

## Risk Assessment for Local Air Pollution Control

Name of permitted activity: VIP Polymers Ltd PG Note: PG6/28  
 Discussed with: Tim French LA Reference: B11/94  
 Inspector's Name: Claire Braybrook Date: 13/02/2020

### Environmental Impact Appraisal

Component 1 - Inherent Environmental Impact Potential			
APRR Risk Rating Category	Possible Scores		Score Awarded
(A) Category 1	10		
(B) Category 2	20		
(C) Category 3	<b>30</b>		<b>30</b>
Component 2 - Progress with Upgrading			
Status of Upgrading	Possible Scores		Score Awarded
(A) Upgrading not complete but PG Note deadline has yet to be reached	5		
(B) Upgrading not yet complete and PG Note deadline has passed	10		
(C) Upgrading complete and meets BAT Requirements	<b>0</b>		<b>0</b>
(D) Emissions control exceeds BAT Requirements	-10		
Component 3 - Sensitivity and Proximity of Receptors			
	Sensitivity of Receptors		
Proximity to Emission Source	High	Medium	Low
(A) < 100m*	20	<b>12</b>	5
(B) 100 - 250m*	12	10	3
(C) 250 - 500m*	5	3	1
(D) >500m*	0	0	0
* All distances should be multiplied by a factor of 2 for mineral and cement & lime processes and by a factor of 4 for combustion, incineration (not cremation), iron & steel and non-ferrous metal processes. Note: Distances should be measured from the process itself, rather than the site boundary.			
Component 4 - Other Targets			
	Possible Scores		Score Awarded
(A) Other air pollution problems in the local area to which process is a potential contributor	10		
(B) No such air pollution problems	<b>0</b>		<b>0</b>
<b>Total Score for Environmental Impact Appraisal</b>	<b>Range 0 to 70</b>		<b>42</b>



## Operator Performance Appraisal

Component 5 - Compliance Assessment				
Scale of Non-Compliance	Possible Scores			Scores Awarded
(A) Incident leading to justified complaint but no breach of specific permit condition or of general/residual BAT condition	0 points			
(B) Incident leading to a justified complaint*	10 per incident			
(C) Breach of permit not leading to formal action	10 per incident			
(D) Incident leading to formal caution, Enforcement Notice or prosecution	15 per incident			
(E) Incident leading to a Prohibition Notice	20 per incident			
<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max. 55)</b>			<b>0</b>
* Unjustified complaints may be e.g. those considered by the inspector to be unreasonable or which cannot be clearly linked to an incident at the process.				
Where facility has been on Reduced Charge due to Mothballing or Reduced Operating Levels				
(f) Failure to notify the regulator or restart or increase in level of operation to above the threshold requiring a permit at the installation in accordance with the acceptance letter	25			
<b>Total (applies only when condition F has been breached)</b>	<b>(Max 80)</b>			
Scoring for Component 6 - Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Records				
Criterion	Possible Scores			Scores Awarded
	Yes	No	N/A	
(A) All monitoring undertaken to the degree required in the permit?	0	10	0	0
(B) Monitoring requirements reduced because results over time show consistent compliance?	-5	0	0	-5
(C) Process operation modified where any problems indicated by monitoring?	0	10	0	0
(D) Fully documented and adhered to maintenance programme, in line with permit?	0	10	0	0
(E) Full documented records as required in permit available on-site?	0	5	0	5
(F) All relevant documents forwarded to the authority by date required?	0	10	0	0
<b>Total score</b>	<b>(-5 to 45)</b>			<b>0</b>
Component 7 - Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility				
Criterion	Possible Scores			Scores Awarded
	Yes	No	N/A	
(A) Documented procedures in place for implementing all aspects of the permit?	0	5	0	0
(B) Specific responsibilities assigned to individual staff for these procedures?	0	5	0	0
(C) Completion of individual responsibilities checked and recorded by the company?	0	5	0	0
(D) Documented training records for all staff with air pollution control responsibilities?	0	5	0	0
(E) Trained staff on site throughout periods where potentially air-polluting activities take place?	0	5	0	0
(F) Is an 'appropriate' environmental management system in place?	-5	0	0	-5
<b>Total</b>	<b>(-5 to 25)</b>			<b>-5</b>
<b>Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal</b>	<b>Range -10 to 105 (150)</b>			<b>-5</b>

Overall scores	Score given
<i>Environmental Impact Appraisal</i>	
Inherent Environmental Impact Potential	30
Progress with Upgrading	0
Sensitivity and Proximity of Receptors	12
Other Targets	0
<i>Operator Performance Appraisal</i>	
Compliance Assessment	0
Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Records	0
Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility	-5
Total score	37

<b>OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROCESS</b>	Range -10 to 175 (200)	<b>37</b>
<b>REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY</b> * high=score of >80, medium 40-80 and low <40	LOW, MED, HIGH	<b>LOW</b>

## Comments

---

New SHEQ manager has been in place since October 2019, Neil and Daniel have both left the company.

Emission monitoring due to be completed soon and results will be sent through. The stack layout plan needs to be checked and updated. This is to enable monitoring of all the stacks to be completed on a rolling programme, ensuring all stacks are checked. *(For clarification and future reference '-5' for reduction in monitoring is because each emission source (stack) should be tested every year, however, due to the number and results HDC agreed monitoring on a rolling basis, once every 4 years with the exception of the main carbon black line & the paint booth).*

Maintenance is mainly reactive, although they do have shut down periods where maintenance is undertaken. Maintenance records require improvement. Score of 5 given on risk assessment – no higher as discussed and agreed improvements.

Safety checks on machines are completed weekly and a maintenance log raised if any issues noted.

Site visit completed – no issues noted. External IBC storage seen – company are planning to tidy, cover and bund the area to minimise pollution risk. Carbon black skip covered.

Company still has ISO14001 accreditation.

---