

Annex D

INSPECTION RATES FOR PART B INSTALLATIONS

Risk Based inspection performance per authority for all installation groups combined

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
Tamworth	0	3	2	47	0	5	3	940%	0%	You will notice that there is a disproportionately high number of inspection visits made to the Ferrous processes this year. There are two metal decontamination processes in the Borough. Both have experienced problems necessitating frequent visits and in the case of one process it was necessary to serve an Enforcement Notice to bring about compliance with Permit Conditions relating to emissions. I can confirm that these are site visits and not drive by visits.
Test Valley	0	2	6	36	2	8	2	450%	100%	
Bassetlaw	2	3	6	37	0	12	4	308%	0%	
South Norfolk	0	5	5	22	0	10	4	220%	0%	We were unable to inspect 2 mobile crushing plant which were operating outside of South Norfolk. We have received confirmation that at least one of these plant have been inspected by the Local Authority in whose area it is operating. We were unable to inspect 1 additional mobile plant and a small waste oil burner as the operators of both appear to have ceased operation but have not surrendered their permit.
Bath & North East Somerset	0	3	2	10	2	5	3	200%	67%	To avoid confusion, extra inspections appear to have been made in 2014/15. This is because our inspections fell behind in 2013/14 due to a gap between the previous permitting officer leaving and me starting, so the outstanding inspections for 13/14 were completed last summer, and the required inspections for 14/15 undertaken on time as required.
Horsham	0	1	0	2	0	1	1	200%	0%	

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
Sandwell	3	27	9	74	0	41	29	180%	0%	A number of Group II and Group III premises were not due for inspection this year. A number of sites were either surrendered or revoked in year (total of 7 - see previous) Some brick crushers may have been off-site and not able to be inspected (see previous) Some sites were not operational (dormant, but wish to hold permits and therefore difficult or impossible to inspect)
Middlesbrough	0	2	7	14	0	9	2	156%	0%	
Manchester	3	11	12	45	5	29	10	155%	50%	
Leicester	1	10	8	30	7	20	8	150%	88%	
South Ribble	7	6	1	24	1	16	8	150%	13%	
North Somerset	0	2	0	3	0	2	2	150%	0%	
York City UA	3	4	1	13	0	9	6	144%	0%	During the year, 5 permits were surrendered hence not all those were inspected. Also 3 of the crushers could not be inspected.
East Northamptonshire	0	3	2	7	0	5	1	140%	0%	
High Peak	0	16	8	33	7	24	7	138%	100%	I am not able to inspect the Tarmac mobile plants, all of which are "LOW" rated (based on a single inspection of the plants before their relocation to other sites outside High Peak Borough Council); two of these, mobile cement plants, are Group I processes, the other two, mobile crushing & screening plants, are Group II.
Hinckley & Bosworth	0	3	0	4	2	3	2	133%	100%	
Blackburn & Darwen	0	6	1	9	6	7	6	129%	100%	
Blaby	0	7	0	9	0	7	3	129%	0%	
Stockport	0	6	2	10	4	8	4	125%	100%	
Hillingdon	0	4	4	10	1	8	4	125%	25%	The inspections did not include Group III Dry Cleaners apart from one site. These are low and were inspected in 3 year period. Due in 2015/16. Part III Petrol Stations inspected by Fire Brigade on 3 yearly basis, 9 sites this year. One medium risk foundry group I (Harven Form) only inspected once. Two concrete plants not inspected this year, one closed down and one in airport, inspected last year, due 2015/16. Two WOBs not inspected, due in 2015/16.

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	Reasons
Selby	2	5	4	15	0	12	5	125%	0%	
Central Bedfordshire UA	0	2	3	6	3	5	2	120%	150%	
Swansea	1	2	6	12	3	10	3	120%	100%	
Hull & Goole PHA	0	1	4	6	0	5	1	120%	0%	
Stoke-on-Trent	1	9	26	44	0	37	10	119%	0%	
Waverley	0	6	0	7	0	6	0	117%	N/A	
Wiltshire UA	0	5	8	15	0	13	4	115%	0%	
Newham	8	12	1	24	4	21	11	114%	36%	
Caerphilly	0	1	14	17	2	15	1	113%	200%	
Aylesbury Vale	0	0	9	10	0	9	0	111%	N/A	
Gwynedd	0	4	14	20	1	18	2	111%	50%	
Colchester	0	8	2	11	3	10	3	110%	100%	
Cornwall UA	0	6	15	23	5	21	5	110%	100%	
Harlow	1	2	7	12	2	11	2	109%	100%	
South Kesteven	0	4	19	25	4	23	4	109%	100%	The inspection regime now allows for inspections every 2 to 3 years.
Richmond upon Thames	0	24	0	26	1	24	1	108%	100%	
South Somerset	0	5	7	13	3	12	4	108%	75%	
Norwich	0	11	2	14	0	13	2	108%	0%	
Gateshead	0	4	10	15	4	14	4	107%	100%	
Hackney	0	30	0	32	0	30	0	107%	N/A	
Cardiff	3	17	13	37	0	35	5	106%	0%	
Trafford	1	5	12	20	6	19	6	105%	100%	
Barnet	2	22	1	27	2	26	6	104%	33%	60 routine inspections 4 change of ownerships inspections There are no inspections that have not been carried out
Ealing	0	43	3	47	0	46	0	102%	N/A	Some revoked installations, multiple crusher screener working sets inspected on the same visit may affect stats
Anglesey	0	0	11	11	0	11	0	100%	N/A	
Bromley	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	Reasons
Bromsgrove	0	1	2	3	0	3	0	100%	N/A	Unable to carry out check inspection of medium risk mobile plant due to plant not being used frequently, operator being difficult to contact and site where plant located difficult to access.
Broxbourne	0	3	3	6	0	6	0	100%	N/A	
Ceredigion	0	0	3	3	0	3	0	100%	N/A	
Chorley	0	0	4	4	0	4	0	100%	N/A	There are a number of inspections that have not been complete in 2014/15 due to staffing changes and restructure impacting on resources therefore we have prioritised the group 1 and 2 inspections over the group 3 inspections due.
Conwy	0	0	5	5	0	5	0	100%	N/A	
Dover	0	0	4	4	0	4	0	100%	N/A	mobile crushers mainly out of district
East Cambridgeshire	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
East Devon	0	0	7	7	0	7	0	100%	N/A	
East Hertfordshire	0	1	1	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	Only carried out one inspection at the road stone coating plant. The plant is always fully compliant with the permit. However its proximity to sensitive receptors means it always risk rates Medium.
Epping Forest	0	13	1	14	0	14	0	100%	N/A	
Exeter	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Forest Heath	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Fylde	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Gloucester	0	1	1	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	I am new to the local authority and Environmental Protection team. Now that I have settled into the team all inspections will be made this summer. All permits inspected were upgraded and new permits issued which has taken some time
Gravesham	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Haringey	0	9	1	10	0	10	0	100%	N/A	
Hart	0	0	3	3	0	3	0	100%	N/A	
Hartlepool	0	0	4	4	0	4	0	100%	N/A	
Hastings	0	0	4	4	0	4	0	100%	N/A	

