

PERMIT CONDITIONS COMPLIANCE CHECK REPORT

| Installation Address: | Fowler & Holden (Grimsby) Ltd Railway Street Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN32 7DB |
|--|---|
| Contact: | 6 |
| Permit Ref: | EP/200200008 |
| Date of Varied Permit: | 20.07.06 |
| Permitted activity: | Foundry process |
| Guidance Note: | PG2/4 (04) |
| Date of Visit: | 19.06.18 |
| Report Reference: | ISW1 |
| Condition number: | |
| 1.1 | Permit review required – VT to start |
| | process 2018 |
| 1.2 Upgrades? | New extraction system and 1 dilution 20% of new send aweed |
| 2.1 no persistent fumes or mist? | 20 tomes new send into the |
| 2.2 No offensive odour beyond site | Offensive odour witnessed by officers (NELC |
| boundary? | Officers VT & LH) beyond site boundary on the |
| | 20.06.17. Site visit made following receipt of |
| | complaint. |
| 2.3 emissions from inductotherm free fro | m compliant |
| visible smoke? | |
| 3.1 visual assessments recorded once a | day? At furnace roof extractor? yes |
| | Sand reclamation filter units? Yes. |
| | Return silo filter? Yes |
| | Double ended grinder fettling booth and rotary barrel |
| | shot blast filter unit? \(\forall e5 \)- |
| 3.2 Alphaset sand reclamation unit inspe | |
| for correct operation and recorded? | and recorded Records held on site from Eurotek |
| | on site from Finalek |

on site from Eurotek to add bland ratio to report.

| 3.3 Bag filter and | I prv to sand silo cleaned and | Every day inspealed and |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| inspected monthly | ? | Cheaned and 6 monthly is |
| Recorded? | | inspection. |
| 3.4 Arrestment p | lant serviced annually | available. compe |
| 3.5 logbook avail | lable and up to date | Yes. Checked LEV extraction completed total Sun Allianze + |
| 3.6 usage rates | of green sand reclamation | zurich. |
| recorded? | - | D Yes. |
| 4.1 reclaimed sa | nd stored in silo, sealed bags | + some sand stored in open man. |
| or closed skip? | | One skin full and covered but issue |
| 4.2 Suitable du | st control measures | with collection |
| utilised for storag | ge and movement of | |
| potentially dusty | materials? | D Y23. |
| 4.3 spillage proc | edure. no dry sweeping | compliant. |
| method to be used | Í | |
| 4.4 All processe | es likely to emit particulate | Sheltered boilding. |
| matter into the a | ir excluding the storage | extration system in |
| and transfer of ra | aw and waste materials | place. |
| shall be undertal | ken in an enclosed area | |
| or sheltered bu | ilding to minimise | |
| emissions to air. | This condition shall apply | |
| to knock out ope | erations. | |
| 4.5 Handling of | of residues | 0. Le. |
| 4.6 Silos fitted | with arrestment plant? | Yes. |
| 4.7 | | + VT needs to add condition |
| 4.8 | | for additional sound and |
| | | Cuenicals sted. 1 |
| | ation unit fitted with dust | Yes. |
| extraction and ope | erational? Serviced? | |
| 5.1 All mixing | of sand and binders | not completely enclosed. |
| and mould form | nation should be | The building has some openings |
| undertaken in | enclosed areas | and verhicled. |
| | nated material – procedure to | Compleat. |
| | | |
| ensure not introdu | iced to prevent odour | |
| | / abnormal emission | |
| 7.1 breakdowns | / abnormal emission | Yes. |
| 7.1 breakdowns recorded, procedu | / abnormal emission | Yes. |
| 7.1 breakdowns | / abnormal emission ures in place? | Yes. Compliant. Firm in writing sand trial |

and new procedure for send dilution (now 20%.
new sand used). and confirm extraction systems installed. Howe independent calibrations.

Report Reference: -

Risk Assessment Score Sheet

Environmental Impact Appraisal

| Component 1 - Inherent Environmental Impact Potential | | | | |
|---|--------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| APRR Risk Rating Category | Possible Scores | Score Awarded | | |
| (A) Category 1 | 10 | CARLES CONTROL OF THE | | |
| (B) Category 2 | 20 | A Description of | | |
| (C) Category 3 | 30 | 30 | | |

| Component 2 - Progress with Upgrading | | |
|--|--------------------|------------------|
| Status of Upgrading | Possible Scores | Score Awarded |
| (A) Upgrading not complete but PG Note | 5 | |
| deadline has yet to be reached | | |
| (B) Upgrading not yet complete and PG Note | 10 | 10 |
| deadline has passed | | |
| (C) Upgrading complete and meets BATNEEC | 0 | |
| Requirements | | |
| (D) Emissions control exceeds BATNEEC | -10 | |
| Requirements | <i></i> | |

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

| Sensitivity of Recep | | | |
|---|-------------|---------------|------------|
| 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 |

^{*} 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 Scores | Score Awarded | | |
| (A) Other air pollution problems in the local area to which process is a potential contributor | 10 | 10 | | |
| (B) No such air pollution problems | 0 | | | |

| Total Score for Environmental Impact Appraisal | Range 0 to 70 | 62 |
|--|------------------|----|
|--|------------------|----|

Operator Performance Appraisal

| Component 5 - Compliance Assessment | | |
|--|--------------------|------------------|
| Scale of Non-Compliance (Within 12 month period prior to review) | Possible Scores | Score Awarded |
| (A) Incident leading to justified complaint but no breach of specific authorisation condition or of general/residual BATNEEC condition | 0 points | 0 |
| (B) Incident leading to a justified complaint* | 5 per incident | 0 |
| (C) Breach of Condition not leading to formal action (Updated by AQ 18) | 10 per breach | 0 |
| (D) Incident leading to formal caution, Enforcement Notice or prosecution | 15 per incident | 0 |
| (E) Incident leading to a Prohibition Notice | 20 per incident | 0 |
| 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.

| | 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 | YO |
| (B) Monitoring requirements reduced because results over time show consistent compliance? | -5 | 0 | 0 | y 0 |
| (C) Process operation modified where any problems indicated by monitoring? | 0 | 5 | 0 | YO |
| (D) Fully documented and adhered to maintenance programme, in line with authorisation? | 0 | 5 | 0 | 70 |
| (E) Full documented records as required in authorisation available on-site? | 0 | 5 | 0 | уО |
| (F) All relevant documents forwarded to the authority by date required? | 0 | 5 | 0 | NIA O |
| Total score | (- | 5 to 3 | 0) | 0 |

| Component 7 - Assessment of Management, | Trainii | ng and | d 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 | Y O |
| (B) Specific responsibilities assigned to individual staff for these procedures? | 0 | 5 | 0 | 40 |
| (C) Completion of individual responsibilities checked and recorded by the company? | 0 | 5 | 0 | 70 |
| (D) Documented training records for all staff with air pollution control responsibilities? | 0 | 5 | 0 | YO |
| (E) Trained staff on site throughout periods where potentially air-polluting activities take place? | 0 | 5 | 0 | YO |
| (F) Is an 'appropriate' environmental management system in place? | -5 | 0 | 0 | 7 0 |
| Total | (- | 5 to 2 | 5) | 0 |

| Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal | Range -10 to 105 | 0 |
|--|---------------------|------|
| OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROCESS | Range -10 to 175 | 62 |
| REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY | LOW, MED, | 0050 |

MED

HIGH

Officer: VICKY THOMPSON

Officer Signature: V. Thouse.

Operator Signature

* high=score of >80, medium 40-80 and low <40

Date: 19.06.18