

---

# APPENDIX J: IMPACT RATING METHODOLOGY AND ASSESSMENT TABLES

## 1.1 Impact Rating Methodology

The assessment of the potential environmental and social impacts was based on the project team's professional judgement, field observations and desk-top analysis. The significance of potential impacts that may result from the proposed closure and remediation was determined to assist decision-makers, specifically the DEA&DP and to some extent also the Applicant.

The standard Legacy EMC impact/risk rating method has been adopted to enable the author to determine the overall impact of the proposed activities by collating the information at hand into a uniform rating matrix.

The following methodology has been applied to the prediction and assessment of impacts. Potential impacts have been rated in terms of the direct, indirect, and cumulative nature of the impact:

- **Direct** impacts – are impacts that are caused directly by the activity and generally occur at the same time and at the place of the activity. These impacts are usually associated with the construction, operation or maintenance of an activity and are generally obvious and quantifiable;
- **Indirect** impacts – of an activity are indirect or induced changes that may occur because of the activity. These types of impacts include all the potential impacts that do not manifest immediately when the activity is undertaken, or which occur at a different place as a result of the activity;
- **Cumulative** impacts – are impacts that result from the incremental impact of the proposed activity on a common resource when added to the impacts of other past, present or reasonably foreseeable future activities. Cumulative impacts can occur from the collective impacts of individual minor actions over a period and can include both direct and indirect impacts.

The significance of each potential impact, with and without the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, will be assessed based on the following variables (evaluation components):

- Spatial extent – The size of the area that will be affected by the impact;
- Intensity – The anticipated severity of the impact;
- Duration – The timeframe during which the impact will be experienced;
- Probability – The probability of the impact occurring;
- Reversibility – The “reversibility” of the environmental impacts of the proposed development after project cessation or decommissioning; and
- Irreplaceability – The “irreplaceability” of natural characteristics in the area that may be impacted upon by the proposed development.

Using the criteria above, the impacts will further be assessed with the use of quantifiable values as described below:

**Table 1: Evaluation of criteria by means of quantitative ratings and descriptions.**

Criteria	Description	Quantitative Rating
<b>Duration</b>	Temporary (less than a year)	1
	Short term (1 to 6 years)	2
	Medium term (6 to 15 years)	3
	Long term (the impact will cease after the operational life of the activity)	4
	Permanent (mitigation will not occur in such a way or in such a time span than the impact can be considered transient)	5
<b>Spatial extent</b>	Site specific	1
	Local (less than 2 km from the site);	2
	Regional (within 30 km of the site)	3
	National (beyond Provincial boundaries and within National boundaries)	4
	International / Transboundary (Beyond National boundaries)	5
<b>Intensity / Magnitude Applicable to Negative Impacts (at indicated spatial extent)</b>	None (Biophysical and/or social functions and/or processes will remain unaltered)	0
	Very Low (Biophysical and/or social functions and/or processes might be negligibly altered)	2
	Low (Biophysical and/or social functions and/or processes might be slightly altered)	4
	Medium (Biophysical and/or social functions and/or processes might be notably altered)	6
	High (Biophysical and/or social functions and/or processes might be considerably altered)	8
	Very High (Biophysical and/or social functions and/or processes might be severely altered)	10
<b>Intensity / Magnitude Applicable to Positive Impacts (at indicated spatial extent)</b>	None (Biophysical and/or social functions and/or processes will remain unaltered)	0
	Very Low (Biophysical and/or social functions and/or processes might be negligibly enhanced)	2
	Low (Biophysical and/or social functions and/or processes might be slightly enhanced)	4
	Medium (Biophysical and/or social functions and/or processes might be notably enhanced)	6
	High (Biophysical and/or social functions and/or processes might be considerably enhanced)	8
	Very High (Biophysical and/or social functions and/or processes might be substantially enhanced)	10
<b>Probability</b>	Improbable (5% to no chance of occurring)	1
	Probable (5% - 25% chance of occurring)	2
	Medium Probability (25% - 75% chance of occurring)	3
	Highly probable (75% - 95% chance of occurring)	4
	Definite (greater than 95% chance of occurring)	5

