Annex D

INSPECTION RATES FOR PART B INSTALLATIONS

Risk Based inspection performance per authority for all installation groups combined

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Tendring	0	1	0	9	0	1	1	900%	0%	
East Lindsey	1	0	0	14	4	2	1	700%	400%	
Bassetlaw	1	3	15	47	0	20	4	235%	0%	
Thanet	0	3	0	7	2	3	0	233%	N/A	DDS operate a concrete crusher which was not in our district during our inspection period.
Bradford	1	15	0	34	18	17	8	200%	225%	
Mansfield	0	13	4	32	7	17	10	188%	70%	
St Helens	0	2	14	30	2	16	2	188%	100%	
Suffolk Coastal	0	4	5	15	2	9	2	167%	100%	
Manchester	4	11	12	50	10	30	11	167%	91%	
Chiltern	0	2	1	5	0	3	1	167%	0%	
Stockport	0	9	4	21	0	13	8	162%	0%	
Cardiff	1	15	12	45	0	29	4	155%	0%	
Sefton	1	13	8	34	9	22	6	155%	150%	A large percentage of the group 2 and 3 installations are categorised as low and as such are on a 2 or 3 year inspection level and were not due an inspection in 2012/13
Middlesbrough	0	3	8	17	0	11	3	155%	0%	
High Peak	1	15	8	37	7	24	7	154%	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.
Dover	0	0	4	6	0	4	0	150%	N/A	
Havering	0	1	1	3	1	2	1	150%	100%	Vapour recovery is carried out by the Fire Brigade and 1/3rd of installations are visited each year. SWOB was inspected last year ans were all car sprayers. No DC's were inspected due to lack of time and staff.
Elmbridge	0	2	2	6	0	4	2	150%	0%	Reduction in staff resources for PPC
Mid Devon	0	5	7	18	0	12	4	150%	0%	

	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	19	10	47	1	32	13	147%	8%	Group 2 - Medium: x2 mobile crushers were not inspected as they were outside the Borough for the whole year. Group 2 - Low: x1 mobile crusher was not inspected as it was outside the Borough for most of the year; x1 mobile crusher was not inspected as this permit has been transfered to Natural Resources Wales and the operator has not yet surrendered their LAPPC permit; and x1 mobile crusher was not inspected as the operator was difficult to get in touch with and did not keep appointments for inspections. Group 3 - High: x1 petrol filling station was not given a check inspection as the manager was not present at the time of the visit.
Norwich	0	5	4	13	0	9	1	144%	0%	
Wycombe	0	7	7	19	0	14	5	136%	0%	All scheduled inspection were undertaken in period.
East Northamptonshire	0	3	6	12	0	9	3	133%	0%	
Ashfield	1	10	16	36	0	28	7	129%	0%	
Huntingdonshire	0	1	17	23	0	18	1	128%	0%	
St Edmundsbury	4	2	1	14	0	11	6	127%	0%	
Sheffield	20	28	1	82	0	65	41	126%	0%	Lack of resources allocated to this area , officer on maternity leave
North Tyneside	4	10	10	30	3	24	11	125%	27%	high group2 were stone crushers found on full inspection to drop to low risk on inspection , high group 3 delay in inspection lead to visit in next financial year April.
Sandwell	7	23	20	70	4	56	25	125%	16%	
Rochdale	11	10	11	46	14	38	18	121%	78%	
Stoke-on-Trent	1	8	28	46	0	38	9	121%	0%	
Mid Sussex	0	1	4	6	1	5	1	120%	100%	
Boston	0	5	5	12	2	10	5	120%	40%	
Maidstone	0	1	4	6	0	5	1	120%	0%	
Harlow	0	4	7	13	2	11	2	118%	100%	
North Hertfordshire	0	5	6	13	0	11	2	118%	0%	
Portsmouth	0	6	0	7	3	6	5	117%	60%	
Ribble Valley	3	6	3	14	0	12	3	117%	0%	

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Milton Keynes	0	2	11	15	2	13	2	115%	100%	Inspected according to risk rating e.g. service stations and dry cleaners did not require a visit during the 2012/13 accounting period
Tunbridge Wells	3	13	3	23	0	20	6	115%	0%	Crusher surrendered permit before viist carried out. Some petrol stations obtained high scores by failing to have paperwork re inspection of systems etc which was resolcved by submission rather than visit. One national drycleaner has a corporate 'difficulty with the accuracy of submitted data rather than on site data which complies.
Bury	0	3	11	16	3	14	2	114%	150%	
Hinckley & Bosworth	0	1	6	8	1	7	1	114%	100%	
Barrow-in-Furness	0	3	4	8	1	7	3	114%	33%	
Cannock Chase	0	4	4	9	3	8	3	113%	100%	N/A
King's Lynn & West Norfolk	3	10	21	39	8	35	11	111%	73%	Mobile batching plant out of area missing a full and check inspection. Petrol terminal closed missed full inspection. Pet food manufacturer entered liquidation and closed missing a full and check inspection. Coal handling activity mothballed missed a full inspection
Darlington	0	2	8	11	2	10	2	110%	100%	
Torridge	1	2	6	11	0	10	3	110%	0%	Group 3 activities do not need an inspection each year
North Lincolnshire	3	12	37	60	24	55	15	109%	160%	Vehicle Resprayors and dry cleaners were not due an inspection.
Trafford	2	6	13	25	10	23	8	109%	125%	
Bristol City UA	1	7	4	14	8	13	6	108%	133%	2 mobile plant are currently based outside the area of Bristol UA
Swindon B.C.	0	2	11	14	0	13	1	108%	0%	
South Cambridgeshire	0	3	11	15	3	14	3	107%	100%	
Liverpool	1	4	10	17	4	16	5	106%	80%	
Gwynedd	0	4	13	18	2	17	3	106%	67%	
Stafford	0	0	18	19	0	18	0	106%	N/A	
Central Bedfordshire UA	0	6	12	19	5	18	5	106%	100%	
Selby	1	4	14	21	0	20	4	105%	0%	Operator of high risk installation refused access so only visit completed during the year.

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Newport	2	8	13	25	8	24	10	104%	80%	"Full Inspection = 100% (98.1%) , Check Inspection = 100% (93.3 %) However, 2 Inspections cannot be conducted (1 full and 1 check) due the sites mothballed Therefore stats should be 100% as all inspections that can be done are done."
Sedgemoor	2	11	10	25	0	24	11	104%	0%	
Ealing	3	18	4	26	3	25	4	104%	75%	Mobile crushers not in borough for check inspetions
Birmingham	8	56	26	93	7	91	31	102%	23%	
Anglesey	0	0	11	11	0	11	0	100%	N/A	
Ashford	0	0	10	10	0	10	0	100%	N/A	Inspections were carried out as per the DEFRA risk rating in each of the risk categories.
Basildon	0	0	17	17	0	17	0	100%	N/A	
Basingstoke & Deane	0	0	4	4	0	4	0	100%	N/A	
Bexley	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Bracknell Forest	0	3	1	4	0	4	0	100%	N/A	
Brentwood	0	0	3	3	0	3	0	100%	N/A	
Brighton & Hove	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Bristol PHA	0	0	5	5	0	5	0	100%	N/A	
Bromley	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	Mobile plant continues to be difficult to inspect.
Bromsgrove	0	1	2	3	0	3	0	100%	N/A	
Cherwell	0	0	6	6	0	6	0	100%	N/A	
Cheshire West UA	0	0	22	22	0	22	0	100%	N/A	
Chorley	0	0	4	4	0	4	0	100%	N/A	

