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

| Name of authorised | Ipswich Crematorium, Cemetery Lane, Ipswich, |
|-----------------------|--|
| process/installation | Suffolk, IP4 2TQ. |
| Process Guidance Note | 5/2 |
| Inspector's Name | Ben Atkinson |
| Date | 26/11/2020 |

Environmental Impact Appraisal

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

| Component 3 - Sensitivity and Proximi score) | ty of Receptors (ci | rcle approp | riate |
|--|---------------------|---------------|---------|
| | Sensi | 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 |

^{*} All distances should be multiplied by a factor of 2 for mineral and cement & lime processes and by a factor of 4 for combustion, incineration (not cremation), iron & 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 | | |

| 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 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.

Scoring for Component 6 - Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Records

| Necolus | | | | |
|---|-----------------|-----------|------------|------------------|
| | 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 maintenance programme, in line with authorisation? | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 |

| (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 | 0 |
|--|--------------|---|
| | 105 | |

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