Criteria	Description	Quantitative Rating
<b>Reversibility</b>	No impact	0
	Impact will be reversible	1
	High potential that impact might be reversed	2
	Moderate potential that impact might be reversed	3
	Low potential that impact might be reversed	4
	Impact cannot be reversed	5
<b>Irreplaceability</b>	None	0
	Very low potential for loss of irreplaceable resources	1
	Low potential for loss of irreplaceable resources	2
	Moderate potential for loss of irreplaceable resources	3
	High potential for loss of irreplaceable resources.	4
	Definite loss of irreplaceable resources	5
<b>CUMULATIVE impact</b>	<b>High:</b> The activity is one of several similar pasts, present or future activities in the same geographical area, and might contribute to a very significant combined impact on the natural, cultural, and/or socio-economic resources of local, regional or national concern.	
	<b>Medium:</b> The activity is one of a few similar pasts, present or future activities in the same geographical area, and might have a combined impact of moderate significance on the natural, cultural, and/or socio-economic resources of local, regional or national concern.	
	<b>Low:</b> The activity is localised and might have a negligible cumulative impact.	
	<b>None:</b> No cumulative impact on the environment.	

Once the evaluation components have been ranked for each impact, the significance of the potential impact is assessed (or calculated) using the following formula:

$$SP \text{ (significance points)} = (\text{intensity} + \text{duration} + \text{spatial extent} + \text{irreplaceable} + \text{reversibility}) \times \text{probability.}$$

The maximum value is 150 SP (significance points). The unmitigated and mitigated scenarios for each environmental impact should be rated as per the table below (Table 2).

**Table 2: Definition of significance ratings (positive and negative)**

Significance Points	Environmental Significance	Description
125 – 150	Very high (VH)	An impact of high or very high significance could influence a decision about whether or not to proceed with the proposed Project, regardless of available mitigation options.
100 – 124	High (H)	<b>Cumulative Impacts:</b> The activity is one of several similar pasts, present or future activities in the same geographical area, and might contribute to a very significant combined impact on the natural, cultural, and/or socio-economic resources of local, regional or national concern.
75 – 99	Moderate-high (MH)	If left unmanaged, an impact of moderate-high significance could influence a decision about whether or not to proceed with the proposed Project. Mitigation options should be re-evaluated.

Significance Points	Environmental Significance	Description
40 – 74	Moderate (M)	If left unmanaged, an impact of moderate significance could influence a decision about whether or not to proceed with the proposed Project. <b>Cumulative Impacts:</b> The activity is one of a few similar pasts, present or future activities in the same geographical area, and might have a combined impact of moderate significance on the natural, cultural, and/or socio-economic resources of local, regional or national concern.
<40	Low (L)	An impact of low significance is likely to contribute to positive decisions about whether or not to proceed with the proposed Project. It will have little real effect and is unlikely to have an influence on project design or alternative motivation. <b>Cumulative Impacts:</b> The activity is localised and might have a negligible cumulative impact.
+	Positive impact (+)	A positive impact is likely to result in a positive consequence/effect and is likely to contribute to positive decisions about whether or not to proceed with the proposed Project.

## 1.2 Impact Assessment

This section of the Report aims to assess and describe potential negative and positive impacts relating to the affected environment that may occur due to the proposed closure and rehabilitation of the NGK Ceramics facility. The identification of issues covers only the **closure phase** of the NGK Ceramics facility. The potential impacts have been subjected to a detailed assessment per the methodology outlined above, including potential biophysical and socio-economic impacts. Recommended mitigation measures associated with each impact are also provided in each section.