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Christchurch	0	0	3	3	0	3	0	100%	N/A	Again, we visited all our premises once this year except for the 5 service stations(should be done year 13/14 as we join East Dorset system) Had to visit Beagle SED activity 3 times Once to look at their training systems, once for sampling figures and once regarding proposed move which may not happen following planning refusal.
Copeland	0	0	8	8	0	8	0	100%	N/A	Waste oil burners (under 0.4 MW) not inspected this year. PVR 1's not inspected this year.
Exeter	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Fylde	0	0	3	3	0	3	0	100%	N/A	
Gloucester	0	0	10	10	0	10	0	100%	N/A	
Gravesham	0	0	11	11	0	11	0	100%	N/A	
Great Yarmouth	0	2	2	4	0	4	0	100%	N/A	
Hambleton	0	0	11	11	0	11	0	100%	N/A	
Harborough	0	0	5	5	0	5	0	100%	N/A	
Hart	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Hastings	0	0	4	4	0	4	0	100%	N/A	
Havant	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	Medium risk was determined at 2013 inspection - rating at beginning of year was Low risk. Medium risk rating was result of minor non-compliance / breach of permit conditions; and is due largely to interpretation of qualifying 'breaches'. Inspection was done under contract by Trading standards, and there is disagreement over the interpretation of the risk score / application of the risk assessment methodology. Requires clarification. Treated as Low risk for invoicing / inspection purposes until rating is verified.
Islington	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
Knowsley	0	0	15	15	0	15	0	100%	N/A	The local authority has decided that provided that the installation is low then they each will visited once a year. Reason to keep a good two way working reltionship between operator and inspector not only working within the system but with possible other environmental issues.
Lewes	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Medway	0	5	8	13	5	13	0	100%	N/A	Not all reduced fee inatallations required visits this year. Some were installation permitted during the year.
Oadby & Wigston	0	1	1	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
River Tees PHA	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Rushmoor	0	0	5	5	0	5	0	100%	N/A	
Rutland	0	1	6	7	0	7	0	100%	N/A	
Slough	0	0	6	6	0	6	0	100%	N/A	
South Holland	0	0	10	10	0	10	0	100%	N/A	
South Northamptonshire	0	0	5	5	0	5	0	100%	N/A	
South Staffordshire	0	0	8	8	0	8	0	100%	N/A	
Southampton	0	0	8	8	0	8	0	100%	N/A	
Stratford-on-Avon	0	0	6	6	0	6	0	100%	N/A	
Teignbridge	0	0	20	20	0	20	0	100%	N/A	
Uttlesford	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	100%	N/A	
Vale of Glamorgan	0	0	9	9	0	9	0	100%	N/A	
Vale of White Horse	0	0	7	7	0	7	0	100%	N/A	
Waveney	0	1	13	14	0	14	0	100%	N/A	
Wellingborough	0	0	11	11	0	11	0	100%	N/A	
West Berkshire	0	0	15	15	0	15	0	100%	N/A	A programmed inspection was due at a roadstone coating plant this year - however was not undertaken as plant was mothballed.
West Devon	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	100%	N/A	
West Dorset	0	2	4	6	0	6	0	100%	N/A	Difficulty with obtaining ability to visit crusher as not always in district. No excuse for the other medium = concrete batcher.
Winchester	0	0	5	5	0	5	0	100%	N/A	All routine inspections for ulnoading petrol into storage at petrol stations (PG1/14) are carried out on routine annual basis by our petroleum officers at Hampshire County Council and are not recorded here. There are 21 permits in total which fall into this category.
Windsor & Maidenhead	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	100%	N/A	

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Swansea Bay PHA	0	1	9	10	3	10	1	100%	300%	Three "Low risk" processes have been inoperative during the year, but annual site visit carried out and potential for operations discussed with operator.
Broxbourne	0	7	3	10	2	10	1	100%	200%	Please note that there is 1x mothballed bulk cement activity and 1x mothballed roadstone coating activity. Actual number of installations is 41, 2 are mothballed leaving 39 active which is the total number in 5.6.2.
York City UA	2	13	6	22	10	22	7	100%	143%	we did not inspect the mobile crushers which operate outside the district this year. 4 mobile crushers came into our district, we inspected these but they are not included in the figures
Calderdale	0	11	30	41	15	41	11	100%	136%	Two combustion installations (medium risk) only operated over the winter period, so only one (full) inspection was possible. Several complaints about ferrous foundry installations required check visits.
Bolsover	0	4	4	8	5	8	4	100%	125%	One Group 1, medium risk permit was surrended during the year and was inspected once which has been included in the answer for 5.4.4 and 5.5. Only 5 of the Group lll activities were due to be inspected in 2012/13. One Group I , medium risk permit was due to re-locate so only inspected once. One Group I, low risk permit was mothballed therefore not inspected. 4 of the inspections undertaken were carried over from 2011/12 inspection programme.
South Gloucestershire UA	0	10	14	24	7	24	6	100%	117%	
Barnet	2	26	1	31	8	31	7	100%	114%	
Derbyshire Dales	0	7	19	26	8	26	7	100%	114%	Service stations and waste oil burners were not due for inspections during 2013. One mobile plant was inspected during the year One low risk Group 1 installation was non operational during the year and not inspected.

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Blackburn & Darwen	0	5	7	12	4	12	4	100%	100%	This year we have had one dry cleaner close down before the inspection could take place Many of our service stations were not due an inspection this year, being on the usual 3 year inspection program
Blaeneau Gwent	1	1	8	11	2	11	2	100%	100%	
Braintree	0	1	12	13	1	13	1	100%	100%	All inspections planned have been carried out in accordance with the visit frequencies indicated by the risk categories
Brent	0	18	4	22	1	22	1	100%	100%	
Bridgend	0	9	7	16	4	16	4	100%	100%	
Caerphilly	0	1	15	16	1	16	1	100%	100%	
Cambridge	0	2	2	4	1	4	1	100%	100%	One of our petrol stations was closed for refurbishement at the time of the due inspection and did not reopen until after the end of the 12/13 year. This was also the application for substantial change. Also one of the vehicle resprayers surrendered thier permit during April 2012.
Canterbury	0	2	6	8	2	8	2	100%	100%	Group II Low Risk Vehicle Refinishers not due for inspection until 2013/14
Castle Point	0	4	1	5	2	5	2	100%	100%	
Charnwood	0	3	11	14	3	14	3	100%	100%	11 mobile plant out of district and not inspected 6 dry cleaners, low risk and not due for inspection this year. 11 petrol filling stations low risk and not due for inspection this year. 4 waste oil burners, low risk and not due for inspection this year
Chelmsford	1	5	6	13	3	13	3	100%	100%	
Cheshire East UA	0	6	28	34	6	34	6	100%	100%	Group II - 1 x VR and 4 x mobile crushers were not due Group III - 6 x WOB's, 18 x dry cleaners and 41 PVRI and II were not due
Colchester	0	8	7	15	2	15	2	100%	100%	
Dacorum	1	1	3	5	1	5	1	100%	100%	
Derby	0	3	9	12	3	12	3	100%	100%	1 x Mobile Crusher, 6 x Vehicle refinshers and 1 x Waste Oil Burner did not fall due for an inspection during the year
East Riding of Yorkshire	0	11	40	51	11	51	11	100%	100%	

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Eastleigh	0	3	5	8	3	8	3	100%	100%	
Epping Forest	1	10	1	12	1	12	1	100%	100%	
Fenland	0	1	11	12	1	12	1	100%	100%	Two PVRI sites (low risk Group three) were not inspected during 2012-13 they were inspected during 2011-12.
Guildford	1	2	1	5	1	5	1	100%	100%	Unable to carry out a visit to a concrete batching plant as due to flooding it had not been operational since before Christmas and remains closed whilst operator (Hansons) seeks planning permission to re-site it.
Harrogate	0	9	15	24	6	24	6	100%	100%	
Hertsmere	1	7	0	8	2	8	2	100%	100%	
Kirklees	0	10	35	45	10	45	10	100%	100%	
Lambeth	0	3	0	3	3	3	3	100%	100%	
Leicester	0	16	8	24	9	24	9	100%	100%	
Lewisham	0	3	0	3	1	3	1	100%	100%	
Mendip	0	9	18	27	9	27	9	100%	100%	
Merthyr Tydfil	0	3	6	9	2	9	2	100%	100%	
Monmouthshire	0	4	4	8	2	8	2	100%	100%	
New Forest	0	3	1	4	2	4	2	100%	100%	Only installations not inspected = 4 of the 5 mobile crushing units. The installation assignment in 5.6.2 and hence the breakdown in 5.6.3 is based on the reduced fee activities listed in Part 2 and 3 of Sch B even though these installations operated before 6/9/12 and as such the reduced fees are not applicable until October 2013. The aim is to inspect all installations once per year irrespective of the minimum annual inspection level.
Newcastle under Lyme	0	11	8	19	6	19	6	100%	100%	One high risk Group I installation is currently mothballed.
North East Derbyshire	0	2	10	12	2	12	2	100%	100%	
North Warwickshire	0	6	10	16	5	16	5	100%	100%	A number of Group II and III installations were not due to be inspected this year
Pembrokeshire	0	1	11	12	1	12	1	100%	100%	Mobile Plant too far away to inspect.
Powys	0	2	21	23	2	23	2	100%	100%	

