

Risk Assessment for Local Air Pollution Control

Name of permitted activity: Linx Printing Technologies Ltd PG Note: PG6/44

Discussed with: Mr Martin Swindells LA Reference: B04/94

Inspector's Name: Dave Bass Date: 05/11/2013

Environmental Impact Appraisal				
Component 1 - Inherent Environmental Impact Potential				
APRR Risk Rating Category	Possible S	Possible Scores		Score varded
(A) Category 1	10	10		
(B) Category 2	20	20 20 30		20
(C) Category 3	30			
Component 2 - Progress with Upgrading				
Status of Upgrading	Possible S	COTOS		Score varded
(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				
	Sensit	tivity of R	ecepto	ors
Proximity to Emission Source	High	Medium		Low
(A) < 100m [*]	20	12		5
(B) 100 - 250m [*]	12	10		3
(C) 250 - 500m [*]	5	3		4
(D) >500m*	θ	θ		0
* All distances should be multiplied by a factor of 2 for mineral and cement	& lime processe	s and by	a facto	or of 4

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.

Component 4 - Other Targets

Component 4 Care range to		
	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	32

Operator Performance Appraisal

Component 5 - Compliance Assessment				
Scale of Non-Compliance	Possible Scores Scores Awarded		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 p	er inciden	ıt	
(E) Incident leading to a Prohibition Notice	20 p	er inciden	ıt	
Total	(Max. 50)			
* Unjustified complaints may be e.g. those considered by the inspector to be unr linked to an incident at the process.	easonable	e or which	cannot	be clearly
Where facility has been on Reduced Charge due to Mothballing or Reduced	d Operati	ng Level	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 Ro				
Criterion		sible Sco	1	Scores Awarded
	Yes	No	N/A	
(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	0	0	0
(C) Process operation modified where any problems indicated by monitoring?	0	5	0	0
(D) Fully documented and adhered to maintenance programme, in line with permit?	0	5	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	5	0	0
Total score		(-5 to 30))	0
Component 7 - Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility				
Criterion	Possible Scores Score		Scores	
Citerion	Yes	No	N/A	Awarded
(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	θ	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	θ	-5
Total		(-5 to 25))	-5
Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal		e -10 to 10 (130))5	-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	0
Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Records	0
Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility	-5
Total score	27

OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROCESS	Range -10 to 175 (200)	27
REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY		
* high=score of >80, medium 40-80 and low <40	LOW, MED, HIGH	LOW

Comments

Annual emission test being undertaken at time of inspection. Following previous testing which
while was compliant was close to the limit the operator has undertaken a series of exercises to
reduce emissions (no variation required). Initial indication shows that these were successful as the
background appeared lower than previous testing. Procedures for certain aspects of the plant
available near the plants which have been communicated to the relevant staff. Most employees
have been there long term. Company has ISO14001.