The following alternatives are considered in this application:

- **Preferred Alternative:** The preferred alternative is for the closure and decommissioning of the NGK ceramics facility. This would require the dismantling, demolition, recycling, and rehabilitation of the following:
  - Three (3) LPG Bullets, along with associated pipelines and supply lines from the bullets to various locations within the facility. Note that the removal of the above-ground installation of LPG bullets is the responsibility of Easigas, the owner.
  - The fire wall situated behind the LPG bullets will be demolished and recycled or disposed at landfill subject to acceptance and appropriateness.
  - Three (3) Shuttle Kilns, will be demolished, and scrap metal will be recycled. Any holes and or excavations as a result of the removal of the kilns will be infilled and rehabilitated.
  - Two stacks, the heat exchanger, and the RTO infrastructure will be demolished, and scrap metal will be recycled.
  - All dust and emissions abatement systems, along with associated installations, will be dismantled, with scrap metal primarily recycled or disposed of appropriately.
- **No-go Alternative:** The No-Go Alternative is defined as the status quo of the site. In this instance, the status quo means that the existing NGK Ceramics South Africa Facility will remain in

operation. This alternative is not possible due to an executive decision resulting from a sustained decline in customer demand. The financial impracticality of sustaining operations in South Africa arose from diminished production levels. The swift transition from combustible engines to electric vehicles adversely affected the business. As such the no-go alternative considered is that the facility and infrastructure is to remain but that all activities and operations at the facility cease. It must also be noted that the no-go alternative will result in the closure of a facility but not allowing for the facility to be demolished and rehabilitated to allow for the proper closure of the facility and its operations.

The impacts assessed for each alternative, including the No-Go alternative, are as follows:

- Nuisances (i.e., Dust, Odours, Noise, etc.).
- Air pollution.
- Visual impact.
- Impact on soil and groundwater.
- Community safety.
- Impact on bulk services / resources.
- Waste Management.
- Socio-Economic impacts (i.e., employment, contribution to the economy).

The Tables below provide the significance ratings for potential impacts that may result from the construction phase of the proposed development for all alternatives, as relevant to the unmitigated and mitigated scenarios for each impact. Activities associated with this project phase mainly involve site clearance and construction activities. The EMPr elaborates on the mitigation measures associated with the relevant impacts.

### 1.2.1 Direct Impact: Nuisances (i.e., Dust, Odours, Noise, and Traffic)

Nuisances –		
PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE		
<b>Nature of Impact:</b> Demolition activities associated with the closure and rehabilitation of the facility may be a source of localised noise, odours, dust, and/or traffic during the demolition phase which includes the removal of infrastructure.		
Criteria	Rating Before mitigation	Rating After mitigation
Status and Nature of the Impact	Negative	Negative
Magnitude	Very Low (2)	Very Low (2)
Duration	Temporary (1)	Temporary (1)
Spatial extent	Local (2)	Site specific (1)
Irreplaceability of resources	Very Low (1)	Very Low (1)
Reversibility of impact	Reversible (1)	Reversible (1)
Probability of impact occurring	Highly Probable (4)	Probable (2)
<b>TOTAL (SP) / Significance</b>	<b>Low Negative (28)</b>	<b>Low Negative (12)</b>
<b>Cumulative impacts</b>	<b>Low Negative</b>	<b>Low Negative</b>
<b>Proposed Mitigation Measures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit working hours to daylight hours.</li> <li>• Use dust suppression techniques (e.g., spraying bare surfaces with non-potable water and limiting driving speeds).</li> <li>• Stockpiled materials from which dust could be generated should be covered or kept moist during windy periods.</li> <li>• Ensure silencers are installed on all vehicles.</li> <li>• Any complaints must be investigated, sources identified, and mitigation measures implemented.</li> <li>• Noise generated from demolition activities must comply with the Western Cape Noise Control Regulations.</li> </ul>	

NO-GO ALTERNATIVE		
Nature of Impact: The no-go alternative shall result in the cessation of all activities and or nuisances resulting from operations at the facility.		
Criteria	Rating Before mitigation	Rating After mitigation
Status and Nature of the Impact	Positive	No mitigation is needed, as it is a positive impact.
Magnitude	Medium (6)	
Duration	Long term (4)	
Spatial extent	Local (2)	
Irreplaceability of resources	None (0)	
Reversibility of impact	No Impact (0)	
Probability of impact occurring	Highly Probable (4)	
<b>TOTAL (SP) / Significance</b>	<b>Moderate Positive (48)</b>	
<b>Cumulative impacts</b>	<b>Moderate Positive</b>	
Proposed Mitigation Measures	No mitigation necessary as it is a positive impact.	

