

Annex E

INSPECTION RATES FOR PART A2 INSTALLATIONS

Risk based inspection performance per authority for those authorities that reported having permitted A2 installations

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
Cherwell	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	200%	N/A	
Mendip	0	1	0	2	1	1	1	200%	100%	
Selby	0	1	1	4	1	2	1	200%	100%	
King's Lynn & West Norfolk	0	2	0	4	1	2	2	200%	50%	
Caerphilly	0	1	2	6	0	3	1	200%	0%	
Cardiff	0	3	1	8	0	4	3	200%	0%	
Chesterfield	0	1	0	2	0	1	1	200%	0%	
Flintshire	0	1	0	2	0	1	1	200%	0%	
Exeter	1	0	2	7	1	4	1	175%	100%	
Stoke-on-Trent	0	3	2	8	0	5	3	160%	0%	
Cheshire East UA	0	0	2	3	0	2	0	150%	N/A	
East Riding of Yorkshire	0	1	1	3	2	2	1	150%	200%	
Burnley	1	0	0	3	1	2	1	150%	100%	
Uttlesford	0	1	1	3	0	2	1	150%	0%	
Wychavon	0	2	0	3	0	2	2	150%	0%	
Sandwell	0	3	2	7	0	5	3	140%	0%	A major metal group (Caparo - but please treat as confidential) went into administration in 2015/16. Inspections (and production) were put on hold until decisions for each site had been made - inspection quotas were not able to be achieved for this non ferrous A2 site.
Bassetlaw	1	0	1	4	0	3	1	133%	0%	
Allerdale	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Amber Valley	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Anglesey	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Barnsley	0	0	4	4	0	4	0	100%	N/A	
Barrow-in-Furness	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Bath & North East Somerset	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Braintree	0	0	3	3	0	3	0	100%	N/A	

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
Breckland	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Broadland	0	0	4	4	0	4	0	100%	N/A	
Broxtowe	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Bury	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Canterbury	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Carmarthenshire	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	The Operators of the animal carcass incinerators wish to maintain their permits even though the process do not operate, and have not done so for some years.
Cheshire West UA	0	0	3	3	0	3	0	100%	N/A	
Colchester	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	1 No. Printworks in the process of being surrendered, therefore not included in section 16.6.2.
Dacorum	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Derby	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Derbyshire Dales	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Doncaster	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
East Devon	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Epping Forest	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Erewash	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Gloucester	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Great Yarmouth	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Greenwich	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Halton	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Hambleton	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Harrogate	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Hinckley & Bosworth	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Horsham	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Huntingdonshire	0	0	4	4	0	4	0	100%	N/A	
Isle of Wight / Medina	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Kirklees	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Knowsley	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Lancaster	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Lewes	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
London PHA	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Maidstone	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Malvern Hills	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Melton	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Mid Devon	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Mid Sussex	0	0	3	3	0	3	0	100%	N/A	
Milton Keynes	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Newark & Sherwood	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Newcastle upon Tyne	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
North Warwickshire	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
North West Leicestershire	0	0	5	5	0	5	0	100%	N/A	
Northampton	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Nuneaton & Bedworth	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Oxford	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Purbeck	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Rochdale	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Rushcliffe	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Solihull	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
South Derbyshire	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
South Hams	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
South Norfolk	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Southampton	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Stockton-on-Tees	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Suffolk Coastal	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Sunderland	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Swindon B.C.	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Tameside	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Tamworth	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Test Valley	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Three Rivers	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
Torfaen	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Vale of White Horse	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Wellingborough	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
West Lancashire	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Wigan	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Worcester	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
York City UA	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
East Staffordshire	0	1	0	1	3	1	1	100%	300%	
Cannock Chase	0	4	0	4	6	4	4	100%	150%	N/A
Wrexham	1	1	3	6	3	6	2	100%	150%	
Ashfield	0	2	2	4	2	4	2	100%	100%	
Blackburn & Darwen	0	2	2	4	2	4	2	100%	100%	
Blaeneau Gwent	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	100%	100%	
Bolsover	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	100%	100%	
Boston	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	100%	100%	
Bradford	1	2	2	6	3	6	3	100%	100%	
Bridgend	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	100%	100%	
Charnwood	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
Ealing	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	100%	100%	
Gateshead	0	1	2	3	1	3	1	100%	100%	
Harborough	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	100%	100%	
Harlow	1	0	0	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
Kettering	1	0	0	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
Leicester	0	2	1	3	2	3	2	100%	100%	
Manchester	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
Medway	0	1	3	4	1	4	1	100%	100%	
Newcastle under Lyme	0	2	1	3	2	3	2	100%	100%	
North Devon	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	100%	100%	
North East Derbyshire	1	0	3	5	1	5	1	100%	100%	
North Kesteven	1	0	0	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
North Lincolnshire	3	3	7	16	6	16	6	100%	100%	

