

Risk Assessment for Local Air Pollution Control

| Name of permitted activity: | Paxford Composites Ltd | PG Note: | PG6/23 & 4/2 | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------|--------------|--|--|
| Discussed with: | Mr Grahame Bloxham | LA Reference: | B01/02 | | |
| Inspector's Name: | Dave Bass | Date: | 28/05/2009 | | |

Environmental Impact Appraisal

| Component 1 - Inherent Environmental Impact Potential | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|---------------|-------|-----------------|
| APRR Risk Rating Category | Possible Scores | | | Score warded |
| (A) Category 1 | 10 | | | |
| (B) Category 2 | 20 | | | |
| (C) Category 3 | 30 | | 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 | | 0 | |
| (D) Emissions control exceeds BAT Requirements | -10 | | | |
| Component 3 - Sensitivity and Proximity of Receptors | | | | |
| | Sensit | ivity of R | ecep | tors |
| Proximity to Emission Source | High | Medium Lo | | Low |
| (A) < 100m [*] | 20 | 12 | | 5 |
| (B) 100 - 250m [*] | 12 | 10 | | 3 |
| (C) 250 - 500m | 5 | 3 | | 4 |
| (D) >500m* | θ | θ | | θ |
| [*] All distances should be multiplied by a factor of 2 for mineral and cement & combustion, incineration (not cremation), iron & steel and non-ferrous metal prov Note: Distances should be measured from the process itself, rather than the site | cesses. | s and by | a fac | tor of 4 fo |
| Component 4 - Other Targets | | | | |
| | Possible S | cores | | Score warded |
| (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 t | o 70 | | 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 | |
| (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. 50) | 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.

| Scoring for Component 6 - Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Records | | | | |
|---|---------------------|-----------------|--------|---------|
| Criterion | | Possible Scores | | |
| | | No | N/A | Awarded |
| (A) All monitoring undertaken to the degree required in the permit? | 0 | 10 | θ | 0 |
| (B) Monitoring requirements reduced because results over time show consistent compliance? | -5 | θ | 0 | 0 |
| (C) Process operation modified where any problems indicated by monitoring? | 0 | 5 | θ | 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) 0 | | 0 | |
| Component 7 - Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility | | | | |
| Criterion | Possible Scores | | Scores | |
| Chterion | Yes | 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 | 0 | θ | 0 |
| Total | (-5 to 25) 0 | | 0 | |
| Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal Range -10 t | | e -10 to 10 | 05 | 0 |

| 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 | 0 | |
| Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility | 0 | |
| Total score | 42 | |

| OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROECSS | Range -10 to 175 | 42 |
|---|------------------|-----|
| REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY | | |
| * high=score of >80, medium 40-80 and low <40 | LOW, MED, HIGH | LOW |

Comments

| The IBC's have been removed from the back yard but work still required to clear of rest of waste. |
|---|
| A dedicated area for waste solvents and other wastes should be developed to ensure that any |
| accidents caused by a spillage are controlled. Emissions monitoring showed slightly elevated |
| levels of VOC's in spraybooth 1, this was probably caused due to no product being sprayed when |
| testing was undertaken, VOC usage still required to be collated and sent. Procedures for use of |
| equipment are in place but require reviewing and auditing. Management structure in place is very |
| good with a clear chain of command and roles and responsibilities defined. Training matrix has |
| been developed and proving very successful. |