### 1.2.2 Direct Impact: Air Quality

#### Impact on Air Quality –

**PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE**

**Nature of Impact:** Impacts on air quality from the cessation of manufacturing operations which generate air pollution, i.e. operation of the kilns which is fuelled from the firing of LPG.

Criteria	Rating Before mitigation	Rating After mitigation
Status and Nature of the Impact	Positive	No mitigation is needed, as it is a positive impact.
Magnitude	Medium (6)	
Duration	Long term (4)	
Spatial extent	Local (2)	
Irreplaceability of resources	None (0)	
Reversibility of impact	No Impact (0)	
Probability of impact occurring	Highly Probable (4)	
<b>TOTAL (SP) / Significance</b>	<b>Moderate Positive (48)</b>	
<b>Cumulative impacts</b>	<b>Moderate Positive</b>	
<b>Proposed Mitigation Measures</b>	No mitigation necessary as it is a positive impact.	

**NO-GO ALTERNATIVE**

**Nature of Impact:** Impacts on air quality from the cessation of manufacturing operations which generate air pollution, i.e. operation of the kilns which is fuelled from the firing of LPG. Impacts are the same as that of the preferred alternative.

Status and Nature of the Impact	No additional impact linked to project site will be realised.
---------------------------------	---

**1.2.3 Direct Impact: Visual Impact**

**Visual Impact –**

**Nature of Impact:** Demolition activities associated with the closure and rehabilitation of the facility may be a source of temporary localised visual impacts during the demolition phase which includes the removal of infrastructure.



PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE		
Criteria	Rating Before mitigation	Rating After mitigation
Status and Nature of the Impact	Negative	Negative
Magnitude	Low (4)	Very Low (2)
Duration	Temporary (1)	Temporary (1)
Spatial extent	Local (2)	Site specific (1)
Irreplaceability of resources	Very Low (1)	Very Low (1)
Reversibility of impact	Reversible (1)	Reversible (1)
Probability of impact occurring	Highly Probable (4)	Probable (2)
<b>TOTAL (SP) / Significance</b>	<b>Low Negative (36)</b>	<b>Low Negative (12)</b>
<b>Cumulative impacts</b>	<b>Low Negative</b>	<b>Low Negative</b>
<b>Proposed Mitigation Measures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Screening of the demolition areas, if possible.</li> <li>• Progressive rehabilitation.</li> </ul>	

NO-GO ALTERNATIVE	
<b>Nature of Impact:</b> The no-go alternative shall not result in any visual impacts other than the status-quo of the facility as it currently stands.	
<b>Status and Nature of the Impact</b>	No additional impact linked to project site will be realised.

### 1.2.4 Direct Impact: Soil and Groundwater

Soil and Groundwater Impacts –	
<b>Nature of Impact:</b> Soil and groundwater may be impacted as a result of the demolition of existing infrastructure. The impact is not likely to be significant owing to the impermeable nature of the current facility footprint. In addition, all infrastructure in which dangerous goods are stored, i.e., LPG installations are aboveground and shall not pose a threat to soil and groundwater during the demolition and or removal of the installation.	
PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE	

Soil and Groundwater Impacts –		
Criteria	Rating Before mitigation	Rating After mitigation
Status and Nature of the Impact	Negative	Negative
Magnitude	Low (4)	Very Low (2)
Duration	Temporary (1)	Temporary (1)
Spatial extent	Local (2)	Local (2)
Irreplaceability of resources	Moderate (3)	Low (2)
Reversibility of impact	Moderate (3)	Reversible (1)
Probability of impact occurring	Medium (3)	Probable (2)
<b>TOTAL (SP) / Significance</b>	<b>Low Negative (39)</b>	<b>Low Negative (16)</b>
<b>Cumulative impacts</b>	<b>Low Negative</b>	<b>Low Negative</b>
Proposed Mitigation Measures	•	
<b>NO-GO ALTERNATIVE</b>		
<b>Nature of Impact:</b> The no-go alternative shall not result in any soil and groundwater impacts other than the status-quo of the facility as it currently stands with the cessation of all operations.		
Status and Nature of the Impact	No additional impact linked to project site will be realised.	