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Preston	0	2	5	7	2	7	2	100%	100%	One mobile crusher not inspected as not in reasonable travel distance
Purbeck	0	1	3	4	1	4	1	100%	100%	
Redbridge	1	23	1	25	4	25	4	100%	100%	
Redcar & Cleveland UA	0	1	9	10	1	10	1	100%	100%	
Ryedale	0	2	10	12	2	12	2	100%	100%	No inspection was made of a single Group II prescribed activity (mobile crushing & screening plant). This was due to the crusher being out of action for several months awaiting repair.
Scarborough	0	2	9	11	2	11	2	100%	100%	
Sevenoaks	0	4	3	7	1	7	1	100%	100%	
Shepway	0	2	4	6	1	6	1	100%	100%	
South Kesteven	0	5	22	27	5	27	5	100%	100%	Many of our reduced fee activities are on a two and three yearly inspection cycle. For this reason, our minimum annual inspection levels are reduced.
South Lakeland	0	5	6	11	3	11	3	100%	100%	
South Oxfordshire	0	6	3	9	2	9	2	100%	100%	
Stevenage	0	2	2	4	1	4	1	100%	100%	
Stockton-on-Tees	0	3	23	26	3	26	3	100%	100%	there is an inconsistency in the PG note section , this is because we have 3 chemical storage processes which are not covered by PG notes and we are working with the IPR4/17 notes for these processes I have added 3 'extra' petrol terminal processes to remove this inconsistency as detailed in email dated 17th May 2013
Surrey Heath	0	3	0	3	1	3	1	100%	100%	
Three Rivers	1	2	3	7	1	7	1	100%	100%	
Torbay	1	3	2	7	2	7	2	100%	100%	

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Wandsworth	0	4	4	8	2	8	2	100%	100%	For information: It should be noted that our inspection programme spreads our low risk inspections for mobile plant, vapour recovery, small waste oil burners and dry cleaners over the 2 or 3 year period so that all inspections do not occur in one year and no inspections in the other 1 or 2 years. Some inspections have therefore been carried out earlier than required. 2 permits were surrendered during the year, 1 concrete crusher and 1 vapour recovery activity.
Warrington	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	100%	100%	
Watford	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	100%	100%	
Welwyn Hatfield	0	1	2	3	1	3	1	100%	100%	
West Lindsey	0	5	9	14	3	14	3	100%	100%	
Weymouth & Portland	1	0	0	2	1	2	1	100%	100%	
Wirral	0	2	9	11	2	11	2	100%	100%	Note- 51 of the total 66 processes are Group II & III low risk processes and are therefore not due a risk based inspection every year. For the period in question Dry Cleaners and Small Waste Oil Burner processes were not examined. These will be inspected on a risk basis during subsequent periods as part of a rolling programme. Additionally the total number of processes includes a "mothballed" process and 4 mobile crushers that were mainly operating outside of the Borough during this period. Therefore, during 2012/2013, the number of processes inspected falls below 80% of the total number of permitted processes.
Woking	0	6	0	6	2	6	2	100%	100%	100% of required inspections undertaken as planned
Worthing	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	100%	100%	
Dudley	1	28	30	60	24	60	28	100%	86%	One medium rated full fee installation was only issued in February 2013 and therefore has not been inspected.

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Staffordshire Moorlands	2	8	10	21	6	21	7	100%	86%	2 check installations on Medium risk installations were not carried out. The first due to this being the installation that applied for a substantial change therefore, addtional inspections/ meetings were carried out in this regard. The second was not deemed necessary due to a good compliance record in the first inspection (& resources are stretched).
East Staffordshire	2	5	11	19	5	19	6	100%	83%	Group 1 - High - One Full inspection, 3 check visits and 1 other visit undertaken
Reading	6	5	1	12	7	12	9	100%	78%	
South Somerset	0	8	15	23	6	23	8	100%	75%	
Tamworth	1	3	3	8	3	8	4	100%	75%	
Fareham	0	3	3	6	1	6	2	100%	50%	One medium risk group 1 installation is operating below the permitting threshold so only a single inspection visit was carried out for it in 2012/13
Kensington & Chelsea	2	0	0	2	1	2	2	100%	50%	One high risk rated dry cleaner changed hands at the start of the year and after the full inspection it was regraded to low risk. A second check inspection was not carried out due to this reason.
Sutton	1	18	1	20	2	20	7	100%	29%	
Camden	3	20	3	26	1	26	4	100%	25%	3 check inspections for hight risk (group III installations) will be carried out at delayed date in June 2013
Adur	0	1	2	3	0	3	1	100%	0%	Our single medium risk premises is winding down and has not received any deliveries for several months. There are only a few members of staff on site and it was felt unecessary to carry out two inspections in the year.
Bedford Borough UA	0	3	8	11	0	11	1	100%	0%	
Broadland	0	1	7	8	0	8	1	100%	0%	

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Craven	0	1	11	12	0	12	1	100%	0%	Of the 27 Processes; 11 Inspections carried out in relation to Low; Group I processes (7 Other Mineral Activities, 2 Cement, 1 Surface Treating Metals & Plactics, 1 Fibre Reinforced Plastics) 2 Inspections carried out in relation to Low; Group II processes (2 Vehicle Refinishing) Next inspections not due until in 2014 1 Inspection carried out in relation to Medium; Group 1 (Crematoria) = Total number of inspections carried out 14 13 Processes are classed as Low; Group III. (4 Small WOB, 2 Dry Cleaners, 7 Petrol Stations). Next inspections due in 2015
Denbighshire	0	4	6	10	0	10	1	100%	0%	See points 5.4.5 (b) and (c) for reasons
Gosport	0	2	1	3	0	3	2	100%	0%	One medium risk installation has now been de-regulated so no extra inspection
Haringey	0	2	2	4	0	4	1	100%	0%	
Hyndburn	0	8	5	13	0	13	6	100%	0%	
Kingston upon Hull	0	4	30	34	0	34	2	100%	0%	Many of our processes are low risk and did not require an inspection this year
Luton BC	4	12	3	19	0	19	12	100%	0%	
Merton	0	3	4	7	0	7	3	100%	0%	
Oxford	1	1	0	2	0	2	1	100%	0%	
Poole	0	2	6	8	0	8	2	100%	0%	Lack of staffing resource for part year
Rother	0	1	2	3	0	3	1	100%	0%	
South Bucks	0	1	5	6	0	6	1	100%	0%	
South Hams	0	1	7	8	0	8	1	100%	0%	one medium risk installation only got one inspection this year, but it obtains the medium risk rating because of its inherent properties (nature of process and location). there were no complaints this year, it is a relatively simple process, so a 2nd visit was not requested.
South Norfolk	0	5	5	10	0	10	3	100%	0%	Check inspections for the three medium Group I installations were not done, as we lost our LAIPPC/LAPPC during the year, leaving a backlog of work and inspections to complete and no note that these check inspections were outstanding.

