

## **Risk Assessment for Local Air Pollution Control**

| Name of permitted activity: | CSG Service Centre | PG Note:      | PG1/01     |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|---------------|------------|
| Discussed with:             | Mr Eddie Hemmaway  | LA Reference: | B03/10     |
| Inspector's Name:           | Dave Bass          | Date:         | 16/01/2014 |

## **Operator Performance Appraisal**

| Component 1 - Compliance Assessment   |                 |               |      |                   |
|---|-----------------|---------------|------|-------------------|
| Scale of Non-Compliance   | Possible Scores |               | es   | Scores<br>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    |                   |
| (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)       |               |      | 0                 |
| Unjustified complaints may be e.g. those considered by the inspector to be unreal linked to an incident at the process.<br>Scoring for Component 2 - Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Reco | ords            |               |      | 1                 |
| Criterion   | Possible Scores |               | ores | Scores            |
|   | Yes             | No            | N/A  | Awarded           |
| (A) Are emissions monitored as required in the permit?<br>Are emissions and emissions monitoring recorded as required in the permit?  | 0               | <del>10</del> | θ    | 0                 |
| (B) Monitoring requirements reduced because results over time show consistent compliance?   | θ               | θ             | 0    | 0                 |
| (C) Does the operator have records showing that each appliance has been services regularly in accordance with manufacturer's instructions?  | 0               | 5             | θ    | 0                 |
| (D) Are there records of servicing for a minimum of two years prior to inspection?  | 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?   | -5              | <del>10</del> | 0    | 0                 |

| Component 3 - Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility  |                    |    |      |         |
|--|--------------------|----|------|---------|
| Criterion  | Possible Scores    |    | ores | Scores  |
|  | Yes                | No | N/A  | Awarded |
| (A) Are clear instructions available at all times on or near the appliance detailing the correct operation and maintenance of the equipment?   | 0                  | 5  | θ    | 0       |
| (B) Are nominated members of staff exclusively permitted to operate the appliance?   | 0                  | 5  | θ    | 0       |
| (C) Is the list of staff permitted to operate the appliance available?   | 0                  | 5  | θ    | 0       |
| (D) Are all nominated SWOB operating staff trained in, and conversant with, its operation? (Staff operating vapourising burners should be particularly conversant with the correct procedure for lighting from cold) | 0                  | 5  | θ    | 0       |
| (E) Are staff nominated to operate the alliance on site while the appliance is in use?   | 0                  | 5  | θ    | 0       |
| (F) Is an 'appropriate' environmental management system in place?  | -5                 | θ  | 0    | 0       |
| Total  | (-5 to 25) 0       |    | 0    |         |
| Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal   | Range -10 to 110 0 |    |      |         |

| Overall scores  | Score given |
|---|-------------|
| Operator Performance Appraisal                        |             |
| Compliance Assessment                                 | 0           |
| Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Records     | 0           |
| Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility | 0           |
| Total score   | 0           |

| OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROCESS                 | Range -10 to 110 | 0   |
|---|------------------|-----|
| REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY                    |                  |     |
| * high=score of >55, medium 30-55 and low <30 | LOW, MED, HIGH   | LOW |

## Comments

Burner rarely used as area is now used for car storage for seized vehicles and only used when

requested by police. Burner started while undertaking inspection and a little smoke created in

building as pan not fully closed but emissions where clear at stack. Company has changed name

so variation required.