### 1.2.5 Direct Impact: Community Safety

Community Safety –	
<b>Nature of Impact:</b> Closure and rehabilitation of the site will involve the “making safe” of the existing LPG installation which will involve the flare-off of the remaining gas kept in the LPG tanks and the site being declared gas free. In doing so the facility will no longer be determined to be an MHI (Major Hazard Installation). Refer to the letter from the MHI specialists in Appendix N.	
<b>PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE</b>	

Criteria	Rating Before mitigation	Rating After mitigation
Status and Nature of the Impact	Positive	No mitigation is needed, as it is a positive impact.
Magnitude	Medium (6)	
Duration	Permanent (4)	
Spatial extent	Regional (3)	
Irreplaceability of resources	None (0)	
Reversibility of impact	No impact (0)	
Probability of impact occurring	Highly Probable (4)	
<b>TOTAL (SP) / Significance</b>	<b>Moderate Positive (52)</b>	
<b>Cumulative impacts</b>	<b>Moderate Positive</b>	
<b>Proposed Mitigation Measures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No mitigation necessary as it is a positive impact.</li> </ul>	
<b>NO-GO ALTERNATIVE</b>		
<b>Nature of Impact:</b> Impacts on community safety from the cessation of manufacturing operations are determined to be the same as that of the preferred alternative because as a result of the cessation of activities the facility will cease to store LPG and therefore will ultimately still be declassified as an MHI.		

**1.2.6 Direct Impact: Impact on bulk services / resources.**

Impact on bulk services / resources –		
<b>Nature of Impact:</b> Closure and rehabilitation of the site will involve the cessation of use of resources until such time that a new owner purchases the facility. This will result in the interim cessation of resource use i.e. water supply, sanitation services, electricity supply etc.		
<b>PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE</b>		
Criteria	Rating Before mitigation	Rating After mitigation
Status and Nature of the Impact	Positive	No mitigation is needed, as it is a positive impact.

<b>Magnitude</b>	Medium (6)
<b>Duration</b>	Short term (2)
<b>Spatial extent</b>	Regional (3)
<b>Irreplaceability of resources</b>	None (0)
<b>Reversibility of impact</b>	Reversible (1)
<b>Probability of impact occurring</b>	Highly Probable (4)
<b>TOTAL (SP) / Significance</b>	<b>Moderate Positive (48)</b>
<b>Cumulative impacts</b>	<b>Moderate Positive</b>
<b>Proposed Mitigation Measures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No mitigation necessary as it is a positive impact.</li> </ul>

**NO-GO ALTERNATIVE**

**Nature of Impact:** Impacts on bulk services / resources from the cessation of manufacturing operations are determined to be the same as that of the preferred alternative because as a result of the cessation of activities the facility will involve the cessation of use of resources until such time that a new owner purchases the facility.

**1.2.7 Direct Impact: Waste Impact Management**

<b>Waste Impact Management –</b>		
<b>PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE</b>		
<b>Nature of Impact:</b> Demolition activities associated with the closure and rehabilitation of the facility will result in the generation of general and hazardous Waste as a result of the demolition and removal of infrastructure.		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Rating Before mitigation</b>	<b>Rating After mitigation</b>
<b>Status and Nature of the Impact</b>	Negative	Negative
<b>Magnitude</b>	Low (2)	Very Low (2)
<b>Duration</b>	Temporary (1)	Temporary (1)