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Torfaen	0	2	10	12	0	12	1	100%	0%	Additional check group 1 programmed for 13/14 period
Wealden	0	2	6	8	0	8	1	100%	0%	
Leeds	4	29	55	87	20	88	26	99%	77%	
Shropshire UA	1	16	23	39	7	40	8	98%	88%	
Doncaster	0	4	33	36	3	37	3	97%	100%	13 Waste Oil burners, 5 dry cleaners and 9 petrol stations were not due for inspection this year.
Salford	5	10	15	31	10	32	12	97%	83%	
Sunderland	0	6	24	29	5	30	6	97%	83%	A process for the Unloading, Storing, Screening, Blending & Reloading of Coal was not inspected as the Operator has mothballed the process but wants to retain the Permit for the near future. This has a medium risk ranking. A mobile crusher was not sited within the City boundary and therefore not able to be inspected. NB: The total inspections in 5.5 is actually 89 out of 92 for the reasons above but due to this inconsistency the system would not allow the submission of the survey. Following advice from Hartley McMaster the three inspections above have been added to the 'Other Mineral Activities' total to bring total to 92 so that survey can be submitted
Wiltshire UA	0	6	23	28	0	29	5	97%	0%	
Greenwich	3	22	2	26	3	27	5	96%	60%	One dry cleaner business reported that they had shut - DCM sold to another business. 2 inspections (full and check) therefore not done. At a 2nd dry cleaner business, check inspection not completed due to difficulty of contacting business owner.
Walsall	3	36	9	47	19	49	30	96%	63%	
Rhondda Cynon Taf	2	9	10	22	10	23	10	96%	100%	We granted 3 new permits which did not require inspection within 2012/13. For example table 5.6.2 has 10 group 1 low installations but we only inspected 9 as 1 was a new permit.
Chesterfield	1	10	10	21	0	22	6	95%	0%	
Richmond upon Thames	0	20	0	19	1	20	1	95%	100%	

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Hartlepool	3	4	13	19	1	20	3	95%	33%	
Hull & Goole PHA	0	1	18	18	0	19	1	95%	0%	
Swale	1	18	18	35	1	37	8	95%	13%	
Durham UA	1	6	43	48	3	51	7	94%	43%	Three check inspections for Group 1 medium risk installations were not completed. One Group 1 installation ceased trading during the year so the inspection could not be completed. One Group 1 installation permit was revoked during the year. One Group 1 installation permit surrendered. Two Group 2 installations surrendered permits during the year. No inspections were due for Group 2 installations given the reduction in inspection frequency. Not all Group 3 installations required an inspection this year due to the reduced inspection frequency.
Newcastle upon Tyne	0	2	15	16	0	17	1	94%	0%	
Peterborough	0	2	14	15	2	16	2	94%	100%	
Richmondshire	0	2	14	15	2	16	2	94%	100%	3 permits were surrendered early in 2012/2013. 1 permit was mothballed. The activity is not currently being operated and the site is closed with no personnel on site. The operator wishes to keep the permit active in anticipation of an upturn in business and the activity being brought back into use in the near future. As detailed in the previous section, we were unable to inspect 8 out of the 19 mobile crushing plant permitted by this Authority as they were located great distances from the home authority. Locations included North Wales, Liverpool, Wigan, Scunthorpe and Bradford. All plant located either within our district, or within a reasonable distance from this authority at some time during the year, were inspected.
Eden	0	3	13	15	0	16	3	94%	0%	A low risk rated quarry has mothballed status thus not inspected

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Bath & North East Somerset	0	4	11	14	2	15	3	93%	67%	Out of my 48 premises; inspections were not needed as follows: 15 WOB were not inspected but these are due next year. Out of the 13 petrol stations two were inspected in 2012 so no inspection needed this year. Inspections not undertaken as required are as follows:1 x Mobile crusher not inspected because it is operating in Cornwall, in its absence a telephone interview was carried out but not recorded as I didn't visit the site. One Group 1 medium risk installation has not received a check visit because I've spoke on the phone so much. They also carry out extensive monitoring that shows the emission limits are met. They also meet the fugitive emission and have submitted a good solvent management plan.
Tameside	0	2	12	13	2	14	2	93%	100%	
Carmarthenshire	0	4	23	25	1	27	4	93%	25%	
Bolton	2	7	15	24	5	26	7	92%	71%	Two low risk Group 1 installations are mothballed. 20 petrol stations were not due for inspection this year. 4 group 2 installations were not due inspection 2 swob and 4 dry cleaners were not due inspection this year.
Taunton Deane	1	7	5	12	2	13	4	92%	50%	One Group 1 medium is a concrete crusher permit, but they do not have a crusher on site at the moment so only visited once. Another Group 1 permit is mothballed so didn't visit.
Conwy	0	3	9	11	2	12	2	92%	100%	
Cotswold	1	4	7	11	3	12	3	92%	100%	currently have 2 standard processes which are mothballed
Hillingdon	0	4	8	11	1	12	4	92%	25%	Low Risk petrol stations and dry cleaners inspected every 3 years. Dry Cleaners last inspected 2010/11 so 15 inspected in 2012/13 and the remainder planned for 2013/14. Petrol stations are inspected on a 3 yearly basis by Fire Brigade. (9 inspected in 2012/13 and all 32 inspected during the last 3 years). All standard processes and WOBs inspected apart from concrete batching plant air side at Heathrow and one resprayer which was inspected in April and in 2011/12. Three compliance checks not carried out due to long inspections on full checks.
Wrexham	0	4	18	20	4	22	4	91%	100%	1 x heavy clay goods manufacture process mothballed 1 x GRP manufacturing process mothballed

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Plymouth	4	8	10	20	1	22	11	91%	9%	Due to staff shortages and restructures Inspections are now carried out according to RA or in event of a complaint
Aylesbury Vale	0	2	8	9	0	10	0	90%	N/A	With the exception of mobile plant, all scheduled inspections were undertaken.
Hackney	0	9	1	9	0	10	0	90%	N/A	
Cheltenham	2	2	4	9	6	10	4	90%	150%	
Pendle	0	4	6	9	3	10	4	90%	75%	One low risk foundry process should have been inspected in March 2013 but was delayed until April 2013. Di-isocyanate permit issued in March 2013 but process is not operating so no inspections scheduled. Di-isocyanate process was scheduled to be inspected in January 2013 but was postponed until July 2013. One waste oil burner permit is dormant because the burner was never installed. One solvent process was inspected in August 2012 and assessed as medium risk. A check inspection should have been carried out in Feburary 2013 but they were not inspected again until June 2013 when the risk category was reduced to low.
Horsham	0	1	9	9	0	10	1	90%	0%	
Nuneaton & Bedworth	0	8	12	18	0	20	4	90%	0%	New permit for one mobile crusher, plant not yet commissioned, so no inspection possible. New permit for surface cleansing process (medium risk) issued half way through year so only one inspection due / completed.
Manchester PHA	0	4	5	8	6	9	4	89%	150%	A full audit was not completed for one of the cement permits due to there being no permitted activity on site. The permit has not yet been withdrawn as a final decision has not been made by the company however, no cement or associated products are currently stored on the site.
Thurrock	0	5	22	24	3	27	5	89%	60%	
Forest of Dean	0	1	17	16	0	18	1	89%	0%	
Northumberland UA	2	6	34	39	7	44	8	89%	88%	Mootlaw Quarry (PPC(B)004) was mothballed on 1/09/2011 and therefore not inspected. This is a DEFRA Group I and High Risk rated installation

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Barnsley	1	7	24	29	5	33	5	88%	100%	Some Group II and III Installations were not visited as they werent sheduled to be this year following the introduction of the 2 and 3 year inspection loop.
Southend-on-sea	0	5	3	7	2	8	2	88%	100%	
Tower Hamlets	0	14	2	14	2	16	2	88%	100%	
Wyre	0	11	5	14	4	16	4	88%	100%	During 2012/2013 there were two low risk group 1 installations that were not inspected before 31st March 2013 due to difficulties in arranging the inspections with the operators. These inspections were arranged to be carried out early in the current year and this will be reflected in the 2013/2014 return. There were also difficulties in inspecting mobile plant as it is out of the area for prolonged periods of time. This will be addressed in the 2013/2014 inspection programme.The vehicle finishing installations (PG6/34b) were not due to be inspected during 2012/2013, these are on the inspection programme for 2013/2014.
Blaby	3	5	5	14	5	16	6	88%	83%	
Maldon	1	3	4	7	3	8	4	88%	75%	The high risk vehicle refinisher was visited on several occasions, however the Operator was not present due to ill health. The continued need for a permit is currently being determined.
Dartford	0	2	6	7	0	8	2	88%	0%	
Lancaster	3	6	6	14	0	16	7	88%	0%	Note - The authority has inherited an installation (mineral fibre S.3.5a - standard Part B (Group 1 above) installlation) from the Environment Agency in February 2013 through the amendments imposed by the Industrial Emissions Directive. As a consequence no inspection was undertaken for this installation in 2012/13 (final handover only took place in May 2013). The installation on handover has been classed as a low risk activity.
North Kesteven	2	3	10	13	2	15	3	87%	67%	
Ipswich	1	5	8	13	1	15	5	87%	20%	one group 1 low risk process was not operating
Tandridge	0	1	6	6	0	7	0	86%	N/A	
North East Lincolnshire	0	14	21	30	13	35	13	86%	100%	Three other mineral activities are currently not operating, a bulk cement process is not operating and a bulk storage of chemicals process is not in use.

