

# PERMIT CONDITIONS COMPLIANCE CHECK REPORT

Installation Address:	Knauf UK GMBH Immingham Docks Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN42 2NT	
Contact:	Debbie Rose	
Permit Ref:	200600005	
Date of Varied Permit:	Sin super	
Permitted activity:	Plaster Process	
Guidance Note:	3/12	
Date of Visit:	25/08/17	
Condition number:		
1 (monitoring records)	Daily which sheet.	
2 (adverse results)		
3 (visible emissions\)	the no visible emissions beyond site boundary	
4 (visual assessments)	Daily checks - recorded on the operators start of shirt Daily montains + weather states.	t checks
5 (monitoring)		
6 (breakdowns)	procedure in place.	
7 (adverse emissions)	procedure in place.	
8 (stockpiles/storage)	Compliant.	
9 (control techniques)	rain bird system	
10 (conveyors)		
14 (loading/unloading)		
12 (site layout)	* we road suseper available	
13 (roadways)	Beelsby provide induction with Drivers. f monthly meetings. NCR report wheel both in place.	ب رسد زدی م
14 (wheel-wash)		
15 (management)	0. K.	
16 (spares consumables)	main factory hold ran bird system.	
17 (staff training)	Staft induction.	

maintenance - to forward last service for rain bird + wheel wash.

Report Reference: -

Car issues

18 (training records)	Yes
19 (preventative maint.)	Ye s
20 (maint. techniques	* forward records.

### **Risk Assessment Score Sheet**

### **Environmental Impact Appraisal**

APRR Risk Rating Category	Possible	Score
	Scores	Awarded
(A) Category 1	10	10
(B) Category 2	20	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
(C) Category 3	30 🦯	

Component 2 - Progress with Upgrading				
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 PG Note deadline has passed	10			
(C) Upgrading complete and meets BATNEEC Requirements	0	0		
(D) Emissions control exceeds BATNEEC Requirements	-10			

# Component 3 - Sensitivity and Proximity of Receptors (circle appropriate score)

	Sensitivity of Receptors		
Proximity to Emission Source	(x) High	(y) Medium	(z) Low
(A) < 100m* Reason Humber Estuary designated a SSSI	20	12	5
(B) 100-250m*	12	10	3
(C) 250 - 500m*	5	3	1
(D) > 500m*	0	0	0

<sup>\*</sup> 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		
	Possible	Score
	Scores	Awarded
(A) Other air pollution problems in the local	10	Charles of the California
area to which process is a potential contributor		

Component 7 - Assessment of Management,	Trainir	ng and	l Resp	onsibility
	Possible Scores		Scores Awarded	
Criterion	(x) Yes	(y) No	(z) N/A	
(A) Documented procedures in place for implementing all aspects of the authorisation?	0	5	0	УО
(B) Specific responsibilities assigned to individual staff for these procedures?	0	5	0	y O
(C) Completion of individual responsibilities checked and recorded by the company?	0	5	0	y 6
(D) Documented training records for all staff with air pollution control responsibilities?	0	5	0	70
(E) Trained staff on site throughout periods where potentially air-polluting activities take place?	0	5	0	уо
(F) Is an 'appropriate' environmental management system in place?	-5	0	0	-5
Total	Ju. (-	5 to 2	5)	-5

to forward latest 15014001 cernficate.

Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal	Range -10 to	_ <
Jenny Control of the	105	

City of the second seco		
OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROCESS	Range -10 to 175	10
REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY * high=score of >80, medium 40-80 and low <40	LOW, MED, HIGH	Low

Officer: VICKY THOMPSON

Officer Signature: V- Thousand

Operator Signature DJROSQ-

Date: 25/08/17.

(B) No such air pollution problems	0	0
------------------------------------	---	---

Total Score for Environmental Impact Appraisal	Range 0 to 70	15 15

## **Operator Performance Appraisal**

Component 5 - Compliance Assessment		
Scale of Non-Compliance (Within 12 month	Possible	Score
period prior to review)	Scores	Awarded
(A) Incident leading to justified complaint but no	0 points	
breach of specific authorisation condition or of	~@	•
general/residual BATNEEC condition		
(B) Incident leading to a justified complaint*	5 per 💸	
	incident	O
(C) Breach of authorisation not leading to	10 per	
formal action (Updated by AQ 18)	breach	. O
(D) Incident leading to formal caution,	🏃 15 per	
Enforcement Notice or prosecution	incident	Ø.,
(E) Incident leading to a Prohibition Notice	20 per	and the second s
as a sure and a sure and a sure and a sure and a sure a sure and a sure	incident	
Total	(Max. 50)	11 S 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Q1		U

<sup>\*</sup> 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	Possible Scores			Score Awarded
Criterion	(x) Yes	(y) No	(z) N/A	
(A) All monitoring undertaken to the degree required in the authorisation?	0	10	0	<b>y</b> 0
(B) Monitoring requirements reduced because results over time show consistent compliance?	-5	0	0	ORIG
(C) Process operation modified where any problems indicated by monitoring?	0	5	0	ž \$
(D) Fully documented and adhered to maintenance programme, in line with authorisation?	0	5	0	خ 0
(E) Full documented records as required in authorisation available on-site?	0	5	0	y G
(F) All relevant documents forwarded to the authority by date required?	0	5	0	N/A O
Total score	(-5 to 30)			O