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
Havant	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	1 No. Petrol Vapour Recovery site (19 London Road, Jet) was scheduled for inspection, however current owners have suspended trading at the site pending sale of business. Prospective Purchaser intends to continue operation as PFS. Unable to inspect this period.
Havering	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	There has been no officer in post to undertake the relevant work since June 2014.
Kensington & Chelsea	0	19	0	19	0	19	0	100%	N/A	St Helens DC revoked
Lewes	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Mid Suffolk	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Milton Keynes	0	0	6	6	0	6	0	100%	N/A	Service stations were all inspected in 2013/14 year, as were concrete batching plants and other reduced fee activities, therefore not requiring inspection 2014/15
North Dorset	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	Our WOBs and dry cleaners were not due for inspection in 14/15. See comment supplied in Section 5.4.5b in relation to one of our two mobile crushers.
North Kesteven	0	0	4	4	0	4	0	100%	N/A	
Pendle	0	0	6	6	0	6	0	100%	N/A	
Purbeck	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	100%	N/A	
River Tees PHA	0	0	3	3	0	3	0	100%	N/A	
Rutland	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	The only 'unusual' inspection would be in relation to a vehicle refinishers (group II - Low Risk) that surrender its Permit this year. An inspection was made to verify that the activity had ceased.
South Northamptonshire	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
South Staffordshire	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Southwark	0	14	0	14	0	14	0	100%	N/A	
Spelthorne	0	4	1	5	0	5	0	100%	N/A	
St Helens	0	0	15	15	0	15	0	100%	N/A	
Stafford	0	0	17	17	0	17	0	100%	N/A	
Stevenage	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Sutton	0	15	0	15	0	15	0	100%	N/A	1 revoked, 2 surrendered, 2 new.
Vale of Glamorgan	0	0	6	6	0	6	0	100%	N/A	

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	Reasons
Vale of White Horse	0	1	2	3	0	3	0	100%	N/A	
Wellingborough	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
West Berkshire	0	0	4	4	0	4	0	100%	N/A	
West Devon	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
West Dorset	0	0	3	3	0	3	0	100%	N/A	
West Oxfordshire	0	0	3	3	0	3	0	100%	N/A	
Winchester	0	0	5	5	0	5	0	100%	N/A	Petrol stations are inspected annually by the petroleum licencing team at the County Council not by officers at Winchester City Council. The service is sub-contracted out.
Worthing	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Swale	1	16	2	20	8	20	7	100%	114%	Several revoked/ surrendered installations within year
Rochdale	10	13	9	37	20	37	19	100%	105%	
Adur	0	2	0	2	2	2	2	100%	100%	
Babergh	0	1	2	3	1	3	1	100%	100%	
Blaeneau Gwent	0	5	3	8	5	8	5	100%	100%	
Bridgend	0	7	5	12	5	12	5	100%	100%	
Brighton & Hove	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
Broadland	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
Canterbury	0	2	3	5	2	5	2	100%	100%	Inspections for some installatons were not due in 2014/15 as they are Low Risk Group 2 & 3
Carlisle	0	2	3	5	2	5	2	100%	100%	
Charnwood	0	2	12	14	2	14	2	100%	100%	8 mobile batching plant out of district and not inspected. 3 mobile crushers out of district and not inspected. 2 installations not inspected because permits were surrendered before inspection could be undertaken. 14 petrol filling statins, low risk and not due for inspection this year. 1 waste oil burner, low risk and not due for inspection this year. 2 vehicle refinishers, low risk and not due for inspection this year. 1 powder coating activity, low risk and not due for inspection this year. 6 dry cleaners, low risk and not due for inspection this year.

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	Reasons
Dacorum	1	2	2	5	1	5	1	100%	100%	
Darlington	0	2	3	5	2	5	2	100%	100%	This note does not relate to inspections but provides an explanantion as to why Darlington Borough Council is now regulating 5 mobile crushers. Tyne Tees Crushing and Screening Ltd relocated their head office from Durham County Council to Darlington Borough Council. It was decided that these permits would be reissued by Darlington Borough Council without making the operator reapply for their permits. Confirmed with Defra via e-mail correspondence between Patrick Chisholm (DBC) and Eamon Prendergast dated 21 and 22 July 2014.
Derby	0	3	4	7	1	7	1	100%	100%	
Derbyshire Dales	0	5	6	11	3	11	3	100%	100%	One dry cleaners in group III was not due for inspection in this year Two group two process are currently not operational and not inspected, the rest were inspected in the previous year and will be due for inspection in the coming year.
East Riding of Yorkshire	2	4	12	20	6	20	6	100%	100%	
Elmbridge	0	5	1	6	2	6	2	100%	100%	Medium group II (General Demolition) inspected 23/01/15 - due for check visit in next few months
Enfield	0	28	0	28	1	28	1	100%	100%	
Fenland	0	1	2	3	1	3	1	100%	100%	
Gosport	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	100%	100%	
Guildford	0	4	1	5	1	5	1	100%	100%	
Hammersmith & Fulham	0	27	0	27	2	27	2	100%	100%	Some installations revoked.
Harrogate	0	5	5	10	2	10	2	100%	100%	Defra inspection frequency - some inspections not required this year.
Hertsmere	1	4	0	5	2	5	2	100%	100%	
Kirklees	0	9	16	25	9	25	9	100%	100%	
Lewisham	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	100%	100%	One of the drycleaners could not be inspected despite repeated visits and messages.
Lichfield	0	2	8	10	1	10	1	100%	100%	Only inspection not carried out were those on the 6 mobile crushers that have not operated in our district as previously stated. All other required inspections completed.

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	Reasons
Lincoln	2	3	2	7	5	7	5	100%	100%	
Maldon	1	4	0	5	4	5	4	100%	100%	
Malvern Hills	0	1	2	3	1	3	1	100%	100%	
Melton	0	1	3	4	1	4	1	100%	100%	
Mid Devon	0	5	9	14	4	14	4	100%	100%	
Mid Sussex	0	1	2	3	1	3	1	100%	100%	
Monmouthshire	0	4	5	9	1	9	1	100%	100%	
North Devon	0	4	2	6	4	6	4	100%	100%	
Pembrokeshire	0	1	11	12	1	12	1	100%	100%	
Plymouth	0	8	6	14	5	14	5	100%	100%	
Reading	0	5	1	6	1	6	1	100%	100%	
Redbridge	0	7	1	8	2	8	2	100%	100%	
Redcar & Cleveland UA	0	1	4	5	1	5	1	100%	100%	Not all group 2 and group 3 installations were due an inspection this financial year.
Rhondda Cynon Taf	1	11	4	17	7	17	7	100%	100%	
Rugby	1	14	3	18	10	18	10	100%	100%	
Sevenoaks	1	7	0	8	1	8	1	100%	100%	
Shepway	0	3	1	4	1	4	1	100%	100%	Temporary PFS
South Cambridgeshire	0	2	3	5	1	5	1	100%	100%	
South Hams	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	100%	100%	
South Lakeland	0	13	3	16	3	16	3	100%	100%	
Southend-on-sea	0	5	0	5	3	5	3	100%	100%	
Staffordshire Moorlands	1	8	4	14	4	14	4	100%	100%	
Stroud	1	0	8	10	1	10	1	100%	100%	
Swansea Bay PHA	0	1	9	10	1	10	1	100%	100%	
Tameside	0	1	11	12	1	12	1	100%	100%	
Three Rivers	1	3	0	5	1	5	1	100%	100%	
Torbay	1	3	0	5	2	5	2	100%	100%	
Torfaen	0	3	7	10	3	10	3	100%	100%	
Tunbridge Wells	1	9	0	10	3	10	3	100%	100%	

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	Reasons
Wakefield	1	19	9	29	7	29	7	100%	100%	
Wandsworth	0	2	0	2	2	2	2	100%	100%	
Warrington	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
Watford	1	0	1	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
Welwyn Hatfield	0	1	2	3	1	3	1	100%	100%	
West Lindsey	0	3	2	5	2	5	2	100%	100%	
Woking	0	13	0	13	2	13	2	100%	100%	
Worcester	0	2	5	7	1	7	1	100%	100%	
Wrexham	0	5	16	21	4	21	4	100%	100%	1 x WOB permitted but not yet installed
Newport	1	9	10	20	9	20	10	100%	90%	However, 2 inspections cannot be undertaken (1 Full and one Check) due to site mothballed. Therefore Stats should be 100% as all inspections that can be done are done. Site has now been closed for 4 years.
Barnsley	0	8	8	16	6	16	7	100%	86%	
Corby	0	10	11	21	8	21	10	100%	80%	A company that holds two Permits with us for different regulated processes had a down period where they were going through significant change. New staff were brought in and the compliance check was not carried out within the year for those 2 which would have appeared as 2 extra in the Check Group 1 for Medium risk processes. This company has since changed management and the new Management has met with us for a full compliance check and will have additional checks for this year 2015/2016 to assure compliance with the Permit.
Cheshire East UA	0	4	12	16	3	16	4	100%	75%	Not all the processes were due inspections this year due to risk rating.
Rossendale	0	4	1	5	3	5	4	100%	75%	One group 2 installation mothballed

