Huntingdonshire

Risk Assessment for Local Air Pollution Control Score Sheet

Name of permitted activity	Lafarge Aggregates Ltd	PG Note	1/3 (04)
Name of operator	Richard Symonds	LA Reference	5/93
Inspector's Name	Aaron Morley	Date	10/3/07

Environmental Impact Appraisal

Component 1 - Inherent Environmental Impact Potential				
APRR Risk Rating Category	Possible Scores	Score Awarded		
(A) Category 1	10	10		
(B) Category 2	20			
(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 BAT Requirements	0	0		
(D) Emissions control exceeds BAT Requirements	-10			

Component 3 - Sensitivity and Proximity of Receptors				
Sensitivity of Receptors				
High	Medium	Low		
20		5		
12	10	3		
5	3	1		
0	0	0		
	High 20 12 5	High Medium 20 12 10 5 3		

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		
(B) No such air pollution problems		0	

Total Score for Environmental Impact Appraisal	Range 0 to 70	22

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		

<u>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.</u>

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?		10	0	0
(B) Monitoring requirements reduced because results over time show consistent compliance?	-5	0		0
(C) Process operation modified where any problems indicated by monitoring?		5	0	0
(D) Fully documented and adhered to maintenance programme, in line with permit?	0		0	5
(E) Full documented records as required in permit available on-site?		5	0	0
(F) All relevant documents forwarded to the authority by date required?	0	5		0
Total score		(-5 to 30)		5

Component 7 - Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility

Criterion		Possible Scores		
		No	N/A	Awarded
(A) Documented procedures in place for implementing all aspects of the permit?		5	0	0
(B) Specific responsibilities assigned to individual staff for these procedures?		5	0	0
(C) Completion of individual responsibilities checked and recorded by the company?		5	0	0
(D) Documented training records for all staff with air pollution control responsibilities?	П	5	0	0
(E) Trained staff on site throughout periods where potentially air-polluting activities take place?		5	0	0
(F) Is an 'appropriate' environmental management system in place?		0	0	-5
Total		(-5 to 25)		-5
Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal	Range	-10 to 10	5	0

OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROECSS	Range -10 to 175	22
REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY * high=score of >80, medium 40-80 and low <40	LOW, MED, HIGH	Low