

Risk Assessment for Local Air Pollution Control

Name of permitted activity:	David Smith St Ives Ltd	PG Note:	6/02(04) & 1/12 (04)	
Discussed with:	Jeremy Warren	LA Reference:	B09/94	
Inspector's Name:	Dave Bass	Date:	24 Sep. 08	

Environmental Impact Appraisal

Total Score for Environmental Impact Appraisal

Component 1 - Inherent Environmental Impact Potential				
APRR Risk Rating Category	Possible Scores		А	Score warded
(A) Category 1	10			
(B) Category 2	20		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			
Proximity to Emission Source	High	Mediu	ım	Low
(A) < 100m [*]	20	12		5
(B) 100 - 250m [*]	12	10		3
(C) 250 - 500m [*]	5	3		4
(D) >500m*	θ	θ		θ
[*] All distances should be multiplied by a factor of 2 for mineral and cement & combustion, incineration (not cremation), iron & steel and non-ferrous metal proc Note: Distances should be measured from the process itself, rather than the site	cesses.	s and by	a fac	tor of 4 foi
Component 4 - Other Targets				
	Possible Scores Score Awarde			
(A) Other air pollution problems in the local area to which process is a potential contributor	10			
(B) No such air pollution problems	0 0		0	

40

Range 0 to 70

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	

* 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.

ecords			
Possible Scores		Scores	
Yes	No	N/A	Awarded
0	10	Φ	0
-5	θ	0	0
θ	5	0	0
0	5	θ	0
0	5	Φ	0
0	5	θ	0
(-5 to 30) 0		0	
Possible Scores		Scores	
Yes	No	N/A	Awarded
0	5	θ	0
0	5	θ	0
0	5	θ	0
0	5	θ	0
0	5	θ	0
-5	θ	θ	-5
(-5 to 25) -5			
Range	e -10 to 10)5	-5
	Pos Yes 0 -5 θ 0 -5	Possible Sco Yes No 0 40 -5 0 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 5 Yes No 0 5	Possible Scores Yes No N/A 0 40 0 -5 0 0 -5 0 0 0 5 0 0 5 0 0 5 0 0 5 0 0 5 0 0 5 0 0 5 0 0 5 0 70 5 0 7 No N/A 0 5 0 10 5 0 0 5 0 0 5 0 0 5 0 0 5 0 0 5 0 0 5 0 0 5 0 0 5 0

Overall scores	Score given
Environmental Impact Appraisal	
Inherent Environmental Impact Potential	20
Progress with Upgrading	0
Sensitivity and Proximity of Receptors	20
Other Targets	0
Operator Performance Appraisal	
Compliance Assessment	0
Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Records	0
Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility	-5
Total score	35

OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROECSS	Range -10 to 175	35
REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY		
* high=score of >80, medium 40-80 and low <40	LOW, MED, HIGH	LOW

Comments

Daily checks on emissions are kept. Procedures and training are in place for working the machines

and maintenance on machines is undertaken and recorded. Emissions monitoring is undertaken

in February each year.