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
North Somerset	0	2	12	12	2	14	2	86%	100%	
Chichester	1	1	5	6	0	7	1	86%	0%	Two group 2 inspections not completed due to shut down of sites from start of 2013 and not restarted before 31.3.13
Gateshead	1	5	20	23	6	27	6	85%	100%	
Southwark	0	13	0	11	0	13	0	85%	N/A	
Newham	3	11	4	16	4	19	5	84%	80%	With regards to extra inspections, no extra was done on the crematoria because one-inspection was completed in conjunction with, the site check-inspection.
Wakefield	1	17	25	37	11	44	10	84%	110%	During the year one Group I (Nettleton & Porter - Hide & Skin process) installation and two Group III (2 branches of Johnsons the Cleaners - dry cleaning activities) installations closed before they could be inspected. Furthermore, a Group II installation (Autorestore Ltd, formerly ADR Accident Repair - vehicle refinishing) was mothballed prior to being inspected.
St Albans	0	1	5	5	0	6	0	83%	N/A	All programmed inspections carried out. Please note additional info: Check Group I, Low - this is the substantial change inspection visit for Lafarge cement and lime batching plant Check Group III, Low - this visit was made to Laurence Autos (petrol station). They no longer sell petrol and visit was carried out to confirm that this was the case (permit to be revoked in due course)
Waverley	0	3	3	5	0	6	0	83%	N/A	
Arun	1	2	3	5	2	6	2	83%	100%	

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
North Norfolk	0	2	4	5	1	6	1	83%	100%	During 2012/13 one group I process and one group II processes surrendered permits. Alongside this a group II process is mothballed, meaning that it is no longer inspected (in line with guidance). Low risk group II processes are inspected every 2 years and are on an appropriate two yearly inspection programme. Similarly, all low risk Group III processes are on a three year inspection routine. The numbers of each undertaken per year varies depending on when the last inspection was undertaken, changes in risk rating and/or when the permit was issued. Therefore, the numbers are not split evenly each year but each process is on the appropriate inspection programme.
Rushcliffe	0	3	3	5	1	6	1	83%	100%	
Stroud	1	0	10	10	1	12	1	83%	100%	5 Group II installations did not require inspection during 2012/13
Tewkesbury	0	1	5	5	1	6	1	83%	100%	
Rugby	0	21	3	20	4	24	5	83%	80%	
Newark & Sherwood	0	16	8	20	9	24	12	83%	75%	Any shortfall in inspection figures will be due to: Not inspecting Grp II mobile plant (4 out of 5 such operators carry out their activity away from our district). Check inspections for some Grp I medium risked operators scheduled in next accounting year, April onwards. Not all Group III low risked operators due this year as most now on a 2 or 3 yearly cycle.
North West Leicestershire	0	4	14	15	2	18	3	83%	67%	
Test Valley	0	6	12	15	3	18	6	83%	50%	
Northampton	0	5	12	14	2	17	4	82%	50%	Two of the low risk group one installations are mothballed and no inspection wa carried out during this year although contact was made with the operators of the installations. There have been some delays in carrying out group three inspections of petrol stations due to staffing issues. These inspections will be carried out in 2013/14
Swansea	0	3	8	9	8	11	2	82%	400%	
Halton	2	2	21	22	2	27	4	81%	50%	Other demands on officer time.

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Lichfield	0	5	16	17	1	21	2	81%	50%	Of 8 mobile crusher permits, none operated in our district. One of those was mothballed for 11 month of 2012/13, and another revoked in March 13 as the operator sold the crusher over a year ago and forgot to revoke the permit. Our new crematoria was only permitted on 27/3/13 so no inspection was conducted, although 2 application visited were.
Hammersmith & Fulham	12	35	0	38	11	47	15	81%	73%	Some of the Group III low risk installations were not scheduled for inspection in 2012/2013. One Group II and two Group III permits were revoked as explained in section 5.4.5c prior to scheduled inspections. Two Group III permits were surrendered after having vacated the premesis also prior to their scheduled inspections.
Telford & Wrekin	1	22	27	41	4	51	23	80%	17%	
Forest Heath	0	0	5	4	0	5	0	80%	N/A	SWOB recently issued and not operational, so not inspected yet. Sterilation plant permit issued prior to plant being operational, so not inspected yet. (I have rated them both as 'LOW' for the time being for the purposes of this return etc...)
London PHA	0	0	5	4	0	5	0	80%	N/A	Staff shortages due to sickness

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Hartley Dewar Ltd	0	2	8	8	2	10	2	80%	100%	Please see below copies of the emails between Defra and NDC regarding discrepancies in the data reported last year. Could you please ensure that this year, the reported data for North Devon Council reflects what has been entered into this return ? Andy Sharon, I spoke to Andy Cole earlier. He confirmed that after revisiting the questions he had carried out all the check inspections required and that this is what, to the best of his knowledge, he had submitted. I said that there were many anomalies every year between what LAs believe they have entered and what appears in the final survey and that we try to weed these out prior to publication. Unfortunately we did not have the resources to drill down below the requirement for full inspections. We are unable to change the published survey but we accept that North Devon carried out all the inspections required and that there was some problem around the data entry stage which meant this is not reflected in the survey. Regards Eamonn From: Sharon Conibear [mailto:Sharon.Conibear@northdevon.gov.uk] Sent: 10 January 2012 12:09 To: Prendergast, Eamonn (ERG-ALE) Subject: RE: 2010/11 Local Pollution Control Statistical Survey Great, thank you for this information, we will have a look at our records. Regards Sharon Conibear
North Devon	0	2	8	8	2	10	2	D-23	80%	100%
Northy Dewar										06/02/2014

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Oldham	0	7	8	12	6	15	6	80%	100%	A permit was issued in August for a new installation to operate a rubber and textile coatings. The permit was required as a condition of the purchase of the site. The permit was issued but the process has yet to start operating, plant is currently being moved onto the site. As the plant was not operating it was not possible to inspect the process.
Worcester	0	3	7	8	1	10	1	80%	100%	Two cement batching plants not inspected, due to work load.
Breckland	4	1	24	24	3	30	4	80%	75%	Vehicle Resprayers to be carried out 2013/14 Petrol Stations to be carreid out 2014 and 2015
Burnley	0	8	7	12	0	15	7	80%	0%	
Tonbridge & Malling	0	4	10	11	0	14	2	79%	0%	We have some Crushers that are permanently operated outside of our Borough, but that move locations throughout the year.
Gedling	0	2	11	10	2	13	2	77%	100%	9 PVR stations (stage 1) were not due for inspection
Flintshire	15	6	26	47	0	62	21	76%	0%	
East Cambridgeshire	0	0	8	6	0	8	0	75%	N/A	1 x Combustion Activity - Not operating (and hasn't for sometime), currently in process of surrendering/mothballing. 1 x Waste Oil Burner not due this year 2 x Crushers not due this year 2 x Dry Cleaners not due this year 1 x Roadstone Coating still mothballed 1 x Petrol Station surrendered Permit. PS: I have put Roadstone Coating under Tar and Bitumen.
East Dorset	0	1	3	3	0	4	0	75%	N/A	
Solihull	0	0	4	3	0	4	0	75%	N/A	one inspection for a group 1 low risk was due to be carried out but has now been moved forward to spring 2013.
Lincoln	2	6	4	9	3	12	6	75%	50%	One of the low risk Group I gategory installations is currently mothballed so did not require inspecting. Seven of the low risk Group III were not due for inspection during 2012/13.
Isle of Wight / Medina	0	1	7	6	0	8	1	75%	0%	