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	Reasons
Burnley	0	4	10	14	2	14	3	100%	67%	<p>Extra inspections were undertaken on one site (Group three, low risk) in particular where issues had been identified following the previous inspection. These were not classed as 'routine'. Additionally, there were visits to a site in regards to proposed alterations to the process (Group 1, medium), a visit to a low-risk dry cleaners to discuss their reporting (which indicated issues), and visits to two petrol stations (both low risk) - one as the operator changed, and another to follow up on issues noted at the previous inspection.</p> <p>There were also changes in permits during the period 2014/2015 in that one permit was surrendered for a mobile crusher, however three more were approved, two petrol station permits were transferred, another petrol station operator was given a permit, and a permit for a dry cleaners was surrendered.</p> <p>As there are no boxes further in the survey for inputting information, I make reference to section 11: costs of running the service. No formal targets were set (for q.11.2.2) however £21,000 of salary savings were effective across Environmental Health and Licensing Services.</p>
St Edmundsbury	4	2	0	10	4	10	6	100%	67%	Two group 1, high check inspections were not carried out due to consistence inspection compliance.
Boston	0	4	0	4	2	4	4	100%	50%	
Huntingdonshire	0	3	19	22	1	22	2	100%	50%	
Ipswich	0	5	2	7	1	7	2	100%	50%	
Maidstone	1	5	0	7	1	7	2	100%	50%	
New Forest	0	2	1	3	1	3	2	100%	50%	One of the medium risk processes (FRP activity) closed part way through the year but did not surrender permit until 15/16 so unable to make check inspection. Reduced fee activities on an inspection programme taking account of reduced inspection frequency so only some inspected during 14/15
Swindon B.C.	0	3	7	10	1	10	2	100%	50%	

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
Tonbridge & Malling	1	1	4	6	1	6	2	100%	50%	Crushers were not inspected, but nominally assigned a LOW risk category as no complaints had been received regarding their operation elsewhere. Not all LOW risk installations were inspected in the last year
Warwick	0	2	5	7	1	7	2	100%	50%	2 Permits were revoked/surrendered during the year and so not inspected.
Rotherham	1	7	7	16	3	16	7	100%	43%	A number of issues have affected Rotherham MBC's returns for 2014/15 including available resources and the impact of Government enquiry into the Council which has focused resources elsewhere
North Tyneside	0	12	14	26	1	26	3	100%	33%	
Birmingham	10	51	8	72	1	72	31	100%	3%	
Bournemouth	0	2	0	2	0	2	1	100%	0%	
Camden	0	31	3	34	0	34	2	100%	0%	
Cheshire West UA	0	6	36	42	0	42	4	100%	0%	
Chesterfield	2	10	10	24	0	24	7	100%	0%	
Chichester	0	1	4	5	0	5	1	100%	0%	
Craven	0	1	10	11	0	11	1	100%	0%	
Dartford	1	6	1	9	0	9	1	100%	0%	
Gedling	0	1	8	9	0	9	1	100%	0%	
Islington	1	15	0	16	0	16	1	100%	0%	
Merton	0	2	2	4	0	4	2	100%	0%	
North East Derbyshire	0	1	8	9	0	9	1	100%	0%	
Portsmouth	0	6	0	6	0	6	6	100%	0%	
Rushcliffe	0	4	1	5	0	5	4	100%	0%	
Taunton Deane	1	6	1	8	0	8	4	100%	0%	High risk dry cleaning premises closed so not inspected. One Cement plant mothballed
Tendring	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	100%	0%	
Tower Hamlets	0	13	1	14	0	14	4	100%	0%	

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	Reasons
Neath and Port Talbot	2	16	11	30	3	31	10	97%	30%	The Authority has done most of the inspections at the frequency required under the risk methodology, and done quite a lot of extra inspections, as occasioned. However as there has been no officer in post for PPC since September 2014 till April 2015, there are some gaps in the inspections. This is a rare departure from the norm for this authority and we expect inspections levels to be back up again , in the current year.
Greenwich	3	23	2	27	1	28	5	96%	20%	(1) Two dry cleaners, inspection was not completed, because they appeared to have closed their activities. So, revocation process is underway.
Leeds	4	31	17	52	26	54	26	96%	100%	
Carmarthenshire	0	0	24	23	0	24	0	96%	N/A	
Sunderland	0	5	18	22	4	23	5	96%	80%	1 x Group 1 medium risk installation not in use - i full and 1 check inspection not undertaken - discussion re mothballing but permit is to be used in full in 2015/2015. 1st full inspection scheduled July 2015.
Telford & Wrekin	0	6	17	22	0	23	6	96%	0%	
Doncaster	1	4	14	19	5	20	5	95%	100%	25 Petrol Stations, 13 Small waste oil burners, 3 vehicle resprayers, 9 Cement & Lime (RF PG 3/1), 1 Quarry (RF), 1 Asphalt (RF), 3 Timber (RF), 2 mobile plant not due for inspection. 3 sites mothballed 1 dry cleaner inspected but surrendered prior to year end.
Calderdale	0	9	10	18	5	19	5	95%	100%	
Dudley	4	22	22	49	20	52	23	94%	87%	One of the high risk full fee premises closed at the start of the year and therefore no visits were made. We also have two mothballed installations, one medium rated full fee installation and one low risk reduced fee installation and hence no visits were made to those sites.
Ribble Valley	0	12	2	13	0	14	0	93%	N/A	
East Staffordshire	1	10	3	13	6	14	8	93%	75%	Group I - Permit surrendered 2/5/14 no inspections undertaken Group II & III - on 2 or 3 year inspection schedules respectively
Nuneaton & Bedworth	0	5	9	13	0	14	3	93%	0%	

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	Reasons
Powys	0	3	25	26	0	28	2	93%	0%	
Newark & Sherwood	0	24	2	24	4	26	7	92%	57%	Our mobile plant operators do not routinely operate in our district so inspections are not usually possible, also some check inspections on medium rated installations are conducted in previous or next period. Or in some instances, there is no upgrading works to check.
Sefton	1	9	2	11	8	12	7	92%	114%	the majority of Group ii and Group iii installations are on 2/3 year inspection frequencies and as such are not due an inspection this year.
Kettering	1	5	5	11	4	12	5	92%	80%	Resources were directed to ensure that all premises with a permit got one inspection/visit per year
North Warwickshire	3	5	3	11	3	12	8	92%	38%	Mobile plant not in borough
Wigan	2	12	3	16	7	18	9	89%	78%	
Chelmsford	1	6	1	8	0	9	1	89%	0%	
Sedgemoor	1	13	4	16	0	18	6	89%	0%	The premises in question, Group 2 High risk, did not receive a check visit as it was due to close shortly after
Waltham Forest	10	23	0	30	1	34	14	88%	7%	
Northumberland UA	2	7	22	29	5	33	6	88%	83%	Mootlaw Quarry (PPC(B)004) - permit mothballed on 01/09/2011 and site is not operational and therefore according to guidance could not be inspected. ED & MA Redpath (EPN12/033) - unable to inspect as mobile plant operating out of the local authority area. ELCO (EPSE11/133) - closed down when visited and awaiting surrender form. Coal Products Ltd (EPSE14/027) - unallocated
Halton	1	4	9	13	1	15	4	87%	25%	Not all check visits made for High and medium risk processes due to other demands on officer time
North East Lincolnshire	0	13	9	19	12	22	12	86%	100%	One vehicle refinisher currently not operating, one bulk chemical storage process not operating and two other mineral processes no activity in 2014/15. A mobile crusher process - both head office and crusher has re-located out of the area.
Teignbridge	0	0	7	6	0	7	0	86%	N/A	
Waveney	0	1	6	6	0	7	0	86%	N/A	

