

Annex E

INSPECTION RATES FOR PART A2 INSTALLATIONS

Annex E – Inspection Rates for Part A2 Installations

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

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	Reasons
Caerphilly	0	1	1	6	0	2	1	300%	0%	
Bassetlaw	1	0	2	11	0	4	1	275%	0%	
Bury	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	200%	N/A	
Knowsley	0	0	2	4	0	2	0	200%	N/A	Knowsley has taken the view that installations are visited twice a year to keep up a good two way relationship between operator and LA about all environmental issues.
South Norfolk	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	200%	N/A	
East Riding of Yorkshire	0	1	1	4	2	2	1	200%	200%	
Exeter	1	0	1	6	2	3	1	200%	200%	
Mendip	0	1	0	2	1	1	1	200%	100%	
York City UA	0	1	0	2	1	1	1	200%	100%	
Cardiff	0	1	0	2	0	1	1	200%	0%	
Chesterfield	0	1	0	2	0	1	1	200%	0%	
Kettering	0	1	0	2	0	1	1	200%	0%	
Neath and Port Talbot	0	1	0	2	0	1	1	200%	0%	
Rotherham	0	4	0	7	2	4	4	175%	50%	
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	
Horsham	0	0	2	3	0	2	0	150%	N/A	
Bradford	0	4	1	7	7	5	4	140%	175%	
Cheshire West UA	0	0	3	4	0	3	0	133%	N/A	

Annex E – Inspection Rates for Part A2 Installations

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
Sandwell	0	4	1	6	0	5	4	120%	0%	<p>One Ferrous site (IPPC90056 - Black Country Castings) was bought by another operator in 2014/15 and so ceased trading. The site was therefore not operational for some time in this reporting year. It only received one inspection, though 2 minimum were planned. The permit was transferred (to Thomas Dudley (Duport) Ltd in April 2015 when it resumed activities.</p> <p>One galvaniser ceased trading in the 2013/2014 reporting year but did not notify us of this until later in the 2014/15 reporting period. We were unaware that operations had ceased (it was risk rated medium, as operational) but could not be inspected at all.</p> <p>Thought it appears that 9 inspections (from 4 medium and 1 low risk site) were due, changes in year meant only 5 inspections (from 2 medium and 1 low) were actually required - 6 inspections were done in full compliance with requirements.</p>
North Lincolnshire	4	1	2	12	6	11	5	109%	120%	
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	1	1	0	1	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	
Blaeneau Gwent	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Braintree	0	0	3	3	0	3	0	100%	N/A	
Breckland	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Chichester	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Colchester	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Corby	0	0	2	2	2	2	0	100%	N/A	
Cotswold	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Dacorum	0	0	1	1	0	1	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	
Erewash	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	

Annex E – Inspection Rates for Part A2 Installations

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	Reasons
Great Yarmouth	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Halton	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	
Huntingdonshire	0	0	3	3	0	3	0	100%	N/A	
Isle of Wight / Medina	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Kingston upon Hull	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Kirklees	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Lancaster	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Lewes	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
London PHA	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Maidstone	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Melton	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Mid Devon	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Mid Sussex	0	0	2	2	0	2	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 Devon	0	0	1	1	0	1	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	
Slough	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	
Southampton	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	

Annex E – Inspection Rates for Part A2 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	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	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Thurrock	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Torfaen	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Uttlesford	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Vale of White Horse	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Warrington	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
West Lancashire	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Worcester	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Calderdale	0	1	1	2	2	2	1	100%	200%	
Cannock Chase	1	3	0	5	8	5	4	100%	200%	
Wrexham	1	1	3	6	3	6	2	100%	150%	
Blackburn & Darwen	0	2	2	4	2	4	2	100%	100%	
Bolsover	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	100%	100%	
Bournemouth	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	100%	100%	
Bridgend	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	100%	100%	
Broadland	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	100%	100%	
Carlisle	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
Charnwood	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
Chiltern	0	2	0	2	2	2	2	100%	100%	
Cornwall UA	0	1	2	3	1	3	1	100%	100%	
Derby	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
Ealing	1	0	0	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
East Staffordshire	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	100%	100%	

Annex E – Inspection Rates for Part A2 Installations

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
Eden	1	0	0	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	<p>please note that as of the 27 January 2015, the Council realized that the installation was not an A2 process, but had a number of A2 and A1 activities and should therefore go the Environment Agency. The EA have accepted that this is the case and are seeking an A1 application from the operator.</p> <p>Where the questions in this survey refer to a date at the beginning of the financial year, ie. April 2014, we therefore were the regulators for one A2 installation, by March 2015, we were the regulators of none.</p>
Gateshead	0	1	2	3	1	3	1	100%	100%	
Hambleton	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
Harlow	1	0	0	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
High Peak	0	3	0	3	3	3	3	100%	100%	
Ipswich	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	100%	100%	
King's Lynn & West Norfolk	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
Leeds	0	4	4	8	4	8	4	100%	100%	
Leicester	0	1	2	3	1	3	1	100%	100%	
Maldon	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	100%	100%	
Medway	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
Mole Valley	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
Newcastle under Lyme	0	1	2	3	1	3	1	100%	100%	Extra inspection was carried out following a complaint.
North East Derbyshire	1	0	3	5	1	5	1	100%	100%	
North Kesteven	1	0	0	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
North Warwickshire	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
Pendle	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
Plymouth	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	100%	100%	
Portsmouth	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	100%	100%	
Rugby	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	100%	100%	
Salford	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	100%	100%	
Selby	0	2	0	2	2	2	2	100%	100%	
South Ribble	1	0	0	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	

