant has confirmed that one of the two methods for odour abatement will be installed by the appointed kitchen and ventilation installer.
- 6.5 EMAQ+ guidance advises that the design and maintenance of the kitchen extraction system is an important factor. Minimum design performance criteria and maintenance criteria are provided in **Appendix C**.

7 Summary of Impacts and Conclusion

- 7.1 The commercial kitchen odour risk assessment indicates that a high level of odour control is required within the development. This is to be provided by a combination of flue dispersion and abatement in the form of fine filtration or ESP with carbon filters.
- 7.2 Recommendations have been provided in relation to the design and maintenance of the kitchen exhaust system and provided these are followed there should be no risk to the amenity of adjacent sensitive receptors.
- 7.3 With the implementation of the mitigation, there is no reason for this application to be refused on the grounds of odour.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Site Location



Appendix B: Risk Assessment for Cooking Odour

Criteria		Score	Details
Dispersion	Very poor	20	Low level discharge, discharge into courtyard or restriction on stack.
	Poor	15	Not low level but below eaves, or discharge at below 10 m/s.
	Moderate	10	Discharging 1m above eaves at 10 -15 m/s
	Good	5	Discharging 1m above ridge at 15 m/s
Proximity of receptors	Close	10	Closest sensitive receptor less than 20m from kitchen discharge.
	Medium	5	Closest sensitive receptor between 20 and 100m from kitchen discharge.
	Far	1	Closest sensitive receptor more than 100m from kitchen discharge
Size of kitchen	Large	5	More than 100 covers or large sized take away
	Medium	3	Between 30 and 100 covers or medium sized take away
	Small	1	Less than 30 covers or small take away
Cooking type (odour and grease loading)	Very high	10	Pub (high level of fried food), fried chicken, burgers or fish & chips. Turkish, Middle Eastern or any premises cooking with solid fuel
	High	7	Vietnamese, Thai, Indian, Japanese, Chinese, Steakhouse
	Medium	4	Cantonese, Italian, French, Pizza (gas fired)
	Low	1	Most pubs (no fried food, mainly reheating and sandwiches etc), Tea rooms
Total Score		26	High Impact: High Level odour control required.

Appendix C: Design and Maintenance Requirements

Minimum Requirements for Odour Control

- Positioning of the stacks as far as possible from the nearest residential dwellings;
- Use of Chinaman's hats or other cowls should not be permitted;
- Consideration of the prevailing wind direction in relation to the ducting positioning; and
- Ducting should be rigid in construction and resiliently mounted.

Recommendations for Cleaning

The recommended cleaning period for grease extraction ductwork is shown in **Table C1**.

Table C1: Recommended cleaning period for grease extraction ductwork

Grease loading		Daily usages	Cleaning intervals(months)
Heavy use	Heavy/continuous grease production	6-12 hours	3-6 months
		12-16 hours	2-3 months
Moderate use	Moderate grease production	6-12 hours	6-12 months
		12-16 hours	3-4 months
Light use	No significant grease production	6-12 hours	12 months
		12-16 hours	6 months

Recommendations for Maintenance

System employing fine filtration and carbon filtration;

- change filters every two weeks (or to product manufacturers recommendation);
- change carbon filters every 4 to 6 months (or to product manufacturers recommendation).

Using a system employing ESP and other inline abatement, typically;

- ESP systems cleaned and sump emptied on a four weekly basis;
- UV-C systems used inline, cleaned on a four weekly basis;
- Side stream UV-C systems, cleaned every 3 to 6 months
- Carbon filters with ESP pre-treatment change carbon filter every 6 to 12 months

These time frames may increase or reduce for extreme or very light applications.

Glossary of Terms

Effects The consequences of the changes in airborne concentration and/or dust deposition for a receptor. These might manifest as annoyance due to soiling, increased morbidity or mortality due to exposure to PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5} or plant dieback due to reduced photosynthesis. The term 'significant effect' has a specific meaning in EIA regulations. The opposite is an insignificant effect. In the context of construction impacts any effect will usually be adverse, however, professional judgement is required to determine whether this adverse effect is significant based in the evidence presented.

Impacts The changes in airborne concentrations and/or dust deposition. A scheme can have an 'impact' on airborne dust without having any 'effects', for instance if there are no receptors to experience the impact.

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