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	Reasons
Great Yarmouth	1	2	3	6	1	7	1	86%	100%	
Merthyr Tydfil	0	3	4	6	2	7	2	86%	100%	The medium risk vehicle refinisher re-rated to low risk following the first inspection of the year. One low risk coaling operation remaining mothballed and was not inspected (drive-by check only to confirm it remained out of operation).
North Hertfordshire	0	12	2	12	4	14	4	86%	100%	
South Holland	0	1	6	6	1	7	1	86%	100%	
Erewash	0	0	13	11	0	13	0	85%	N/A	
Walsall	3	29	6	33	4	39	26	85%	15%	Staff redundancy. Reallocation of resources for 2015/16 should address issue. Inspection of Group II & III companies carried out in previous 1 or 2 years. One Group I Low Risk company stopped trading before inspection could be carried out.
East Lindsey	1	4	0	5	9	6	3	83%	300%	
Brentwood	1	0	4	5	1	6	1	83%	100%	
Cotswold	0	1	5	5	1	6	1	83%	100%	Group 1 - Low risk site currently mothballed
Ashford	0	2	4	5	0	6	2	83%	0%	N/A
Tandridge	0	3	3	5	0	6	2	83%	0%	Mobile crusher/screener not operating and the owner was waiting for a buyer. Owner of quarry site was away and unable to arrange an inspection.
Durham UA	1	12	20	28	9	34	10	82%	90%	Group 1 1 Medium Risk installation- 1 check inspection missed. Low Risk - 1 mothballed installation and 3 installations Permitted during 2014/2015- therefore general compliance visits not undertaken. Group 3 Medium Risk not inspected as incorrectly given a 24 month inspection frequency. To be corrected during 2015/2016 Not all Group 2 and Group 3 Low installations required a general compliance visit during 2014/2015

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
Bolton	2	9	6	14	5	17	7	82%	71%	Three low risk dry cleaners not due inspections Two WOB low risk not due inspection 12 Low risk petrol stations not due inspection Two low risk vehicle resprayers not due inspection One mobile plant not due inspection one mothballed cement batching plant One group 1 installation mothballed One Group 1 installation surrendered permit.
Eden	0	6	5	9	4	11	4	82%	100%	There are a disproportionate no of inspections for one of the Bulk Cement Processes. This was due to investigating numerous complaints which resulted in the service of an Enforcement Notice
Oldham	0	6	5	9	3	11	6	82%	50%	
Newcastle upon Tyne	0	1	10	9	0	11	1	82%	0%	Inspection plan at beginning of year identified 25 inspections were required in 2014/15. All standard processes were inspected but due to staff resources 1 vehicle refinisher (to close in 2015), 1 waste oil burner and 6 petrol stations (2xS1 and 4xS1+2) were not inspected. The VR is about to close but the inspection of the waste oil burner and 6 petrol stations will be included in the 2015/16 inspection programme and will be prioritised so as to be inspected first.
Salford	1	24	0	21	6	26	6	81%	100%	For Group II and III inspections for low risk are not carried out on an annual basis as stated above in the DEFRA minimum inspection levels. therefore there will be a number of installations that will not have required an inspection.
South Derbyshire	0	0	5	4	0	5	0	80%	N/A	Mobile plant (PPC/B/01/03(A)) was not operational for 2014/2015 and is currently undergoing maintenance work. Inspection has been scheduled once the plant is back in use.
Tewkesbury	0	0	5	4	0	5	0	80%	N/A	We have a quarry (reduced fee PG 3/08 process) which is mothballed and so not inspected. For this reason there is a group 1 low risk process that will show as not inspected. We were due to inspect 15 group 3 low risk processes in this year (PG1/14 petrol stations and PG1/01 waste oil burners) but only one of the inspections was completed due to staff shortages.
Ashfield	0	9	11	16	6	20	5	80%	120%	

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	Reasons
Cannock Chase	0	10	0	8	6	10	6	80%	100%	
Mendip	0	15	0	12	8	15	8	80%	100%	
Peterborough	0	2	3	4	1	5	1	80%	100%	
South Oxfordshire	0	2	3	4	2	5	2	80%	100%	
West Lancashire	0	4	6	8	1	10	4	80%	25%	
South Tyneside	0	5	10	12	0	15	5	80%	0%	group 3 completed last year
Copeland	0	0	9	7	0	9	0	78%	N/A	One group 1 installation mothballed. One group 1 new application. Group 2 installations inspected previous year Group 3 installations inspected previous year
King's Lynn & West Norfolk	1	19	6	21	11	27	10	78%	110%	
South Gloucestershire UA	0	12	15	21	5	27	12	78%	42%	Prioritized against risk; largely concurs with inspection level. Public sector cuts/increased workloads with less staff
Coventry	3	14	8	21	2	27	11	78%	18%	Lack of staff resources meant it was not possible to ensure all installations were inspected at the required frequency. We have focused on carrying out full inspections at as many installations as possible.
Bradford	2	13	5	17	11	22	14	77%	79%	
Poole	0	0	4	3	0	4	0	75%	N/A	Insufficient resources due to reduction in staff numbers by 75% during 2014/2015 therefore unable to schedule routine inspection visits. Not expected to be an issue in 2015/2016 reporting period.
Richmondshire	0	4	8	9	2	12	2	75%	100%	
Suffolk Coastal	0	3	1	3	1	4	2	75%	50%	
Newcastle under Lyme	1	7	0	6	2	8	5	75%	40%	
Wirral	0	2	2	3	0	4	2	75%	0%	
Thurrock	0	5	6	8	4	11	5	73%	80%	one bulk terminal vehicle refinisher and lime and cement currently mothballed other low risk groups 2 and 3 not programmed for 2014 -2015
Sheffield	17	24	0	41	0	57	35	72%	0%	Severe lack of resources devoted to this area. Half a fte post cut a couple of years ago.
Allerdale	0	0	7	5	0	7	0	71%	N/A	

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
Ryedale	0	2	5	5	2	7	2	71%	100%	One Group Two mineral installation was not operational for the entire year.
Bolsover	0	2	5	5	1	7	2	71%	50%	We missed 1 full inspection for a group 1 low risk process due to part time working of the business manager and our consultant EHO not being able to make the same dates. We also missed 1 check inspection for a group 1 medium risk process.
Wychavon	0	2	8	7	0	10	2	70%	0%	
Hambleton	0	0	3	2	0	3	0	67%	N/A	Several installations did not require an inspection as they are on a two or three-yearly inspection frequency, one site is currently mothballed so no inspection was carried out.
Isle of Wight / Medina	0	1	14	10	0	15	1	67%	0%	
Rushmoor	1	0	1	2	0	3	1	67%	0%	Plant for High Risk Group I not operational throughout year due to plant breakdown
Wyre Forest	1	2	2	4	0	6	3	67%	0%	
Bury	1	11	5	11	3	17	5	65%	60%	
Wycombe	0	0	11	7	0	11	0	64%	N/A	Inspections completed according to schedule.
Medway	1	17	3	14	4	22	4	64%	100%	
Northampton	0	2	9	7	0	11	1	64%	0%	Some of our processes are mothballed hence no inspection due
Barking & Dagenham	0	5	5	6	0	10	0	60%	N/A	health status of staff other project work
London PHA	0	0	5	3	0	5	0	60%	N/A	
Cheltenham	1	1	2	3	2	5	2	60%	100%	Low risk category 1 permitted installation due to close on 1st April
Preston	0	2	3	3	2	5	2	60%	100%	A total of 31 inspections were scheduled for 2014-15. Upon arrival for inspection at one premises it was determined that the business had recently closed down and the permit has subsequently been surrendered. A further two inspections that were due in March 2015 unfortunately had to be re-scheduled at the request of the operator due to unforeseen availability and staffing problems. These have been undertaken in the period 2015-16.

