

Risk Assessment for Local Air Pollution Control

Name of permitted activity:	Darex UK Ltd	PG Note		6/28 6/44		
Discussed with:	Mr Glen Draper	LA Reference	_A Reference: <u>B1</u>		19/93	
Inspector's Name:	Dave Bass	Date	Date: 29/04/2009			
Environmental Impact Ap	nraisal					
Component 1 - Inherent Environ	•					
APRR Risk Rating Category		Possible Scores Score Awarded				
(A) Category 1		10	10			
(B) Category 2		20	20			
(C) Category 3		30	30		30	
Component 2 - Progress with Up	grading					
Status of Upgrading		Possible Scores		Score warded		
(A) Upgrading not complete but PG	Note deadline has yet to be reached	5	5			
(B) Upgrading not yet complete and	d PG Note deadline has passed	10	10			
(C) Upgrading complete and meets	BAT Requirements	0 0		0		
(D) Emissions control exceeds BA	Γ Requirements	-10				
Component 3 - Sensitivity and P	roximity of Receptors					
		Sensitiv	/ity of R	lecep	tors	
Proximity to Emission Source		High Medium Low		Low		
(A) < 100m [*]		20	20 12		5	
(B) 100 - 250m [*]		12	10		æ	
(C) 250 - 500m [*]		5	3		4	
(D) >500m*		θ	θθ		θ	
combustion, incineration (not crem	d by a factor of 2 for mineral and cement & ation), iron & steel and non-ferrous metal pr red from the process itself, rather than the s	ocesses.	and by	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	^a 10	10			
(B) No such air pollution problems		0			0	
Total Score for Environmental In	npact Appraisal	Range 0 to	70		50	

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?	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				
Criterion	Possible Scores		Scores	
Criterion		No	N/A	Awarded
(A) Documented procedures in place for implementing all aspects of the permit?	0	5	Φ	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		-5	
Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal		e -10 to 10)5	-5

Overall scores	Score given
Environmental Impact Appraisal	
Inherent Environmental Impact Potential	30
Progress with Upgrading	0
Sensitivity and Proximity of Receptors	20
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	45

OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROECSS	Range -10 to 175	45
REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY		
* high=score of >80, medium 40-80 and low <40	LOW, MED, HIGH	MEDIUM

Comments

No changes to process since last inspection. Planning on upgrading the Banbury unit later in year

but no changes to emissions points. Possible increase in production this year. Audit of companies

environmental management system due during year.