

Risk Assessment for Local Air Pollution Control

Name of permitted activity:	Paxford Composites Ltd	PG Note	: <u>PG</u>	6/23		
Discussed with:	Mr Neil Search	LA Reference	LA Reference: <u>B01/02</u> Date: <u>30/03/2012</u>			
Inspector's Name:	Dave Bass	Date			012	
Environmental Impact Ap	praisal					
Component 1 - Inherent Environ	mental Impact Potential					
APRR Risk Rating Category		Possible Scores		Score Awarded		
(A) Category 1) Category 1 40					
(B) Category 2		20		20		
(C) Category 3	C) Category 3					
Component 2 - Progress with Up	grading					
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	d PG Note deadline has passed 40					
(C) Upgrading complete and meets	(C) Upgrading complete and meets BAT Requirements		0		0	
(D) Emissions control exceeds BAT Requirements		-10				
Component 3 - Sensitivity and P	roximity of Receptors					
		Sensitiv	Sensitivity of Receptors			
Proximity to Emission Source		High	ligh Mediu		Low	
(A) < 100m [*]		20	12		5	
(B) 100 - 250m [*]		12	10		3	
(C) 250 - 500m [*]		5	3		4	
(D) >500m*		θ	θ		0	
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.	and by a	a fact	tor of 4 for	
Component 4 - Other Targets						
		Possible Scores		Score warded		
(A) Other air pollution problems potential contributor	in the local area to which process is a	10				
(B) No such air pollution problems		0			0	
Total Score for Environmental In	otal Score for Environmental Impact Appraisal		70	32		

Operator Performance Appraisal

Component 5 - Compliance Assessment					
Scale of Non-Compliance	Possible Scores		es	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		t	10	
(D) Incident leading to formal caution, Enforcement Notice or prosecution	15 per incident		t		
(E) Incident leading to a Prohibition Notice	20 per incident		t		
Total	(Max. 50)			10	
[*] 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 b	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	1				
Criterion	Possible Scores			Scores	
	Yes	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	0	0	0	
(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) 0		0		
Component 7 - Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility	•				
	Possible Scores		ores	Scores	
Criterion	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	θ	θ	-5	
Total	(-5 to 25) -5				
Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal	Range -10 to 105 (130) -5				

Overall scores	Score given
Environmental Impact Appraisal	
Inherent Environmental Impact Potential	20
Progress with Upgrading	0
Sensitivity and Proximity of Receptors	12
Other Targets	0
Operator Performance Appraisal	
Compliance Assessment	10
Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Records	0
Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility	-5
Total score	37

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

Comments

Emission test results show that there is a serious non-compliance of the emission limit for

Spraybooth 1 with Spraybooth 2 meeting the limit and Spraybooth 3 slightly over (but uncertainty

levels moves it below). Spraybooth 1 has shown a dramatic increase in emissions despite

maintenance/filters etc. being undertaken on the plant. Procedures and training is very good.

Company has developed its own EMS and has implemented changes already.