<b>Spatial extent</b>	Local (2)	Site specific (1)
<b>Irreplaceability of resources</b>	Very Low (1)	Very Low (1)
<b>Reversibility of impact</b>	Reversible (1)	Reversible (1)
<b>Probability of impact occurring</b>	Highly Probable (4)	Probable (2)
<b>TOTAL (SP) / Significance</b>	<b>Low Negative (28)</b>	<b>Low Negative (12)</b>
<b>Cumulative impacts</b>	<b>Low Negative</b>	<b>Low Negative</b>
<b>Proposed Mitigation Measures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Scrap Metal:</b> Scrap metal resulting from the demolition of structures on-site will be recycled.</li> <li>• <b>Rubble Utilisation:</b> Rubble generated from the demolition of structures like the firewall will be recycled or disposed of at a landfill subject to acceptance and appropriateness.</li> <li>• <b>General Waste:</b> All other general waste will be managed by Interwaste Holdings Ltd., which will be disposed of at the Vissershok Landfill Site or another suitable waste disposal facility.</li> <li>• <b>Hazardous Waste:</b> Hazardous waste within the facility will be carefully sorted at various internal departments and prepared for disposal. Special attention will be given to ceramic fibre waste associated with shuttle kilns. While harmful to human health, this Type 3 waste will be removed and disposed of at the Vissershok landfill.</li> </ul> <p>This comprehensive approach demonstrates the Applicant's commitment to responsible waste management and environmentally conscious practices in the decommissioning of its well-established ceramics manufacturing facility.</p>	
<b>NO-GO ALTERNATIVE</b>		
<b>Nature of Impact:</b> The no-go alternative shall result in the cessation of all activities and or waste generation from the facility as such no waste management impact shall result from this alternative.		
<b>Status and Nature of the Impact</b>	No additional impact linked to project site will be realised.	

### 1.2.8 Direct Impact: Impact on Employment

Impact on Employment –		
<b>Nature of Impact:</b> As a result of the closure of the facility the NGK Ceramics South Africa will have to retrench all the staff employed at the NGK Ceramics South Africa Facility.		
PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE		
Criteria	Rating Before mitigation	Rating After mitigation
Status and Nature of the Impact	Negative	Negative
Magnitude	High (8)	Medium (6)
Duration	Permanent (5)	Permanent (5)
Spatial extent	Regional (3)	Regional (3)
Irreplaceability of resources	Very Low (1)	Very Low (1)
Reversibility of impact	Reversible (1)	Reversible (1)

<b>Probability of impact occurring</b>	Definite (5)	Definite (5)
<b>TOTAL (SP) / Significance</b>	<b>Moderate-High Negative (90)</b>	<b>Moderate-High Negative (80)</b>
<b>Cumulative impacts</b>	<b>Moderate-High Negative</b>	<b>Moderate-High Negative</b>

**NO-GO ALTERNATIVE**

**Nature of Impact:** Impact on employment from the cessation of manufacturing operations are determined to be the same as that of the preferred alternative. The no-go alternative shall result in the cessation of all operations and activities since the permanent closure of the facility is unfortunately unavoidable as the closure of NGK Ceramics South Africa resulted from a sustained decline in customer demand.

**1.2.9 Direct Impact: Economic Impact**

**Economic Impact –**

**Nature of Impact:** The loss of economic contribution that NGK Ceramics South Africa contributes locally and internationally due to the permanent closure of the facility is unfortunately unavoidable as the closure of NGK Ceramics South Africa resulted from a sustained decline in customer demand. The financial impracticality of sustaining operations in South Africa arose from diminished production levels. The swift transition from combustible engines to electric vehicles adversely affected the business. As such NGK Ceramics has made the decision to cease all operations in South Africa thus resulting in the immediate closure and decommissioning of the facility.

**PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Rating Before mitigation</b>	<b>Rating After mitigation</b>
<b>Status and Nature of the Impact</b>	Negative	Negative
<b>Magnitude</b>	High (8)	Medium (6)
<b>Duration</b>	Permanent (5)	Permanent (5)
<b>Spatial extent</b>	Regional (3)	Regional (3)
<b>Irreplaceability of resources</b>	Very Low (1)	Very Low (1)
<b>Reversibility of impact</b>	Reversible (1)	Reversible (1)

<b>Probability of impact occurring</b>	Definite (5)	Definite (5)
<b>TOTAL (SP) / Significance</b>	<b>Moderate-High Negative (90)</b>	<b>Moderate-High Negative (80)</b>
<b>Cumulative impacts</b>	<b>Moderate-High Negative</b>	<b>Moderate-High Negative</b>

**NO-GO ALTERNATIVE**

**Nature of Impact:** Impact on the economy from the cessation of manufacturing operations are determined to be the same as that of the preferred alternative. The no-go alternative shall result in the cessation of all operations and activities since the permanent closure of the facility is unfortunately unavoidable as the closure of NGK Ceramics South Africa resulted from a sustained decline in customer demand.