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
Manchester PHA	2	1	0	3	1	5	2	60%	50%	We were unable to audit 1 x Low reduced fee permit (cement) due to the plant being out of operation. The plant wish to retain their permit despite there being no activity on site. A check visit is completed to ensure that no cement handling is taking place.
Hyndburn	2	10	3	10	0	17	10	59%	0%	Just in post for 6 months of the year concerned
North West Leicestershire	0	6	6	7	0	12	0	58%	N/A	We have had a lot of permits that have been reclassified to reduced fee and therefore inspections have not been required in this cycle of inspections.
Redditch	0	2	5	4	0	7	2	57%	0%	
Lancaster	7	8	1	13	3	23	12	57%	25%	
Amber Valley	0	2	9	6	0	11	2	55%	0%	Some low risk Group 2 inspections were not due in 2014/15. Also see section 5.4.5. Small number of scheduled inspections not completed due to competing demand for resources. This will be addressed in 2015/16
Bristol City UA	1	10	5	9	1	17	6	53%	17%	Due to the main permits officer retiring in December 2014 the inspections were not all carried out accordingly as the remaining staff have had to learn the permitting process.
Bracknell Forest	0	5	1	3	0	6	0	50%	N/A	
Cherwell	0	0	10	5	0	10	0	50%	N/A	not all permits held in the categories in 5.6.2 were due for inspection in this annual return year
Surrey Heath	0	1	1	1	0	2	0	50%	N/A	Staff vacancy doing this function from November 14. Unsuccessful in recruitment since. Agency replacement due May 15 - will be catching up on those due.
Weymouth & Portland	0	2	0	1	2	2	1	50%	200%	
Cambridge	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	50%	100%	
Fareham	0	3	1	2	2	4	3	50%	67%	1 x vehicle refinishers has closed; 1 x vehicle refinishers is at reduced operation; 1 x SED activity is at reduced operation; and 1 x mobile plant is not operating
Wyre	0	12	0	6	1	12	2	50%	50%	One full inspection missed in respects to a waste oil burner, and one check inspection missed in relation to a Tar and Bitumen Process. Both processes have since received inspections early in 2015/16.
Slough	0	7	4	5	1	11	0	45%	N/A	
Brent	0	18	14	14	0	32	1	44%	0%	

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
Thanet	0	5	5	4	0	10	2	40%	0%	Severe staff shortages through January through to May 2015 meant only medium risk inspections were carried out. Three new team members, one of which specialising in Part B inspections will be in place as of middle May 2015. First priority for new Officer is to inspect all installations in addition to those already scheduled for later in the year. This decision was authorised by Management.
North Lincolnshire	30	20	3	27	13	77	44	35%	30%	
Mole Valley	0	0	3	1	0	3	0	33%	N/A	
Arun	0	2	1	1	1	3	1	33%	100%	Full inspections on 2 Group one premises (1 medium & 1 low risk) programmed for March 2015 carried out in April & May 2015.
Luton BC	1	6	2	3	0	9	2	33%	0%	One of our Dry Cleaners was destroyed by fire and it took 11 months to get the shop refurbished to working order
Lambeth	0	15	37	15	1	52	3	29%	33%	
Croydon	0	4	0	1	1	4	1	25%	100%	2014-15 For the 97 processes operational a total of 39 full inspections and 1 check were completed as scheduled.
Braintree	0	0	44	9	0	44	0	20%	N/A	
North Norfolk	0	0	5	1	0	5	0	20%	N/A	
Breckland	1	14	4	4	8	20	2	20%	400%	
Kingston upon Hull	0	4	16	4	0	20	4	20%	0%	
Stockton-on-Tees	0	3	14	3	2	17	2	18%	100%	
Basildon	0	0	6	1	0	6	0	17%	N/A	
Bristol PHA	1	1	4	1	0	6	1	17%	0%	Inspections in 2014/2015 were limited due to the principal permits officer retiring halfway through the year with 2 weeks notice. Therefore we have had to train staff in the management of the permitting regime and train staff to undertake the inspections which is taking some time due to reduced staffing levels and no reduction in workload for the team as a whole.
Uttlesford	1	1	3	1	0	6	1	17%	0%	

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	Reasons
Barrow-in-Furness	0	2	5	1	2	7	2	14%	100%	one medium risk installation not operating for a significant proportion of the year.
Bedford Borough UA	0	15	1	2	1	16	1	13%	100%	
Broxtowe	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0%	N/A	One group (low) was being decommissioned. Insepction cycles means not all are due to be inspected during this period.
Christchurch	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0%	N/A	Our new pollution team is now in place following a review of services and it it is intended to get inspections in both the Christchurch Borough council and East Dorset district Council in the year 2015/2016. We have concentrated on reactive work in the pollution area over the last year.
Crawley	0	6	0	0	0	6	0	0%	N/A	
East Dorset	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0%	N/A	Our new pollution team is now in place following a review of services and it it is intended to get inspections in both the Christchurch Borough council and East Dorset district Council in the year 2015/2016. We have concentrated on reactive work in the pollution area over the last year.
Kingston upon Thames	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0%	N/A	Some inspections have not been undertaken due to absence of appropriately skilled and experienced resource for much of the year.
Knowsley	0	0	15	0	0	15	0	0%	N/A	Knowsley has taken the view that installations are visited once a year to keep up a good two way relationship between operator and LA about all environmental issues.
Nottingham	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Solihull	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	0%	N/A	solihull MBC received 50 mobile permits as Tarmac relocated to the Borough. These were made up of 16 mobile concrete plant, 4 roadstone , 30 mobile crushers.screeners
Southampton	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0%	N/A	
Stratford-on-Avon	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	0%	N/A	
Westminster	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Castle Point	0	3	0	0	0	3	1	0%	0%	
Hounslow	0	3	2	0	0	5	3	0%	0%	
Mansfield	3	8	3	0	0	14	8	0%	0%	
Rochford	0	4	1	0	0	5	3	0%	0%	Due to the workload demands with insufficient staffing resources, programmed visits were unable to be undertaken

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	Reasons
Runnymede	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0%	0%	

* Low risk installations for groups II and III are excluded from the calculation of inspection performance.