Annex E – Inspection Rates for Part A2 Installations

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
St Helens	0	1	4	5	1	5	1	100%	100%	
Stroud	1	0	0	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
Teignbridge	1	0	0	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
Wakefield	0	3	5	8	3	8	3	100%	100%	
Walsall	1	4	3	9	3	9	5	100%	60%	Staff redundancy. Reallocation of resources for 2015/16 should address issue.
Ashfield	0	2	2	4	1	4	2	100%	50%	Check inspection not carried out due to a lack of communication when an officer left the Authority in March
Gedling	0	2	1	3	1	3	2	100%	50%	
South Gloucestershire UA	0	3	0	3	1	3	3	100%	33%	
Hyndburn	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	100%	0%	
Manchester	0	1	1	2	0	2	1	100%	0%	
North Somerset	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	100%	0%	
Swale	0	1	2	3	0	3	1	100%	0%	1 site mothballed
West Lindsey	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	100%	0%	Directive 2010/75/EU Chapter II, Provisions for Activities Listed in Annex I, Article 10 this Chapter shall apply to the activities set out in Annex 1 and where applicable, reaching the capacity thresholds set out in that Annex. Article 23 Environmental Inspections (4) Based on inspection plans etc., goes onto say that the period between two site visits shall be based on a systematic appraisal of the environmental risks of the installations concerned and shall not exceed 1 year for an installation posing the highest risk and 3 years for installations posing the lowest risk. If an inspection identified an important case of non-compliance with the permit conditions, an additional site visit shall be carried out within 6 months of that inspection. As the installation is classed as Medium I interrupted this as Bi-annually x 2 inspection, one full and one check. I will amend our inspection plan for the forthcoming year.
Wychavon	0	1	2	3	0	3	1	100%	0%	
Sheffield	3	1	0	6	0	7	4	86%	0%	lack of resources
Dudley	0	3	2	4	3	5	3	80%	100%	One of the ceramic A2 installations is a low risk mothballed process and therefore we are unable to inspect the process.
Telford & Wrekin	3	5	2	10	0	13	8	77%	0%	

Annex E – Inspection Rates for Part A2 Installations

Authority Name	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		Reasons
	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	
Birmingham	0	1	3	3	1	4	1	75%	100%	One of the processes is currently mothballed and did not receive a full inspection
Northumberland UA	0	2	2	3	2	4	2	75%	100%	One of our A2 installations is currently mothballed and not operating an extra inspection visit was therefore carried out. Two extra inspections were carried out on installations which were undergoing improvements to their plant during the year.
Peterborough	1	0	2	3	0	4	1	75%	0%	One installation is mothballed, therefore no inspection carried out - site is not operational.
Powys	1	2	0	3	0	4	3	75%	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 currently seeking advice in respect of permit revocation.
Durham UA	1	2	3	5	5	7	3	71%	167%	One Low risk installation is mothballed so no general compliance visit carried out. High Risk installation- 1 full and 2 check visits carried out instead of 2 Full and 1 check. (error)
North East Lincolnshire	0	1	2	2	1	3	1	67%	100%	A full inspection has not been completed on the SWIP as site was not fully operational, plant still being installed.
Newport	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	50%	N/A	One Inspection could not be undertaken due to the site being mothballed. Therefore Stats should be 100% as all inspections that could be done have been. Site has now been closed for over 4 years.
Burnley	0	2	0	1	2	2	2	50%	100%	The visit to one A2 site was in relation to their surrender. The site is now vacant, however the fee for surrender has not they been received. The visits made to this site were in relation to the extent of contamination present following operations on site
Gloucester	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	50%	100%	
Chelmsford	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	50%	0%	
Newham	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	50%	0%	Facility ceased animal rendering activity on 1st October 2014. To remain a waste transfer depot under the Animal By-Products (Enforcement) (England) Regulations 2013. Surrender process to be completed in 2015.

Annex E – Inspection Rates for Part A2 Installations

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	Reasons
Redcar & Cleveland UA	0	1	2	1	0	3	1	33%	0%	The medium risk installation ceased operating part way through the year so no check inspection could be completed. One low risk installation is mothballed so no inspection was due. The SWIP installation is still undertaking it's commissioning phase so no full inspection could be completed.
Broxtowe	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	visit to inspect, in process of change of operator so further advice given, though operation to remain unchanged
Carmarthenshire	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0%	N/A	There were no inspections carried out at the animal carcass incineration installation because they are not operational, and have not been for over five years. Operators however wish to maintain their permits.
Cherwell	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
East Devon	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Guildford	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	It was proposed to carry out the 'full' inspection as determined by the 'low' risk assessment at the end of 2013/14 on the SWIP regulated by this Authority, during 2014/15. Due to redevelopment of the site and a change in procedures it has not operated since April 2014. It was envisaged that it would commence operations during February / March 2015 and the inspection would take place at this time. However, re-commissioning was delayed and therefore the proposed inspection not carried out.
Rother	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0%	N/A	
Solihull	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	1	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	The site is closed and therefore could not be inspected
Bromsgrove	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0%	0%	No inspections made as plant was not operated during the year.
Harborough	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0%	0%	
Poole	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	0%	0%	Insufficient resources due to reduction in staff numbers by 75% therefore unable to schedule routine inspection visits. Any visits undertaken were complaint led. Not expected to be an issue in 2015/2016 reporting period.
South Tyneside	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0%	0%	

Annex E – Inspection Rates for Part A2 Installations

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	Reasons
Torridge	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0%	0%	This premises has been mothballed so no inspection necessary.

Authorities which have yet to risk assess any of their installations

Ashford

Flintshire

Liverpool

Ribble Valley

South Staffordshire

Wellingborough