Huntingdonshire

Risk Assessment for Local Air Pollution Control Score Sheet

Name of authorised process

Boardcraft Limited

PG Note 6/2(04)

Name of operator

Bill Chambers LA Reference

6/92

Inspector's Name

Aaron Morley

Date 8/3/05

Environmental Impact Appraisal

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

Component 3 - Sensitivity and Proximity of Receptors (circle appropriate score)					
Proximity to Emission Source	Sensit	Sensitivity of Receptors			
	(x) High	(y) Medium	(z) Low		
(A) < 100m		12	5		
(B) 100 - 250m ²	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	11.7	
(B) No such air pollution problems	0	0	

Total Score for Environmental Impact Appraisal	Range 0 to 70	30

Component 5 - Compliance Assessment				
Scale of Non-Compliance	Possible Scores		2	Scores Awarded
(A) Incident leading to justified complaint but no breach of specific authorisation condition or of general/residual BATNEEC condition	0 points			
(B) Incident leading to a justified complaint	5 per incident			
(C) Breach of authorisation not leading to formal action	10 per incident			
(D) Incident leading to formal caution, Enforcement Notice or prosecution	15 per incident		29	
(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 unilinked to an incident at the process.</u>	reasonat	ole or which	cannot	be clearly
Scoring for Component 6 - Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Re	cords			
Criterion	Possible Scores			Score
	(x) Yes	(y) No	(z) N/A	Award d
(A) All monitoring undertaken to the degree required in the authorisation?		10	0	0
(B) Monitoring requirements reduced because results over time show consistent	-5	0		0

5

5

(-5 to 30)

Possible Scores

(y) No

5

5

5

5

(-5 to 25)

Range -10 to 105

Range -10 to 175

LOW, MED, HIGH

0

0

(z)

N/A

0

П

0

0

(x)

Yes

0

0

0

-5

0

5

0

5

Scores

Awarde

d

0

0

0

0

٥

0

5

35

LOW

(C) Process operation modified where any problems indicated by monitoring?

(D) Fully documented and adhered to maintenance programme, in line with

(E) Full documented records as required in authorisation available on-site?

Component 7 - Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility

(A) Documented procedures in place for implementing all aspects of the

(B) Specific responsibilities assigned to individual staff for these procedures?

(C) Completion of individual responsibilities checked and recorded by the

(D) Documented training records for all staff with air pollution control

(E) Trained staff on site throughout periods where potentially air-polluting

(F) Is an 'appropriate' environmental management system in place?

Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal

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

OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROECSS

REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY

(F) All relevant documents forwarded to the authority by date required?

authorisation?

Criterion

authorisation?

company?

Total

responsibilities?

activities take place?