Authorities with fewer full inspections than required – group I installations

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
Powys	0	2	25	26	0	27	2	96%	0%	
Carmarthenshire	0	0	24	23	0	24	0	96%	N/A	
Sunderland	0	5	18	22	4	23	5	96%	80%	1 x Group 1 medium risk installation not in use - i full and 1 check inspection not undertaken - discussion re mothballing but permit is to be used in full in 2015/2015. 1st full inspection scheduled July 2015.
Neath and Port Talbot	2	8	11	22	3	23	10	96%	30%	The Authority has done most of the inspections at the frequency required under the risk methodology, and done quite a lot of extra inspections, as occasioned. However as there has been no officer in post for PPC since September 2014 till April 2015, there are some gaps in the inspections. This is a rare departure from the norm for this authority and we expect inspections levels to be back up again , in the current year.
Telford & Wrekin	0	6	17	22	0	23	6	96%	0%	
Leeds	2	22	17	41	24	43	24	95%	100%	
Doncaster	1	4	14	19	5	20	5	95%	100%	25 Petrol Stations, 13 Small waste oil burners, 3 vehicle resprayers, 9 Cement & Lime (RF PG 3/1), 1 Quarry (RF), 1 Asphalt (RF), 3 Timber (RF), 2 mobile plant not due for inspection. 3 sites mothballed 1 dry cleaner inspected but surrendered prior to year end.
Newport	0	9	10	18	8	19	9	95%	89%	However, 2 inspections cannot be undertaken (1 Full and one Check) due to site mothballed. Therefore Stats should be 100% as all inspections that can be done are done. Site has now been closed for 4 years.
King's Lynn & West Norfolk	1	9	6	16	11	17	10	94%	110%	

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
Dudley	4	19	22	46	20	49	23	94%	87%	One of the high risk full fee premises closed at the start of the year and therefore no visits were made. We also have two mothballed installations, one medium rated full fee installation and one low risk reduced fee installation and hence no visits were made to those sites.
Ashfield	0	5	11	15	6	16	5	94%	120%	
Walsall	1	23	6	29	3	31	24	94%	13%	Staff redundancy. Reallocation of resources for 2015/16 should address issue. Inspection of Group II & III companies carried out in previous 1 or 2 years. One Group I Low Risk company stopped trading before inspection could be carried out.
Calderdale	0	5	10	14	5	15	5	93%	100%	
Halton	1	3	9	13	1	14	4	93%	25%	Not all check visits made for High and medium risk processes due to other demands on officer time
Wigan	1	7	3	11	7	12	8	92%	88%	
Bolton	0	5	6	10	4	11	5	91%	80%	Three low risk dry cleaners not due inspections Two WOB low risk not due inspection 12 Low risk petrol stations not due inspection Two low risk vehicle resprayers not due inspection One mobile plant not due inspection one mothballed cement batching plant One group 1 installation mothballed One Group 1 installation surrendered permit.
Kettering	1	4	5	10	4	11	5	91%	80%	Resources were directed to ensure that all premises with a permit got one inspection/visit per year
Richmondshire	0	2	8	9	2	10	2	90%	100%	
East Staffordshire	0	7	3	9	6	10	7	90%	86%	Group I - Permit surrendered 2/5/14 no inspections undertaken Group II & III - on 2 or 3 year inspection schedules respectively
North Warwickshire	1	5	3	9	1	10	6	90%	17%	Mobile plant not in borough
Eden	0	4	5	8	4	9	4	89%	100%	There are a disproportionate no of inspections for one of the Bulk Cement Processes. This was due to investigating numerous complaints which resulted in the service of an Enforcement Notice

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
Durham UA	1	9	20	27	9	31	10	87%	90%	<p>Group 1</p> <p>1 Medium Risk installation- 1 check inspection missed. Low Risk - 1 mothballed installation and 3 installations Permitted during 2014/2015- therefore general compliance visits not undertaken.</p> <p>Group 3 Medium Risk not inspected as incorrectly given a 24 month inspection frequency. To be corrected during 2015/2016</p> <p>Not all Group 2 and Group 3 Low installations required a general compliance visit during 2014/2015</p>
Northumberland UA	2	4	22	26	5	30	6	87%	83%	<p>Mootlaw Quarry (PPC(B)004) - permit mothballed on 01/09/2011 and site is not operational and therefore according to guidance could not be inspected.</p> <p>ED & MA Redpath (EPN12/033) - unable to inspect as mobile plant operating out of the local authority area.</p> <p>ELCO (EPSE11/133) - closed down when visited and awaiting surrender form.</p> <p>Coal Products Ltd (EPSE14/027) - unallocated</p>
Brent	0	1	14	13	0	15	1	87%	0%	
Teignbridge	0	0	7	6	0	7	0	86%	N/A	
North East Lincolnshire	0	12	9	18	12	21	12	86%	100%	<p>One vehicle refinisher currently not operating, one bulk chemical storage process not operating and two other mineral processes no activity in 2014/15.</p> <p>A mobile crusher process - both head office and crusher has re-located out of the area.</p>
South Holland	0	1	6	6	1	7	1	86%	100%	
Erewash	0	0	13	11	0	13	0	85%	N/A	
Brentwood	1	0	4	5	1	6	1	83%	100%	
Cotswold	0	1	5	5	1	6	1	83%	100%	Group 1 - Low risk site currently mothballed

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
Merthyr Tydfil	0	2	4	5	2	6	2	83%	100%	The medium risk vehicle refinisher re-rated to low risk following the first inspection of the year. One low risk coaling operation remaining mothballed and was not inspected (drive-by check only to confirm it remained out of operation).
Ashford	0	2	4	5	0	6	2	83%	0%	N/A
Oldham	0	6	5	9	3	11	6	82%	50%	
Newcastle upon Tyne	0	1	10	9	0	11	1	82%	0%	Inspection plan at beginning of year identified 25 inspections were required in 2014/15. All standard processes were inspected but due to staff resources 1 vehicle refinisher (to close in 2015), 1 waste oil burner and 6 petrol stations (2xS1 and 4xS1+2) were not inspected. The VR is about to close but the inspection of the waste oil burner and 6 petrol stations will be included in the 2015/16 inspection programme and will be prioritised so as to be inspected first.
Bradford	2	12	5	17	11	21	14	81%	79%	
South Derbyshire	0	0	5	4	0	5	0	80%	N/A	Mobile plant (PPC/B/01/03(A)) was not operational for 2014/2015 and is currently undergoing maintenance work. Inspection has been scheduled once the plant is back in use.
Tewkesbury	0	0	5	4	0	5	0	80%	N/A	We have a quarry (reduced fee PG 3/08 process) which is mothballed and so not inspected. For this reason there is a group 1 low risk process that will show as not inspected. We were due to inspect 15 group 3 low risk processes in this year (PG1/14 petrol stations and PG1/01 waste oil burners) but only one of the inspections was completed due to staff shortages.
Great Yarmouth	1	0	3	4	1	5	1	80%	100%	
South Oxfordshire	0	2	3	4	2	5	2	80%	100%	
West Lancashire	0	4	6	8	1	10	4	80%	25%	
Coventry	2	8	8	16	2	20	10	80%	20%	Lack of staff resources meant it was not possible to ensure all installations were inspected at the required frequency. We have focused on carrying out full inspections at as many installations as possible.
South Tyneside	0	5	10	12	0	15	5	80%	0%	group 3 completed last year

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
Copeland	0	0	9	7	0	9	0	78%	N/A	One group 1 installation mothballed. One group 1 new application. Group 2 installations inspected previous year Group 3 installations inspected previous year
Bury	0	4	5	7	1	9	4	78%	25%	
Poole	0	0	4	3	0	4	0	75%	N/A	Insufficient resources due to reduction in staff numbers by 75% during 2014/2015 therefore unable to schedule routine inspection visits. Not expected to be an issue in 2015/2016 reporting period.
Medway	1	3	3	6	4	8	4	75%	100%	
Newham	0	3	1	3	0	4	3	75%	0%	
Wirral	0	2	2	3	0	4	2	75%	0%	
Thurrock	0	5	6	8	4	11	5	73%	80%	one bulk termnial vehicle refinisher and lime and cement currently mothballed other low risk groups 2 and 3 not programmed forr 2014 -2015
Allerdale	0	0	7	5	0	7	0	71%	N/A	
Ryedale	0	2	5	5	2	7	2	71%	100%	One Group Two mineral installation was not operational for the entire year.
Bolsover	0	2	5	5	1	7	2	71%	50%	We missed 1 full inspection for a group 1 low risk process due to part time working of the business manager and our consultant EHO not being able to make the same dates. We also missed 1 check inspection for a group 1 medium risk process.
South Gloucestershire UA	0	12	15	19	5	27	12	70%	42%	Prioritized against risk; largely concurs with inspection level. Public sector cuts/increased workloads with less staff
Northampton	0	1	9	7	0	10	1	70%	0%	Some of our processes are mothballed hence no inspection due
Wychavon	0	2	8	7	0	10	2	70%	0%	
Sheffield	16	18	0	34	0	50	34	68%	0%	Severe lack of resources devoted to this area. Half a fte post cut a couple of years ago.
Hambleton	0	0	3	2	0	3	0	67%	N/A	Several installations did not require an inspection as they are on a two or three-yearly inspection frequency, one site is currently mothballed so no inspection was carried out.
Chelmsford	1	0	1	2	0	3	1	67%	0%	

