

LAPPC Environmental Permitting Regulations 2016 (As Amended),
Barrow Borough Council - Environmental Protection Team



Pollution Prevention and Control Act 1999 TOTAL RISK SCORE: -53
Part B Risk Assessment Scoresheet RISK RATING: LOW

Permit Holder Ref / Name :	PPC/B/21	Burlington Aggregates Ltd.
Contact Details:	Paul Cooper	
Address:	Yard B' Bouthwood Road, Barrow In Furness	
PG Notes / Description of Installation:	PG3/1	Blending/ Packing/ Loading
Date / Officer Carrying out Assessment:	31/01/2017	Geoff Dowker/ Simon Ohara

	Input	Score	Comments
Step 1 - Type of Installation (click for help)	Category 1	10	Mixed in vehicle/ just silos
Step 2 - Size factor	Simple Permit	-30	
Step 3 - Receptors (click for Help)	12	12	SSSI & Adjacent Businesses
Step 4 - No. of AQMA contibutory pollutants	0	0	None recorded

Step 5 - Compliance			
Number of incidents leading to justified complaint?	0	0	
Number of breaches of permit NOT leading to formal action?	0	0	
Number of incidents leading to Enforcement Notice?	0	0	
Number of incidents leading to a prohibition notice or suspension notice, simple caution, prosecution?	0	0	
Did operator fail to notify regulator upon restart or increase in operation to above mothball threshold?	No	0	
Risk Subtotal		-8	

Step 6 - Performance			
Is monitoring & recording undertaken as required in the permit?	Yes	-5	
Are monitoring requirements reduced because results over time show consistent compliance?	N/A	0	
Was appropriate action taken where any permit breaches identified?	N/A	0	
Is a fully documented and adhered to maintenance programme, in line with permit?	Yes	-5	
Are fully documented records as required in permit available on-site?	Yes	-5	
Have all relevant documents been forwarded to the Regulator by date required?	N/A	0	

Step 7 - Management Systems			
Are documented procedures in place for implementing all aspects of the permit?	Yes	-5	
Are specific responsibilities assigned to individual staff for these procedures?	Yes	-5	
Is completion of individual responsibilities checked and recorded by the company?	Yes	-5	
Are there documented training records for all staff with permit responsibilities?	Yes	-5	
Are trained staff on site throughout periods where potentially polluting activities take place?	Yes	-5	
Is there an 'appropriate' environmental management system in use?	Yes	-5	
Risk Mitigation Subtotal		-45	

General Comments:

* Despite sending a pre visit warning, no arrangements had been made for the inspection. However the site operative was more than accomidating and the inspection was undertaken. GDR & SOA visited the site during wet conditions. The yard surface was not adequately cleaned and aggregates covered most of the yard. This was leading to excessive trackout on the access road beyond the boundary. The site operative was warned about this and he does acquire the services of a road sweeper on a regular basis. GDR also noticed that sand material was being kept at a height above the bunding giving rise to potential dust nuisnace. All other permit conditions were being complied with. However SOA did raise concern about the surface run off and the drainage system employed. The sock and silo had been properly maintained and no other cause for concern was noted. The current work load was steady and no new employees had been trained at the point of inspection. END.