

Risk Assessment for Local Air Pollution Control

Name of permitted activi	ty: Terrex PL801	PG	Note:	PG3/1	6(12)	
Discussed with:	Philip Hales	LA Refe	rence:	B22/1	6	
Inspector's Name:	Claire Braybrook	 Date:		22/01/2019		
Operator Performance	Δnnraisal	•	-			
Component 1 - Compliance As						
Scale of Non-Compliance		Possi	Possible Scores		Scores Awarded	
(A) Incident leading to justified condition or of general/residual B	I complaint but no breach of specific permit AT condition	0	0 points			
(B) Incident leading to a justified complaint		5 pe	5 per incident			
(C) Breach of permit not leading	to formal action	10 pe	10 per incident			
(D) Incident leading to formal cau	ition, Enforcement Notice or prosecution	15 pe	15 per incident			
(E) Incident leading to a Prohibition	on Notice	20 pe	20 per incident			
Total			ax. 50)		0	
* Unjustified complaints may be e linked to an incident at the proce.	e.g. those considered by the inspector to be unresss.	asonable o	r which ca	annot be	clearly	
Where facility has been on Rec	luced Charge due to Mothballing or Reduced	Operating	Levels			
	or restart or increase in level of operation to ermit at the installation in accordance with the		25			
Total (applies only when condition F has been breached)			(Max 75)			
Scoring for Component 2 - Ass	sessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Rec				_	
Criterion		Possible Scores		ores	Scores	
		Yes	No	N/A Awarde		
(A) Are emissions monitored as r Are emissions and emissions mo	equired in the permit? nitoring recorded as required in the permit?	0	10	0	0	
(B) Monitoring requirements reducempliance?	uced because results over time show consistent	0	0	0	0	
(C) Is an appropriate maintenanc	e schedule in place and available on request?	0	5	0	0	
(D) Fully documented and adh permit?	ered to maintenance programme, in line with	0	5	0	0	
(E) Full documented records as r	equired in permit available on-site?	0	5	0	0	
(F) Has the operator notified the	regulator promptly of all relocations of all plant?	-5	10	0	-5	
otal score			(-5 to 35)		-5	

Component 3 - Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility				
Criterion	Possible Scores			Scores
Criterion		No	N/A	Awarded
(A) Are procedures in place to ensure proper management, supervision and training for process operations, proper use of equipment and effective preventative maintenance on all plant and equipment concerned with the control of emissions to air?	0	5	θ	0
(B) Specific responsibilities assigned to individual staff for these procedures?	0	5	0	0
(C) Does the operator maintain, and make available on request, a statement of training requirements for each operational post?	0	5	0	0
(D) Are all staff with responsibility for operating the process sufficiently trained to be aware of their responsibilities under the permit, minimising emissions on start up and shut down and taking action to minimise emissions during abnormal conditions?	0	5	0	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	0	-5
Total	(-5 to 25) -5		-5	
Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal Range -10 to 110 (135)		10	-10	

Overall scores	Score given
Operator Performance Appraisal	
Compliance Assessment	0
Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Records	-5
Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility	-5
Total score	-10

OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROCESS	Range -10 to 110 (135)	-10
REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY		
* high=score of >55, medium 30-55 and low <30	LOW, MED, HIGH	LOW

Comments

Plant not seen in operation. Procedures and record keeping discussed with operator. Dust suppression is present on all crushers. Daily defect sheet is completed by the operator every day when the crusher is in use. Operators keep a daily record of monitoring emissions. Documentation checked by Philip.

The Operatives are trained in the use of the plant and also have NPORS &/or CPCS.

Mick George Ltd has ISO14001.