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Cornwall UA	0	8	54	46	10	62	8	74%	125%	Two sites are currently mothballed so have not been inspected, five visits to mobile crushers were unable to be completed, none of the petrol stations (82) required visits during 2012/13 and some of the low risk group 2 and 3 sites (vehicle resprayers and dry cleaners were not due visits during 2012/13. There were six sites which did not receive visits due to maternity leave.
Spelthorne	0	6	1	5	0	7	0	71%	N/A	The Group I installation is currently being transferred to a new operator and varied to PG note 3/01, the visit has been postponed until April 2013 when the transfer will be completed and the draft permit available. One of the Grp III medium risk installations was a dry cleaner which closed, and whose permit was subsequently revoked before inspection was due. One Grp III medium risk installation, a service station, had an extra and check inspections associated with enforcement action and subsequent notice. Two Grp III low risk installations, both service stations, received extra and check inspections again associated with enforcement action and subsequent notices. Other Grp II installation was inspected in the previous year. All Grp III dry cleaners have their solvent recording submissions checked, and where necessary chased up, quarterly - this has not been counted as check/ extra inspections as this is a desk based exercise.
South Ribble	5	17	3	19	0	27	11	70%	0%	
Mid Suffolk	0	0	10	7	0	10	0	70%	N/A	2 x mobile crushers - checked records. Brought to our office 3 x cement batching plants not currently operating
Corby	2	9	13	18	0	26	11	69%	0%	

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Coventry	11	11	10	26	9	38	18	68%	50%	The majority of our dry cleaners and over half of our petrol stations were not due inspection this year due to their low risk rating. In addition to this: 1 x vehicle refinisher not inspected as company in administration, all staff made redundant and process not operating 1 x di-isocyanate process closed before inspection could take place, permit subsequently surrendered 1 x di-isocyanate process mothballed by company therefore not operating or inspected 1 x di-isocyanate process not operating due to recession and therefore not inspected but permit neither mothballed or surrendered as company have not decided on the future of the installation 2 x mobile crushers not inspected as previously stated due to locality We have concentrated our resources on the higher risk processes and, however due to staff shortages we were unable to undertake every inspection
Waltham Forest	6	14	0	15	3	22	10	68%	30%	
Rossendale	1	3	4	6	6	9	3	67%	200%	The authority has 16 Group III installations, only four of which fell due for inspection in 2012/13 One low risk Group I installation is mothballed. One low risk Group I installation transferred from the Environment Agency at the end of February.
Wyre Forest	0	5	7	8	2	12	5	67%	40%	Some check inspections and some low risk cement and timber processes missed due to work load.
Babergh	0	2	7	6	0	9	1	67%	0%	1 No. Group I/Low installation: closed down, but permit not mothballed/transferred/surrendered. 1 No. Group III/Medium installation: closed down, but permit not mothballed/transferred/surrendered. 1 No. Group III/Low installation: closed down, but permit not mothballed/transferred/surrendered.

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Warwick	0	4	5	6	0	9	4	67%	0%	The Council was going through a lean working review during the year and key staff were seconded to work on this project which has concluded with a major internal re-structuring. This had an impact on service delivery but we hope to have all visits up-to-date during 2013/14 as a result. Most missed visits during 12/13 were to premises where multiple annual visits were required. One of our two medium risk sites is a Council-operated service (crematorium) which is subject to regular inspections outside the LAPPC regime which we have therefore not recorded as such, and the other site is a factory which performs well and if the LAPPC risk rating was consistent with HSW risk rating would be visited at a much reduced frequency.
West Lancashire	0	4	13	11	4	17	4	65%	100%	1 revoked, 1 surrendered, 1 mothballed
Wychavon	0	1	15	10	1	16	1	63%	100%	Some cement and vehicle refinishers missed due to work load.
Rochford	1	6	0	5	0	8	4	63%	0%	Insufficient time and resource to meet all required inspections

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
South Tyneside	0	11	6	10	5	17	9	59%	56%	Practical Compounds. Group I Medium Risk have not used their Tar/ Bitumen Process (6.3) since 2011. Letter has been sent do they want to surrender their Permit. Port of Tyne. Group I Medium Risk. Other mineral activities standard permits only (3.5a) did not have a formal check inspection and the operation of the process has been split between 3 sperate operatives. Discussions are taking place to establish who the permit should actually be issued to. Cemex Group I Medium Risk (Had previously been categorised low risk but moved to medium risk by virtue of the guidance requiring distance to residential properties should be multiplied by 2 for mineral and cement & lime processes) had one full inspection only and no formal check visit. It is situated within the Port of Tyne boundary and has had drive by visits almost daily. No complaints received. O'Briens. Mobile crushers have not been situated within the borough of South Tyneside. Roger Bullivant Group 1, Low Risk (Cement batching) was not formally inspected. 14x Petrol Filling Stations to be inspected between 2012 and 2015 3x vehicle refinishing PG6/3a to be inspected between 2013 and 2014

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Croydon	1	9	2	7	0	12	2	58%	0%	For the 93 processes operational a total of 51 full inspections and 2 checks were scheduled, of which a total of 47 full inspections were completed. The following full inspections were not completed within the period 2012-13: Group III Medium Risk - 1x Dry Cleaner. Scheduled for March 2013, completed 02.08.13. Inspection postponed until the machine was serviced at the request of the operator. - 1x Waste Oil Burner. Scheduled for February 2013, completed 03.04.13. Unable to raise response from owner which delayed the inspection. - 1x PVR. Scheduled September 2012. Completed 09.04.13, inspection moved following correspondence with the operator to return outstanding information. Note: The risk category for all of the above installations was reduced to low following inspection. Group I Low Risk - 1x Cement batcher. Scheduled for March 2013, completed 04.04.13. Inspection date slipped due to scheduling. The following checks were not completed within the period 2012-13: - 1x check on Group III High Risk Dry Cleaner following full inspection. Solvent data submitted every month, inspection postponed to correspond with the engineers visit. Scheduled October 2012, completed 03.04.13. - 1x check on Group I Medium Risk Crematorium following the full inspection. Scheduled March 2013, completed 11.04.13. Inspection date slipped due to scheduling, however regular contact maintained with the operator. The remaining 42 processes were not scheduled for inspection during 2012-13. LB Croydon schedule Group III Low Risk inspections every two years rather than three yearly as required by Defra. Therefore if the inspection of a low risk installation falls outside of the LB Croydon 24 month inspection window it remains within the 36 month Defra requirement.
Hartley McMaster Ltd							D-29			06/02/2014 To avoid slippage with those installations requiring an annual inspection during 2013-14 the inspection schedule has been adjusted to ensure a more even spread throughout

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Redditch	0	2	10	7	0	12	2	58%	0%	Some inspections missed due to departmental reorganisation and workloads.
Malvern Hills	0	0	7	4	0	7	0	57%	N/A	2 Cement PG3/1(4) processes and one Timber process not inspected due to workload.
Erewash	0	0	9	5	0	9	0	56%	N/A	Capacity issues have meant that inspections have been deferred. Completion of all overdue inspections is planned for September 2013
Amber Valley	0	3	14	9	0	17	3	53%	0%	Inspection rate deteriorated due to resources being diverted onto the implementation of a revised waste and recycling contract. Inspection rate should be back to 100% for 2013/14
North Dorset	0	2	2	2	0	4	2	50%	0%	Firstly, see 5.4.5.b text. (mobile crusher) Also, one Group 1 SED coater is in receivership/administration, so we await outcome of this imminently - a new operator is likely to 'emerge from the ashes'. Finally, our dry cleaners were due in March 2013, but this has slipped. (We are an extrememly small team of 1.5 people for all EP functions) However, they will be inspected in the next month.
Wigan	3	28	44	35	19	75	21	47%	90%	The number of inspections is lower than may have been expected because when we programmed in the low risk reduced fee inspections we placed most in 2013/14 or 2014/15 rather than 2012/13 as they had all been inspected in 2011/12. This has lead to fewer inspections this year than would have been undertaken if we had simple done one third each year in the three year plan.
Herefordshire	0	10	17	11	0	27	9	41%	0%	reduction of staff/ maternity leave
Enfield	0	14	6	8	1	20	1	40%	100%	The vast majority of the permitted installations in the London Borough of Enfield are Group III low risk and therefore only require one full inspection every three years. In 2012/13 there were 42 installations due for inspection, all of which were inspected and this matches the figure given in section 5.4 and in 5.6.3. With this figure in mind the London Borough of Enfield inspected 100% of the installations due for inspection.