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	Reasons
Isle of Wight / Medina	0	1	14	10	0	15	1	67%	0%	
Rushmoor	1	0	1	2	0	3	1	67%	0%	Plant for High Risk Group I not operational throughout year due to plant breakdown
Wyre Forest	1	2	2	4	0	6	3	67%	0%	
Wycombe	0	0	11	7	0	11	0	64%	N/A	Inspections completed according to schedule.
London PHA	0	0	5	3	0	5	0	60%	N/A	
Cheltenham	1	1	2	3	2	5	2	60%	100%	Low risk category 1 permitted installation due to close on 1st April
Preston	0	2	3	3	2	5	2	60%	100%	A total of 31 inspections were scheduled for 2014-15. Upon arrival for inspection at one premises it was determined that the business had recently closed down and the permit has subsequently been surrendered. A further two inspections that were due in March 2015 unfortunately had to be re-scheduled at the request of the operator due to unforeseen availability and staffing problems. These have been undertaken in the period 2015-16.
Tandridge	0	2	3	3	0	5	2	60%	0%	Mobile crusher/screener not operating and the owner was waiting for a buyer. Owner of quarry site was away and unable to arrange an inspection.
Breckland	1	1	4	4	2	7	2	57%	100%	
Redditch	0	2	5	4	0	7	2	57%	0%	
Thanet	0	2	5	4	0	7	2	57%	0%	Severe staff shortages through January through to May 2015 meant only medium risk inspections were carried out. Three new team members, one of which specialising in Part B inspections will be in place as of middle May 2015. First priority for new Officer is to inspect all installations in addition to those already scheduled for later in the year. This decision was authorised by Management.
Amber Valley	0	2	9	6	0	11	2	55%	0%	Some low risk Group 2 inspections were not due in 2014/15. Also see section 5.4.5. Small number of scheduled inspections not completed due to competing demand for resources. This will be addressed in 2015/16
Hyndburn	2	8	3	8	0	15	10	53%	0%	Just in post for 6 months of the year concerned

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
Cherwell	0	0	10	5	0	10	0	50%	N/A	not all permits held in the categories in 5.6.2 were due for inspection in this annual return year
Cambridge	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	50%	100%	
Fareham	0	3	1	2	2	4	3	50%	67%	1 x vehicle refinishers has closed; 1 x vehicle refinishers is at reduced operation; 1 x SED activity is at reduced operation; and 1 x mobile plant is not operating
Manchester PHA	2	0	0	2	1	4	2	50%	50%	We were unable to audit 1 x Low reduced fee permit (cement) due to the plant being out of operation. The plant wish to retain their permit despite there being no activity on site. A check visit is completed to ensure that no cement handling is taking place.
Lancaster	7	5	1	10	3	20	12	50%	25%	
Waltham Forest	1	4	0	3	0	6	5	50%	0%	
Bristol City UA	1	5	5	5	1	12	6	42%	17%	Due to the main permits officer retiring in December 2014 the inspections were not all carried out accordingly as the remaining staff have had to learn the permitting process.
Mole Valley	0	0	3	1	0	3	0	33%	N/A	
North Lincolnshire	24	14	3	21	12	65	38	32%	32%	
Bristol PHA	0	0	4	1	0	4	0	25%	N/A	Inspections in 2014/2015 were limited due to the principal permits officer retiring halfway through the year with 2 weeks notice. Therefore we have had to train staff in the management of the permitting regime and train staff to undertake the inspections which is taking some time due to reduced staffing levels and no reduction in workload for the team as a whole.
Braintree	0	0	44	9	0	44	0	20%	N/A	
Barking & Dagenham	0	0	5	1	0	5	0	20%	N/A	health status of staff other project work
North Norfolk	0	0	5	1	0	5	0	20%	N/A	
Uttlesford	1	0	3	1	0	5	1	20%	0%	
Basildon	0	0	6	1	0	6	0	17%	N/A	
Barrow-in-Furness	0	2	5	1	2	7	2	14%	100%	one medium risk installation not operating for a significant proportion of the year.

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	Reasons
Stockton-on-Tees	0	2	14	2	2	16	2	13%	100%	
Lambeth	0	3	37	3	1	40	3	8%	33%	
Bracknell Forest	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Broxtowe	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0%	N/A	One group (low) was being decommissioned. Inseption cycles means not all are due to be inspected during this period.
Christchurch	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0%	N/A	Our new pollution team is now in place following a review of services and it is intended to get inspections in both the Christchurch Borough council and East Dorset district Council in the year 2015/2016. We have concentrated on reactive work in the pollution area over the last year.
East Dorset	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0%	N/A	Our new pollution team is now in place following a review of services and it is intended to get inspections in both the Christchurch Borough council and East Dorset district Council in the year 2015/2016. We have concentrated on reactive work in the pollution area over the last year.
Kingston upon Thames	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0%	N/A	Some inspections have not been undertaken due to absence of appropriately skilled and experienced resource for much of the year.
Knowsley	0	0	15	0	0	15	0	0%	N/A	Knowsley has taken the view that installations are visited once a year to keep up a good two way relationship between operator and LA about all environmental issues.
Nottingham	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Solihull	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	0%	N/A	solihull MBC received 50 mobile permits as Tarmac relocated to the Borough. These were made up of 16 mobile concrete plant, 4 roadstone , 30 mobile crushers.screensers
Southampton	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0%	N/A	
Stratford-on-Avon	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	0%	N/A	
Surrey Heath	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	Staff vacancy doing this function from November 14. Unsuccessful in recruitment since. Agency replacement due May 15 - will be catching up on those due.
Westminster	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Arun	0	1	1	0	1	2	1	0%	100%	Full inspections on 2 Group one premises (1medium & 1 low risk) programmed for March 2015 carried out in April & May 2015.
Castle Point	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0%	0%	

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	Reasons
Hounslow	0	3	2	0	0	5	3	0%	0%	
Kingston upon Hull	0	4	16	0	0	20	4	0%	0%	
Mansfield	0	5	3	0	0	8	5	0%	0%	
Rochford	0	3	1	0	0	4	3	0%	0%	Due to the workload demands with insufficient staffing resources, programmed visits were unable to be undertaken

Authorities with fewer full inspections than required – group II installations

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
Sedgemoor	1	6	0	6	0	7	1	86%	0%	The premises in question, Group 2 High risk, did not receive a check visit as it was due to close shortly after
Newark & Sherwood	0	12	0	10	0	12	0	83%	N/A	Our mobile plant operators do not routinely operate in our district so inspections are not usually possible, also some check inspections on medium rated installations are conducted in previous or next period. Or in some instances, there is no upgrading works to check.
Wyre	0	4	0	3	0	4	0	75%	N/A	One full inspection missed in respects to a waste oil burner, and one check inspection missed in relation to a Tar and Bitumen Process. Both processes have since received inspections early in 2015/16.
Blaby	0	3	0	2	0	3	0	67%	N/A	
Wigan	0	3	0	2	0	3	0	67%	N/A	
Newcastle under Lyme	1	2	0	2	0	3	1	67%	0%	
Salford	0	14	0	9	0	14	0	64%	N/A	For Group II and III inspections for low risk are not carried out on an annual basis as stated above in the DEFRA minimum inspection levels. therefore there will be a number of installations that will not have required an inspection.
Barnet	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	50%	N/A	60 routine inspections 4 change of ownerships inspections There are no inspections that have not been carried out
Bristol City UA	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	50%	N/A	Due to the main permits officer retiring in December 2014 the inspections were not all carried out accordingly as the remaining staff have had to learn the permitting process.
North Hertfordshire	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	50%	N/A	
Selby	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	50%	N/A	
North Lincolnshire	6	6	0	6	1	12	6	50%	17%	
Medway	0	8	0	2	0	8	0	25%	N/A	
Bury	1	4	0	1	2	5	1	20%	200%	

