Risk Assessment Method for Local Air Pollution Control Score Sheet Revised July 2013

Name of authorised	Bradleys [Stowmarket] Ltd
process/installation	
Name of person with	Doug Renwick
whom sheet discussed	
Process Guidance Note	Pg6/23(11)
Local Authority Reference	C/VPA/02/11
Inspector's Name	Louise Burns
Date	27/2/14

Environmental Impact Appraisal

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

(x) High 20	(y) Med	(z) Low
20	12	5
	• • •) i
12	10	3
5	3	1
0	0	0
	5 0 or minera	

steel and non-ferrous metal processes.

Note: Distances should be measured from the process itself, rather than the site boundary.

Component 3 – 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 for Environmental Impact Appraisal	Range 0 to 70	32
--	---------------	----

Operator Performance Appraisal

Component 5 - Compliance Assessment		
Scale of Non-Compliance	Possible Scores	Score Awarded
(A) Incident leading to justified complaint but no breach of any specific authorisation condition or of the general/residual BATNEEC condition	0	
(B) Incident leading to a justified complaint*	10 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	
(E) Incident leading to a Prohibition Notice or Suspension Notice	20 per incident	
Total	(Max 55)	

^{*} 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			
Criterion	(x) Yes	(y) No	(z) N/A	Score Awarded
(A) All monitoring undertaken to the degree required in the authorisation?	0	10	0	0
(B) Monitoring requirements reduced because results over time show consistent compliance?	-5	0	0	0
(C) Process operation modified where any problems indicated by monitoring?	0	10	0	0

(D) Fully documented and adhered to	0	10	0	0
maintenance programme, in line with				
authorisation?				
(E) Full documented records as required in	0	5	0	0
authorisation available on-site?				
(F) All relevant documents forwarded to	0	10	0	0
the authority by date required?				
Total Score		(-5 to 45)	0

Component 7 - Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility				
-	Possible Scores			
Criterion	(x) Yes	(y) No	(z) N/A	Score Awarded
(A) Documented procedures in place for implementing all aspects of the authorisation?	0	5	0	0
(B) Specific responsibilities assigned to individual staff for these procedures?	0	5	0	0
(C) Completion of individual responsibilities checked and recorded by the company?	0	5	0	0
(D) Documented training records for all staff with air pollution control responsibilities?	0	5	0	5
(E) Trained staff on site throughout periods where potentially air-polluting activities take place?	0	5	0	0
(F) Is an 'appropriate' environmental management system in place?	-5	0	0	0
Total Score		(-5 to 25))	5

	Range -10 to 105	5
--	------------------	---

Overall Score for the Process	Range -10 to 195	37
Regulatory Effort Category High =>80, med = 40 - 80, low = <40	Low/Med/High	low