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
West Oxfordshire	0	1	9	4	1	10	1	40%	100%	Inspection frequency reduced in 2012-13 due to extension of simplified permitting programme
Ceredigion	0	2	3	2	0	5	2	40%	0%	There has been a significant increase in the number of inspections since last year, however the 80% target was not met. A department restructure has resulted in a new dedicated officer (0.2 FTE) with other officers in the Environmental Protection providing structured support. This should result in improved implementation of the LA function, however this is wholly dependant on future budgets constraints. There has been a delay in ensuring the new officer was able to properly undertake these duties due to the lack of regular national training in Environemtal Permitting for new officers.
South Derbyshire	0	0	14	5	0	14	0	36%	N/A	Certain inspections were not carried in 2012/2013 due to departmental restructure and temporary shortfall in LA-PPC Officers' availability, inspections were prioritised to higher risk installations. An annual inspection schedule for 2013/2014 has been established and forms part of the Council's service planning and performance management framework. This schedule has been developed to ensure inspections not completed in 2012/2013 are carried out in Q1 of 2013-2014.
Broxtowe	0	1	2	1	0	3	1	33%	0%	Reduced inspection frequency meant that many reduced fee installations were not due to be inspected this year. One premises which was due for inspection was permanently closed and has been revoked post 1st April 2013.
Hounslow	0	3	9	3	2	12	3	25%	67%	
Barking & Dagenham	0	0	5	1	0	5	0	20%	N/A	Staff Capacity Staff sickness Some premises were low risk therefore inspection not needed yet
East Hertfordshire	0	2	35	7	0	37	0	19%	N/A	A number of mobile plant were not operational at any point in 2012/13.
Crawley	0	1	12	2	0	13	1	15%	0%	
Mole Valley	0	3	23	3	0	26	2	12%	0%	

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Bournemouth	0	29	2	3	0	31	1	10%	0%	3 inspections that were due were not carried out: 1 was due to the waste oil burner being broken. It was deemed that it was not appropriate to carry out the inspection at that time. 1 which was due at the end of the reporting period (ie March) was in the process of being transferred so the inspection was carried out once the transfer had taken place. 1 slipped through the net.
Allerdale	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	0%	N/A	The officer who previously dealt with the LAPPC regime at Allerdale Borough Council left the authority in April 2012, although he did complete the LPCSS Survey 2011/2012 on the councils behalf. In 2012/2013 visits were made to 19 of the Part B installations in order to introduce the new officers implementing the regime and to gather background information on each process where there were gaps in our records. Based on this information an inspection plan has been drawn up for 2013/2014.
Blackpool	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0%	N/A	No Inspections were carried out this year due to a change over in staff, work has been carried out this year to begin updating all current permits in order for inspections to be carried out soon.
East Devon	0	0	8	0	0	8	0	0%	N/A	
East Hampshire	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0%	N/A	
Eastbourne	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0%	N/A	
Westminster	0	24	1	0	0	25	0	0%	N/A	
Melton	0	1	7	0	0	8	1	0%	0%	
Nottingham	3	7	7	0	0	17	6	0%	0%	Significant resource shortages, re-organisation and prioritisation of other work impacted on activity.

* 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

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Dudley	1	27	30	58	24	59	28	98%	86%	One medium rated full fee installation was only issued in February 2013 and therefore has not been inspected.
Doncaster	0	3	33	35	3	36	3	97%	100%	13 Waste Oil burners, 5 dry cleaners and 9 petrol stations were not due for inspection this year.
Sunderland	0	6	24	29	5	30	6	97%	83%	A process for the Unloading, Storing, Screening, Blending & Reloading of Coal was not inspected as the Operator has mothballed the process but wants to retain the Permit for the near future. This has a medium risk ranking. A mobile crusher was not sited within the City boundary and therefore not able to be inspected. NB: The total inspections in 5.5 is actually 89 out of 92 for the reasons above but due to this inconsistency the system would not allow the submission of the survey. Following advice from Hartley McMaster the three inspections above have been added to the 'Other Mineral Activities' total to bring total to 92 so that survey can be submitted
Wiltshire UA	0	5	23	27	0	28	5	96%	0%	
Rhondda Cynon Taf	2	8	10	21	10	22	10	95%	100%	We granted 3 new permits which did not require inspection within 2012/13. For example table 5.6.2 has 10 group 1 low installations but we only inspected 9 as 1 was a new permit.
Hull & Goole PHA	0	1	18	18	0	19	1	95%	0%	

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Durham UA	1	6	43	48	3	51	7	94%	43%	Three check inspections for Group 1 medium risk installations were not completed. One Group 1 installation ceased trading during the year so the inspection could not be completed. One Group 1 installation permit was revoked during the year. One Group 1 installation permit surrendered. Two Group 2 installations surrendered permits during the year. No inspections were due for Group 2 installations given the reduction in inspection frequency. Not all Group 3 installations required an inspection this year due to the reduced inspection frequency.
Chesterfield	1	5	10	16	0	17	6	94%	0%	
Peterborough	0	2	14	15	2	16	2	94%	100%	
Richmondshire	0	2	14	15	2	16	2	94%	100%	3 permits were surrendered early in 2012/2013. 1 permit was mothballed. The activity is not currently being operated and the site is closed with no personnel on site. The operator wishes to keep the permit active in anticipation of an upturn in business and the activity being brought back into use in the near future. As detailed in the previous section, we were unable to inspect 8 out of the 19 mobile crushing plant permitted by this Authority as they were located great distances from the home authority. Locations included North Wales, Liverpool, Wigan, Scunthorpe and Bradford. All plant located either within our district, or within a reasonable distance from this authority at some time during the year, were inspected.
Eden	0	3	13	15	0	16	3	94%	0%	A low risk rated quarry has mothballed status thus not inspected
West Berkshire	0	0	15	14	0	15	0	93%	N/A	A programmed inspection was due at a roadstone coating plant this year - however was not undertaken as plant was mothballed.
Barnsley	1	4	24	28	5	30	5	93%	100%	Some Group II and III Installations were not visited as they werent sheduled to be this year following the introduction of the 2 and 3 year inspection loop.

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Tameside	0	2	12	13	2	14	2	93%	100%	
Mansfield	0	10	4	13	7	14	10	93%	70%	
Bath & North East Somerset	0	3	11	13	2	14	3	93%	67%	Out of my 48 premises; inspections were not needed as follows: 15 WOB were not inspected but these are due next year. Out of the 13 petrol stations two were inspected in 2012 so no inspection needed this year. Inspections not undertaken as required are as follows:1 x Mobile crusher not inspected because it is operating in Cornwall, in its absence a telephone interview was carried out but not recorded as I didn't visit the site. One Group 1 medium risk installation has not received a check visit because I've spoke on the phone so much. They also carry out extensive monitoring that shows the emission limits are met. They also meet the fugitive emission and have submitted a good solvent management plan.
Carmarthenshire	0	4	23	25	1	27	4	93%	25%	
Swale	0	7	18	23	0	25	7	92%	0%	
Bolton	2	5	15	22	5	24	7	92%	71%	Two low risk Group 1 installations are mothballed. 20 petrol stations were not due for inspection this year. 4 group 2 installations were not due inspection 2 swob and 4 dry cleaners were not due inspection this year.
Hillingdon	0	4	8	11	1	12	4	92%	25%	Low Risk petrol stations and dry cleaners inspected every 3 years. Dry Cleaners last inspected 2010/11 so 15 inspected in 2012/13 and the remainder planned for 2013/14. Petrol stations are inspected on a 3 yearly basis by Fire Brigade. (9 inspected in 2012/13 and all 32 inspected during the last 3 years). All standard processes and WOBs inspected apart from concrete batching plant air side at Heathrow and one resprayer which was inspected in April and in 2011/12. Three compliance checks not carried out due to long inspections on full checks.
Wrexham	0	4	18	20	4	22	4	91%	100%	1 x heavy clay goods manufacture process mothballed 1 x GRP manufacturing process mothballed
Cheltenham	2	2	4	9	6	10	4	90%	150%	

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Pendle	0	4	6	9	3	10	4	90%	75%	One low risk foundry process should have been inspected in March 2013 but was delayed until April 2013. Di-isocyanate permit issued in March 2013 but process is not operating so no inspections scheduled. Di-isocyanate process was scheduled to be inspected in January 2013 but was postponed until July 2013. One waste oil burner permit is dormant because the burner was never installed. One solvent process was inspected in August 2012 and assessed as medium risk. A check inspection should have been carried out in Feburary 2013 but they were not inspected again until June 2013 when the risk category was reduced to low.
Horsham	0	1	9	9	0	10	1	90%	0%	
Manchester PHA	0	4	5	8	6	9	4	89%	150%	A full audit was not completed for one of the cement permits due to there being no permitted activity on site. The permit has not yet been withdrawn as a final decision has not been made by the company however, no cement or associated products are currently stored on the site.
Thurrock	0	5	22	24	3	27	5	89%	60%	
Forest of Dean	0	1	17	16	0	18	1	89%	0%	
Northumberland UA	2	6	34	39	7	44	8	89%	88%	Mootlaw Quarry (PPC(B)004) was mothballed on 1/09/2011 and therefore not inspected. This is a DEFRA Group I and High Risk rated installation
Breckland	1	0	24	23	0	26	1	88%	0%	Vehicle Resprayers to be carried out 2013/14 Petrol Stations to be carreid out 2014 and 2015
North West Leicestershire	0	3	14	15	2	17	3	88%	67%	
Rugby	0	5	3	7	4	8	5	88%	80%	
Taunton Deane	0	3	5	7	2	8	3	88%	67%	One Group 1 medium is a concrete crusher permit, but they do not have a crusher on site at the moment so only visited once. Another Group 1 permit is mothballed so didn't visit.

