

Risk Assessment for Local Air Pollution Control

Name of permitted activity:	VIP Polymers Ltd	PG Not	te: <u>PG</u>	66/28	8	
Discussed with:	Nick Lucken	LA Reference	:e: <u>B1</u>	1/94	L	
Inspector's Name:	D Bass & H Nicholson	Dat	Date: 22/09/2011			
Environmental Impact Ap	praisal					
Component 1 - Inherent Environ	mental Impact Potential	-1		1		
APRR Risk Rating Category		Possible Scores		Score Awarded		
(A) Category 1		10				
(B) Category 2) Category 2		20			
(C) Category 3		30		30		
Component 2 - Progress with Up	grading					
Status of Upgrading		Possible S	Possible Scores		Score Awarded	
(A) Upgrading not complete but PG	Note deadline has yet to be reached	5	5			
(B) Upgrading not yet complete an	d PG Note deadline has passed	10				
(C) Upgrading complete and meets	BAT Requirements	0			0	
(D) Emissions control exceeds BA	(D) Emissions control exceeds BAT Requirements		-10			
Component 3 - Sensitivity and P	roximity of Receptors					
		Sensit	Sensitivity of Receptors			
Proximity to Emission Source		High	High Mediur		Low	
(A) < 100m [*]		20	12		5	
(B) 100 - 250m [*]		12	10		3	
(C) 250 - 500m [*]		5	3		4	
(D) >500m*		θ	θ		θ	
combustion, incineration (not crem	d by a factor of 2 for mineral and cement a ation), iron & steel and non-ferrous metal pr red from the process itself, rather than the s	ocesses.	s and by	a fac	ctor of 4 for	
Component 4 - Other Targets						
		Possible S	Possible Scores		Score warded	
(A) Other air pollution problems potential contributor	in the local area to which process is a	1 0	10			
(B) No such air pollution problems		0	0		0	
Total Score for Environmental In	npact Appraisal	Range 0 to 70 42		42		

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	5 per incident		t		
(C) Breach of permit not leading to formal action	10 per incident		ıt		
(D) Incident leading to formal caution, Enforcement Notice or prosecution	15 per incident		ıt		
(E) Incident leading to a Prohibition Notice	20 per incident		ıt		
Total	(Max. 50)			0	
* Unjustified complaints may be e.g. those considered by the inspector to be unrelinked to an incident at the process.	easonabl	e or which	cannot l	be clearly	
Where facility has been on Reduced Charge due to Mothballing or Reduced	d Operati	ing Levels	S		
(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				
Total (applies only when condition F has been breached)	· · ·	Max 75)			
Scoring for Component 6 - Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Re	ecords				
Criterion	Possible Scores			Scores	
	Yes	No	N/A	Awarded	
(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	θ	θ	-5	
(C) Process operation modified where any problems indicated by monitoring?	θ	5	0	0	
(D) Fully documented and adhered to maintenance programme, in line with permit?	0	5	θ	0	
(E) Full documented records as required in permit available on-site?	0	5	θ	0	
(F) All relevant documents forwarded to the authority by date required?	0	5	θ	0	
Total score	(-5 to 30) -5			-5	
Component 7 - Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility					
0.10.10	Possible Scores		ores	Scores	
Criterion		No	N/A	Awarded	
(A) Documented procedures in place for implementing all aspects of the permit?	0	5	θ	0	
(B) Specific responsibilities assigned to individual staff for these procedures?	0	5	θ	0	
(C) Completion of individual responsibilities checked and recorded by the company?	0	5	θ	0	
(D) Documented training records for all staff with air pollution control responsibilities?	0	5	θ	0	
(E) Trained staff on site throughout periods where potentially air-polluting activities take place?	0	5	θ	0	
(F) Is an 'appropriate' environmental management system in place?	-5	θ	θ	-5	
Total	(-5 to 25) -5				
Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal	Range -10 to 105 -10				
		(130)		-10	

Overall scores	Score given
Environmental Impact Appraisal	
Inherent Environmental Impact Potential	30
Progress with Upgrading	0
Sensitivity and Proximity of Receptors	12
Other Targets	0
Operator Performance Appraisal	
Compliance Assessment	0
Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Records	-5
Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility	-5
Total score	32

OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROCESS	Range -10 to 175 (200)	32
REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY		
* high=score of >80, medium 40-80 and low <40	LOW, MED, HIGH	LOW

Comments

Site has finished changing modifying their stacks and although reduced the number of stacks

exiting to atmosphere they have kept them with fans in case of future changes and if they need to

duct air back into the factory. Emissions testing has been completed and copy will be e-mailed to

HDC when obtained. Maintenance records kept and company has new head of maintenance so

changes to system being implemented. Procedures have been produced and training on

procedures kept at HR department. Site has localised EMS system but is still considering

ISO14001 accreditation. Site recently has installed a new spraybooth but similar make to previous

so no variation required.