

Risk Assessment for Local Air Pollution Control

Name of permitted activity: Enval Plant - Alconbury Installation **PG Note:** _____
Discussed with: Frank Hartsema & Jamie Gatt **LA Reference:** A17/12
Inspector's Name: Claire Braybrook **Date:** 06/03/2020

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	20	
(C) Category 3	30		
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	0	0	
(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	12	5
(B) 100 - 250m*	12	10	3
(C) 250 - 500m*	5	3	1
(D) >500m*	0	0	0
<small>* 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.</small>			
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	0	0	
Total Score for Environmental Impact Appraisal		Range 0 to 70	23

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			
Total	(Max. 55)			0
* 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			
Total (applies only when condition F has been breached)	(Max 80)			
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	40	0	0
(B) Monitoring requirements reduced because results over time show consistent compliance?	-5	0	0	0
(C) Process operation modified where any problems indicated by monitoring?	0	40	0	0
(D) Fully documented and adhered to maintenance programme, in line with permit?	0	40	0	0
(E) Full documented records as required in permit available on-site?	0	5	0	0
(F) All relevant documents forwarded to the authority by date required?	0	40	0	0
Total score	(-5 to 45)			0
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	0
Total	(-5 to 25)			0
Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal	Range -10 to 1205 (150)			0

Overall scores	Score given
<i>Environmental Impact Appraisal</i>	
Inherent Environmental Impact Potential	20
Progress with Upgrading	0
Sensitivity and Proximity of Receptors	3
Other Targets	0
<i>Operator Performance Appraisal</i>	
Compliance Assessment	0
Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Records	0
Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility	0
Total score	23

OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROCESS	Range -10 to 175 (200)	23
REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY * high=score of >80, medium 40-80 and low <40	LOW, MED, HIGH	LOW

Comments

Visit undertaken in conjunction with the Environment Agency in order to discuss the Permit for the site. The Permit requires updating to a Schedule 13 SWIP Permit, which will include requirements under the Industrial Emissions Directive, however this will depend on the classification of the gas. More information regarding this will be provided in the cover email that accompanies this risk assessment.

The site continues to be in the commissioning stage. Emission testing will be completed when there is sufficient throughput.

The company have had issues over the last year with the microwave generator, therefore operation of the site was minimal for most of 2019. Works are programmed in at the end of March. There have been advances regarding the oil generated and this may be able to be used in making new plastic. There is still insufficient flow of gas to run through the generator.

The operators have a very specific manually fed waste input, ensuring stringent control and resulting in an awareness of emission composition.

Weekly litter picks are continuing, and preventative maintenance is completed every Monday.

No spillages or issues to report – no changes since last year, restricted use over the last year.