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
Peterborough	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
Plymouth	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	100%	100%	
Rotherham	1	3	0	5	4	5	4	100%	100%	
Rugby	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	100%	100%	
Salford	0	1	2	3	1	3	1	100%	100%	
South Ribble	1	0	0	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
St Helens	0	2	3	5	2	5	2	100%	100%	
Stroud	1	0	0	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
Thurrock	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
Wakefield	1	4	3	9	5	9	5	100%	100%	
Leeds	0	4	3	7	3	7	4	100%	75%	
Walsall	1	4	3	9	3	9	5	100%	60%	3 check visits to medium rated processes not carried out due to long term staff sickness
Bournemouth	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	100%	0%	
Calderdale	0	1	1	2	0	2	1	100%	0%	Monitoring and upgrading visits are included in the above that are not included in Section 18.
Cotswold	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	100%	0%	
East Northamptonshire	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	100%	0%	permit was issued in Nov 15. Gave time for 1 inspection visit for this year, not the 2 had the permit been issued at the beginning of the year.
Kingston upon Hull	0	1	3	4	0	4	1	100%	0%	
North Somerset	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	100%	0%	
Pendle	0	1	1	2	0	2	1	100%	0%	One check inspection at Medium risk A2 premises has not been carried out.
Poole	0	2	0	2	0	2	2	100%	0%	
Portsmouth	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	100%	0%	
Powys	0	1	2	3	0	3	1	100%	0%	One A2 installation - non ferrous metals - High Risk - has ceased trading and is in administration. Therefore inspection was not possible. Powys County Council are seeking advice in respect of permit revocation.
South Gloucestershire UA	0	3	0	3	0	3	3	100%	0%	
Wiltshire UA	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	100%	0%	Because a number of visits were made prior to the issuing of the Part A2 permit issued in Jul 2015, we decided only one visit was necessary for the remainder of the year.

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
Telford & Wrekin	1	7	3	11	3	12	8	92%	38%	From the records I have available I can see only one full inspection carried out for the High Risk premises, the officer in charge of this premises has since left the authority so I am unable to prove otherwise at this time.
Durham UA	0	3	4	6	3	7	3	86%	100%	1 Low risk installation not inspected as currently mothballed
Dudley	0	2	3	4	2	5	2	80%	100%	One of the low risk ceramic installations is mothballed and therefore we cannot carry out an inspection.
Sheffield	4	1	0	7	0	9	5	78%	0%	We have insufficient resources to carry out the number of check inspections recommended by DEFRA. We do however spend almost a full day when we carry out the compliance inspection to ensure the EMS, procedures and records etc are satisfactory, so the visit made is thorough and complete. A detailed inspection report is sent after the visit. Any breaches of ELVs or complaints would also be investigated in addition to the compliance visit.
Birmingham	0	1	3	3	1	4	1	75%	100%	One of our sites (MG Motors car plant) is mothballed
North East Lincolnshire	0	2	2	3	2	4	2	75%	100%	The wood preservation permit issued February and did not start operating within this reporting year.
Northumberland UA	0	1	3	3	1	4	1	75%	100%	No full inspection has been carried out for our ceramic process (Swarland Brick) as it remains mothballed.
Carlisle	0	1	2	2	1	3	1	67%	100%	
Swale	0	1	2	2	1	3	1	67%	100%	One A2 site is no longer operating but the permit remain in situ. We therefore visit site regularly to ensure no other activities are being undertaken.
High Peak	0	3	0	2	2	3	3	67%	67%	
Shropshire UA	1	3	1	4	1	6	4	67%	25%	
Chichester	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	50%	N/A	
Warrington	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	50%	N/A	
Wolverhampton	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	50%	N/A	
Chelmsford	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	50%	100%	
Neath and Port Talbot	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	50%	100%	The PG 6/07 activity , which upgraded in to an A2 activity-permit was not issued till the end of the year for reasons mentioned in 16.4.5 and therefore inspected under the Part B inspections frequency/schedule
South Tyneside	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	50%	100%	Timber process is a new A2 process issued in Feb 2016

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
Teignbridge	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	50%	100%	
Bromsgrove	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	50%	0%	The rendering activity has not now operated since March 2014, the one visit was to discuss potential noise and odour issues.
Cornwall UA	0	0	3	1	0	3	0	33%	N/A	
Herefordshire	0	2	1	1	0	3	2	33%	0%	Dealing with wood treatment A2 applications took a large amount of time/resource. Plus staff absence for 6 months
Ipswich	0	1	2	1	0	3	1	33%	0%	staff shortages meant inspections not carried out in first part of the year making it impossible to do 2 inspections in last few months of year
Newport	0	0	4	1	0	4	0	25%	N/A	The Grinding clinker /slag (was A2 process) is mothballed according to records (site closed for numerous years). NCC could not inspect -charged as a Part B process. Due to changes in legislation the site will be classed as a part B for 2016/2017 figures.
Chorley	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	formal inspection due in coming year (June 2016)- other inspections related to application and ensure compliance before permit issued- process assessed as low risk and inspection to be undertaken in line with part B timber process inspection for efficiency purposes.
Corby	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0%	N/A	
Forest Heath	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Newham	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Redcar & Cleveland UA	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0%	N/A	No inspections required as one installation is mothballed, one permit was surrendered and the remaining installation is still in a commissioning phase.
Rother	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Shepway	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
South Northamptonshire	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Swansea	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	The A2 installation is no longer in operation and the equipment has been removed from site. There is an ongoing contaminated land issue. We are in contact with NRW regarding this matter.
Waverley	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0%	N/A	Ceramic site is closed and could not be inspected. Other A2 (Timber) site has had application visit only
Wealden	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0%	N/A	
Hyndburn	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0%	100%	
Sedgemoor	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	0%	0%	

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
Torrige	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0%	0%	premises has been mothballed
West Lindsey	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0%	0%	

Authorities which have yet to risk assess any of their installations

Ashford

Ceredigion

Maldon

New Forest

Ribble Valley

South Staffordshire

St Edmundsbury