### 1.3 Summary of Impacts Assessed

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE		
<b>1. Nuisances</b>		
Criteria	Rating Before mitigation	Rating After mitigation
Status and Nature of the Impact	Negative; Low (L)	Negative; Low (L)
<b>2. Air Quality</b>		
Criteria	Rating Before mitigation	Rating After mitigation
Status and Nature of the Impact	Positive; Moderate (M)	
<b>3. Visual Impact</b>		
Criteria	Rating Before mitigation	Rating After mitigation
Status and Nature of the Impact	Negative; Low (L)	Negative; Low (L)
<b>4. Impacts on Soil and Groundwater</b>		
Criteria	Rating Before mitigation	Rating After mitigation
Status and Nature of the Impact	Negative; Low (L)	Negative; Low (L)
<b>5. Community Safety</b>		
Criteria	Rating Before mitigation	Rating After mitigation
Status and Nature of the Impact	Positive; Moderate (M)	
<b>6. Impact on Bulk Services / Resources</b>		
Criteria	Rating Before mitigation	Rating After mitigation
Status and Nature of the Impact	Positive; Moderate (M)	
<b>7. Waste Impact Management</b>		
Criteria	Rating Before mitigation	Rating After mitigation
Status and Nature of the Impact	Negative; Low (L)	Negative; Low (L)
<b>8. Impact on Employment</b>		
Criteria	Rating Before mitigation	Rating After mitigation
Status and Nature of the Impact	Negative; Moderate-High (MH)	Negative; Moderate-High (MH)
<b>9. Economic Impact</b>		
Criteria	Rating Before mitigation	Rating After mitigation
Status and Nature of the Impact	Negative; Moderate-High (MH)	Negative; Moderate-High (MH)
NO-GO ALTERNATIVE		
<b>10. Nuisances</b>		

<b>NO-GO ALTERNATIVE</b>		
Criteria	Rating Before mitigation	Rating After mitigation
Status and Nature of the Impact	Positive; Moderate (M)	
<b>11. Air Quality</b>		
Criteria	Rating Before mitigation	Rating After mitigation
Status and Nature of the Impact	No additional impact linked to project site will be realised.	
<b>12. Visual Impact</b>		
Criteria	Rating Before mitigation	Rating After mitigation
Status and Nature of the Impact	No additional impact linked to project site will be realised.	
<b>13. Impacts on Soil and Groundwater</b>		
Criteria	Rating Before mitigation	Rating After mitigation
Status and Nature of the Impact	No additional impact linked to project site will be realised.	
<b>14. Community Safety</b>		
Criteria	Rating Before mitigation	Rating After mitigation
Status and Nature of the Impact	Positive; Moderate (M)	
<b>15. Impact on Bulk Services / Resources</b>		
Criteria	Rating Before mitigation	Rating After mitigation
Status and Nature of the Impact	Positive; Moderate (M)	
<b>16. Waste Impact Management</b>		
Criteria	Rating Before mitigation	Rating After mitigation
Status and Nature of the Impact	No additional impact linked to project site will be realised.	
<b>17. Impact on Employment</b>		
Criteria	Rating Before mitigation	Rating After mitigation
Status and Nature of the Impact	Negative; Moderate-High (MH)	Negative; Moderate-High (MH)
<b>18. Economic Impact</b>		
Criteria	Rating Before mitigation	Rating After mitigation
Status and Nature of the Impact	Negative; Moderate-High (MH)	Negative; Moderate-High (MH)