

LA-PPC Inspection Report

General Information

Inspection Type	Concrete Crusher
Local Authority	Harlow District Council
Site Name and Address	R. B. Whitbread (Plant Hire) Ltd. Roydon Lee Farm, Roydon Road, Harlow, Essex. CM19 5DU.
Installation Type	Mobile Crushing Equipment
Permit Reference	EPR/3-16 Whitbread
Site Representative Seen	Chris Whitbread
Local Authority representative;	Steven Adams, Senior Environmental Health Officer
Inspection Date	3 rd March 2016
Report Date	9 th March 2016
Duration of Inspection	1 hour
Review of permit conditions undertaken	Permit review not required

Recent History

	Comments	Action
Number of complaints received	None	None
Process/Installation changes	None	None

Future Developments

	Comments	Action
Information relating to EPR	None	None
Other relevant information	None	None

Risk Assessment

Risk Assessment Score	35 (Low)
Summary of changes	Now a reduced fee activity an environmental impact appraisal not required

Summary of Inspection

During the period under review no complaints have been received by the operator or regulator.
Limited crusher runs have taken place on site.
Stock piles remain high.
Maintenance operations have been partly outsourced.

Actions Required

Reference to any breach of condition (or not) and other compliance issues as necessary	Records show only once a day monitoring emissions No training records available for the awareness of permit conditions and potential environmental impacts.
Other relevant information	None

Inspection Notes

Weather Conditions	Dry & calm
---------------------------	------------

Unique/Abnormal Site Hazards to take into consideration.	Access to the site is across a golf course
---	--

Compliance Checking

Inspection List	✓, ✗ or N/A	Observations	Action Required
1. Asbestos shall not be crushed or screened	✓	Asbestos is not crushed or handled. No asbestos was seen at time of visit.	None
2. Plant movement's notifications?	✓	No plant movements have taken place during the period under review	None
3. No visible emissions of particulate matter beyond the installation boundary?	✓	No visual emissions during inspection	None
4. Daily visual assessment during start up and at least two more occasions each day? Particulate matter Smoke <i>Observations recorded?</i>	✗	Records show only once a day monitoring	Observations to be recorded on startup and twice daily.

5. Plant and suppression maintenance recorded?	✓	6 Weekly maintenance schedule records up to date.	None
6. Dusty materials subject to suppression?	✓	Water suppression is not routinely employed but is available via hosepipes when required.	None
7. Crusher fitted with water suppression?	✓	Spray bars mounted on the crusher mouth, conveyor feed and discharge point.	None
8. Suitable water supply available? Crusher not used if water supply not available and is needed to control emissions?	✓	Water suppression is available if required.	None
9. Deposits of dust on plant shall be cleaned off at the end of each working day?	✓	Dust deposits are not routinely removed from equipment at the end of the day because the crusher is generally located behind the large stockpile where it is protected from wind whipping.	None
10. Processed material likely to generate dust conditioned with water prior to internal transfer?	✓	Water suppression is available if required.	None
11. Belt conveying in a way that prevents escape of visible emissions.	✓	Conveyor has sufficient capacity to handle max loads without spillage. Located where there is adequate wind protection.	None
12. Dusty materials or finished products arrive/leave site via a sheeted or fully enclosed vehicle.	x	Lorries are not routinely sheeted due to the elevated moisture content of the aggregates.	A regular visual check should be made to un-sheeted lorries arriving and leaving site. If there are visual dust emissions the lorries must be sheeted.
13. Roadways- consolidated surfaces that are kept clean and in good repair?	✓	Satisfactory	None
14. Vehicles not track materials onto highway?	✓	Aggregate is not tracked onto the highway. Some aggregate is deposited onto the access road but does not appear to create nuisance/ problems. The track leading the installation is in poor condition at the point where it joins Roydon Road. The operator has no obligation to maintain the road beyond the site boundary	None

<p>15. Records kept for 18 months and available for inspection?</p> <p>Manufacturer's instructions? <i>Log book with all inspections and observation checks?</i></p>	✓	Maintenance and observation records up to date.	None
<p>16. Staff training related to permitted activities</p> <p><i>Records?</i></p>	x	<p>Formal health & safety training records are available for use of the plant equipment.</p> <p>No training records available for the awareness of potential environmental impacts.</p>	<p>Staff training is required for understanding the impact of air emissions, proper site management and conditions being met to create a site that is substantially free from airborne particulate emissions.</p>
<p>17. BAT?</p>	x	Environmental Management System?	<p>Please provide a copy of your environmental management system.</p>
<p>18. Operator notifies regulator of any changes of plant.</p>	✓	New boundary fence to be installed	None

END

Risk Assessment – Mobile Plant

1 - Compliance Assessment; R.B. Whitbread (Plant Hire) Ltd

3rd March 2016

Scoring for Compliance Assessment

Scale of Non-Compliance	Possible Score	Score Awarded
(A) Incident leading to justified complaint but no breach of any specific permit condition or of the general/residual BAT condition.	0 points	0
(B) Incident leading to a justified complaint*.	5 points per incident	0
(C) Breach of permit not leading to formal action.	10 points per breach	0
(D) Incident leading to formal caution, Enforcement Notice or prosecution.	15 points per incident	0
(E) Incident leading to a Prohibition Notice or Suspension Notice.	20 points per incident	0
Total (Max. 50):		0

2 - Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Records

Scoring for Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Records

Criterion	Possible Score			Score Awarded
	Yes	No	N/A	
(A) Are emissions and emissions monitoring recorded as required in the permit?	0	10	0	10
(B) Process operation modified where any problems indicated by monitoring?	0	5	0	0
(C) Is an appropriate maintenance schedule in place and available on request?	0	5	0	0
(D) Full documented records as required in permit available on-site?	0	5	0	0
(E) Has operator notified the regulator promptly of all relocations of all plant?	-5	10	0	0
Total:				10

3 - Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility

Scoring for Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility

Criterion	Possible Score			Score Awarded
	Yes	No	N/A	
(A) Documented procedures in place for implementing all aspects of the permit?	0	5	0	5
(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	5
(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	5
(E) Trained staff on site throughout periods where potentially polluting activities take place?	0	5	0	0
(F) Is an 'appropriate' environmental management system in place and working effectively?	-5	0	0	0
Total:				15

4 - Determination of Regulatory Effort from Scores

OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROCESS	Range -10 to 175	25
REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY * high=score of >55, medium 30-55 and low <30	LOW, MED, HIGH	LOW