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

Name of authorised	Lebronze alloys UK, Bolton Aerospace, Hadleigh
process/installation	Road, Ipswich, Suffolk, IP2 0BD.
Name of person with	John McRoberts
whom sheet discussed	
SG Note	SG4
Local Authority Reference	wk/201901217
Inspector's Name	Ben Atkinson
Date	6 <sup>th</sup> June 2019

**Environmental Impact Appraisal** 

Component 1 – Inherent Environmental Impact Potential					
APRR Risk Rating Category Possible Score					
	Scores	Awarded			
(A) Category 1	10	0			
(B) Category 2	20	0			
(C) Category 3	30	30			

Component 2 - Progress with Upgrading				
Status of Upgrading	Possible Scores	Score Awarded		
(A) Upgrading not complete but SG Note deadline has yet to be reached	5	0		
(B) Upgrading not yet complete and SG Note deadline has passed	10	0		
(C) Upgrading complete and meets BAT Requirements	0	0		
(D) Emissions control exceeds BAT Requirements	-10	0		
(E) Improvement programme not submitted within 6 months of issue of permit	5	0		

Component 3 - Sensitivity and Proximi score)	ty of Receptors (ci	rcle approp	riate
	Sensit	tivity of Rec	eptors
Proximity to Emission Source	(x) High	(y) Med	(z) Low
(A) < 100m*	<u>20</u>	12	5
(B) 100 - 250m*	12	10	3
(C) 250 - 500m*	5	3	1
(D) >500m*	0	0	0

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	0		
(B) No such air pollution problems	0	0		

Total for Environmental Impact Appraisal	Range 0 to 70	50
--	---------------	----

## **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 BAT condition	0	0		
(B) Incident leading to a justified complaint*	10 per incident	0		
(C) Breach of authorisation not leading to formal action	10 per incident	0		
(D) Incident leading to formal caution, Enforcement Notice or prosecution	15 per incident	0		
(E) Incident leading to a Prohibition Notice or Suspension Notice	20 per incident	0		
Total	(Max 55)	0		

<sup>\*</sup> 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				
-	Pos	sible Sc		
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	0
(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)	)	0

Total for Operator Performance Appraisal	Range -10 to 125	0
--	------------------	---

Overall Score for the Process	Range -10 to 195	50
Regulatory Effort Category High =>80, med = 40 - 80, low = <40	Low/Med/High	MED