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

Name of authorised process/installation	Tarmac Trading Ltd, Cliff Quay, Ipswich, Suffolk, IP3 0BS.
Name of person with	Simon Fowler
whom sheet discussed	
Process Guidance Note	
Local Authority Reference	201908454
Inspector's Name	Ben Atkinson
Date	3 rd February 2020

Environmental Impact Appraisal

Component 1 – Inherent Environmental Impact Potential				
APRR Risk Rating Category	Risk Rating Category Possible Scores Awar			
(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	0			
(B) Upgrading not yet complete and PG Note deadline has passed	10	0			
(C) Upgrading complete and meets BATNEEC Requirements	0	0			
(D) Emissions control exceeds BATNEEC Requirements	-10	0			

Proximity to Emission Source	(x) High	/v/ Mad	
(A) . 100 · · · *		(y) Med	(z) Low
$(A) < 100m^*$	20	12	5
(B) 100 - 250m*	12	10	3
(C) 250 - 500m*	5	3	1
(D) >500m*	0	0	0

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	0
(B) No such air pollution problems	0	0

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	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	

^{*} 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	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 105	0
--	------------------	---

Overall Score for the Process	Range -10 to 195	25
Regulatory Effort Category High =>80, med = 40 - 80, low = <40	Low/Med/High	LOW