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	Reasons
Walsall	2	4	0	1	1	6	2	17%	50%	Staff redundancy. Reallocation of resources for 2015/16 should address issue. Inspection of Group II & III companies carried out in previous 1 or 2 years. One Group I Low Risk company stopped trading before inspection could be carried out.
Ashfield	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Bedford Borough UA	0	12	0	0	0	12	0	0%	N/A	
Bradford	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Castle Point	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Coventry	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	Lack of staff resources meant it was not possible to ensure all installations were inspected at the required frequency. We have focused on carrying out full inspections at as many installations as possible.
Crawley	0	6	0	0	0	6	0	0%	N/A	
Dudley	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	One of the high risk full fee premises closed at the start of the year and therefore no visits were made. We also have two mothballed installations, one medium rated full fee installation and one low risk reduced fee installation and hence no visits were made to those sites.
Halton	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	Not all check visits made for High and medium risk processes due to other demands on officer time
Havering	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	There has been no officer in post to undertake the relevant work since June 2014.
Luton BC	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0%	N/A	One of our Dry Cleaners was destroyed by fire and it took 11 months to get the shop refurbished to working order
North West Leicestershire	0	5	0	0	0	5	0	0%	N/A	We have had a lot of permits that have been reclassified to reduced fee and therefore inspections have not been required in this cycle of inspections.
Northampton	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	Some of our processes are mothballed hence no inspection due
Rochford	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	Due to the workload demands with insufficient staffing resources, programmed visits were unable to be undertaken
Suffolk Coastal	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Uttlesford	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	Reasons
Waveney	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Weymouth & Portland	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Mansfield	3	1	0	0	0	4	3	0%	0%	

Authorities with fewer full inspections than required – group III installations

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
Waltham Forest	9	18	0	26	1	27	9	96%	11%	
Greenwich	2	21	0	22	0	23	2	96%	0%	(1) Two dry cleaners, inspection was not completed, because they appeared to have closed their activities. So, revocation process is underway.
Ribble Valley	0	10	0	9	0	10	0	90%	N/A	
Barnet	1	16	0	15	1	17	1	88%	100%	60 routine inspections 4 change of ownerships inspections There are no inspections that have not been carried out
Swale	0	8	0	7	0	8	0	88%	N/A	Several revoked/ surrendered installations within year
North Hertfordshire	0	6	0	5	0	6	0	83%	N/A	
Coventry	1	5	0	5	0	6	1	83%	0%	Lack of staff resources meant it was not possible to ensure all installations were inspected at the required frequency. We have focused on carrying out full inspections at as many installations as possible.
Dartford	0	5	0	4	0	5	0	80%	N/A	
Newark & Sherwood	0	5	0	4	0	5	0	80%	N/A	Our mobile plant operators do not routinely operate in our district so inspections are not usually possible, also some check inspections on medium rated installations are conducted in previous or next period. Or in some instances, there is no upgrading works to check.
Neath and Port Talbot	0	4	0	3	0	4	0	75%	N/A	The Authority has done most of the inspections at the frequency required under the risk methodology, and done quite a lot of extra inspections, as occasioned. However as there has been no officer in post for PPC since September 2014 till April 2015, there are some gaps in the inspections. This is a rare departure from the norm for this authority and we expect inspections levels to be back up again , in the current year.
Taunton Deane	1	2	0	2	0	3	1	67%	0%	High risk dry cleaning premises closed so not inspected. One Cement plant mothballed

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	Reasons
Eden	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	50%	N/A	There are a disproportionate no of inspections for one of the Bulk Cement Processes. This was due to investigating numerous complaints which resulted in the service of an Enforcement Notice
Sedgemoor	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	50%	N/A	The premises in question, Group 2 High risk, did not receive a check visit as it was due to close shortly after
Sefton	1	1	0	1	2	2	1	50%	200%	the majority of Group ii and Group iii installations are on 2/3 year inspection frequencies and as such are not due an inspection this year.
Bolton	2	2	0	2	1	4	2	50%	50%	Three low risk dry cleaners not due inspections Two WOB low risk not due inspection 12 Low risk petrol stations not due inspection Two low risk vehicle resprayers not due inspection One mobile plant not due inspection one mothballed cement batching plant One group 1 installation mothballed One Group 1 installation surrendered permit.
Ashfield	0	3	0	1	0	3	0	33%	N/A	
Bracknell Forest	0	3	0	1	0	3	0	33%	N/A	
Cardiff	1	11	0	3	0	12	1	25%	0%	
Wyre	0	6	0	1	0	6	0	17%	N/A	One full inspection missed in respects to a waste oil burner, and one check inspection missed in relation to a Tar and Bitumen Process. Both processes have since received inspections early in 2015/16.
Bedford Borough UA	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0%	N/A	
Breckland	0	13	0	0	3	13	0	0%	N/A	
Brent	0	16	0	0	0	16	0	0%	N/A	
Bridgend	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0%	N/A	
Cannock Chase	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0%	N/A	
Castle Point	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Croydon	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	0%	N/A	2014-15 For the 97 processes operational a total of 39 full inspections and 1 check were completed as scheduled.

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
Durham UA	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0%	N/A	<p>Group 1</p> <p>1 Medium Risk installation- 1 check inspection missed. Low Risk - 1 mothballed installation and 3 installations Permitted during 2014/2015- therefore general compliance visits not undertaken.</p> <p>Group 3</p> <p>Medium Risk not inspected as incorrectly given a 24 month inspection frequency. To be corrected during 2015/2016</p> <p>Not all Group 2 and Group 3 Low installations required a general compliance visit during 2014/2015</p>
East Lindsey	0	2	0	0	5	2	0	0%	N/A	
King's Lynn & West Norfolk	0	6	0	0	0	6	0	0%	N/A	
Mansfield	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0%	N/A	
Mendip	0	4	0	0	0	4	0	0%	N/A	
Newcastle under Lyme	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Nuneaton & Bedworth	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Peterborough	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Powys	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Richmondshire	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0%	N/A	
Slough	0	7	0	0	0	7	0	0%	N/A	
Stockport	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Thanet	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	0%	N/A	<p>Severe staff shortages through January through to May 2015 meant only medium risk inspections were carried out. Three new team members, one of which specialising in Part B inspections will be in place as of middle May 2015. First priority for new Officer is to inspect all installations in addition to those already scheduled for later in the year. This decision was authorised by Management.</p>

Annex D –Inspection Rates for Part B Installations

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	Reasons
Bristol PHA	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	0%	0%	Inspections in 2014/2015 were limited due to the principal permits officer retiring halfway through the year with 2 weeks notice. Therefore we have had to train staff in the management of the permitting regime and train staff to undertake the inspections which is taking some time due to reduced staffing levels and no reduction in workload for the team as a whole.
Luton BC	1	3	0	0	0	4	1	0%	0%	One of our Dry Cleaners was destroyed by fire and it took 11 months to get the shop refurbished to working order
Runnymede	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0%	0%	

Authorities which have yet to risk assess any of their installations

Basingstoke & Deane

Boston PHA

Flintshire

Harborough

Liverpool

Torridge

Wealden