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Northampton	0	4	12	14	2	16	4	88%	50%	Two of the low risk group one installations are mothballed and no inspection wa carried out during this year although contact was made with the operators of the installations. There have been some delays in carrying out group three inspections of petrol stations due to staffing issues. These inspections will be carried out in 2013/14
Dartford	0	2	6	7	0	8	2	88%	0%	
North Somerset	0	2	12	12	2	14	2	86%	100%	
Blaby	3	3	5	12	5	14	6	86%	83%	
Ipswich	1	4	8	12	1	14	5	86%	20%	one group 1 low risk process was not operating
Burnley	0	7	7	12	0	14	7	86%	0%	
North East Lincolnshire	0	13	21	29	13	34	13	85%	100%	Three other mineral activities are currently not operating, a bulk cement process is not operating and a bulk storage of chemicals process is not in use.
Gateshead	1	5	20	23	6	27	6	85%	100%	
Newark & Sherwood	0	12	8	17	9	20	12	85%	75%	Any shortfall in inspection figures will be due to: Not inspecting Grp II mobile plant (4 out of 5 such operators carry out their activity away from our district). Check inspections for some Grp I medium risked operators scheduled in next accounting year, April onwards. Not all Group III low risked operators due this year as most now on a 2 or 3 yearly cycle.
Stroud	1	0	10	10	1	12	1	83%	100%	5 Group II installations did not require inspection during 2012/13
Tewkesbury	0	1	5	5	1	6	1	83%	100%	
Test Valley	0	6	12	15	3	18	6	83%	50%	
Lancaster	1	4	6	10	0	12	5	83%	0%	Note - The authority has inherited an installation (mineral fibre S.3.5a - standard Part B (Group 1 above) installlation) from the Environment Agency in February 2013 through the amendments imposed by the Industrial Emissions Directive. As a consequence no inspection was undertaken for this installation in 2012/13 (final handover only took place in May 2013). The installation on handover has been classed as a low risk activity.
Halton	2	2	21	22	2	27	4	81%	50%	Other demands on officer time.

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Telford & Wrekin	1	22	27	41	4	51	23	80%	17%	
Forest Heath	0	0	5	4	0	5	0	80%	N/A	SWOB recently issued and not operational, so not inspected yet. Sterilation plant permit issued prior to plant being operational, so not inspected yet. (I have rated them both as 'LOW' for the time being for the purposes of this return etc...)
London PHA	0	0	5	4	0	5	0	80%	N/A	Staff shortages due to sickness
St Albans	0	0	5	4	0	5	0	80%	N/A	All programmed inspections carried out. Please note additional info: Check Group I, Low - this is the substantial change inspection visit for Lafarge cement and lime batching plant Check Group III, Low - this visit was made to Laurence Autos (petrol station). They no longer sell petrol and visit was carried out to confirm that this was the case (permit to be revoked in due course)
Swansea	0	2	8	8	8	10	2	80%	400%	

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	High	Med.	Low	Full	Check	Full	Check	Full	Check	Reasons
		2								Please see below copies of the emails between Defra and NDC regarding discrepancies in the data reported last year. Could you please ensure that this year, the reported data for North Devon Council reflects what has been entered into this return ? Andy Sharon, I spoke to Andy Cole earlier. He confirmed that after revisiting the questions he had carried out all the check inspections required and that this is what, to the best of his knowledge, he had submitted. I said that there were many anomalies every year between what LAs believe they have entered and what appears in the final survey and that we try to weed these out prior to publication. Unfortunately we did not have the resources to drill down below the requirement for full inspections. We are unable to change the published survey but we accept that North Devon carried out all the inspections required and that there was some problem around the data entry stage which meant this is not reflected in the survey. Regards Eamonn From: Sharon Conibear [mailto:Sharon.Conibear@northdevon.gov.uk] Sent: 10 January 2012 12:09 To: Prendergast, Eamonn (ERG-ALE) Subject: RE: 2010/11 Local Pollution Control Statistical Survey Great, thank you for this information, we will have a look at our records. Regards Sharon Conibear
Hartley Master Ltd	0		8	8	2	10	2	D-39	80%	100%
North Devon										06/02/2014

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
North Norfolk	0	1	4	4	1	5	1	80%	100%	During 2012/13 one group I process and one group II processes surrendered permits. Alongside this a group II process is mothballed, meaning that it is no longer inspected (in line with guidance). Low risk group II processes are inspected every 2 years and are on an appropriate two yearly inspection programme. Similarly, all low risk Group III processes are on a three year inspection routine. The numbers of each undertaken per year varies depending on when the last inspection was undertaken, changes in risk rating and/or when the permit was issued. Therefore, the numbers are not split evenly each year but each process is on the appropriate inspection programme.
Southend-on-sea	0	2	3	4	2	5	2	80%	100%	
Oldham	0	6	8	11	6	14	6	79%	100%	A permit was issued in August for a new installation to operate a rubber and textile coatings. The permit was required as a condition of the purchase of the site. The permit was issued but the process has yet to start operating, plant is currently being moved onto the site. As the plant was not operating it was not possible to inspect the process.
Wyre	0	4	5	7	4	9	4	78%	100%	During 2012/2013 there were two low risk group 1 installations that were not inspected before 31st March 2013 due to difficulties in arranging the inspections with the operators. These inspections were arranged to be carried out early in the current year and this will be reflected in the 2013/2014 return. There were also difficulties in inspecting mobile plant as it is out of the area for prolonged periods of time. This will be addressed in the 2013/2014 inspection programme.The vehicle finishing installations (PG6/34b) were not due to be inspected during 2012/2013, these are on the inspection programme for 2013/2014.
Lichfield	0	2	16	14	1	18	2	78%	50%	Of 8 mobile crusher permits, none operated in our district. One of those was mothballed for 11 month of 2012/13, and another revoked in March 13 as the operator sold the crusher over a year ago and forgot to revoke the permit. Our new crematoria was only permitted on 27/3/13 so no inspection was conducted, although 2 application visited were.

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Gedling	0	2	11	10	2	13	2	77%	100%	9 PVR stations (stage 1) were not due for inspection
Flintshire	15	6	26	47	0	62	21	76%	0%	
East Cambridgeshire	0	0	8	6	0	8	0	75%	N/A	1 x Combustion Activity - Not operating (and hasn't for sometime), currently in process of surrendering/mothballing. 1 x Waste Oil Burner not due this year 2 x Crushers not due this year 2 x Dry Cleaners not due this year 1 x Roadstone Coating still mothballed 1 x Petrol Station surrendered Permit. PS: I have put Roadstone Coating under Tar and Bitumen.
Solihull	0	0	4	3	0	4	0	75%	N/A	one inspection for a group 1 low risk was due to be carried out but has now been moved forward to spring 2013.
Rossendale	1	2	4	6	6	8	3	75%	200%	The authority has 16 Group III installations, only four of which fell due for inspection in 2012/13 One low risk Group I installation is mothballed. One low risk Group I installation transferred from the Environment Agency at the end of February.
Arun	0	1	3	3	1	4	1	75%	100%	
Rushcliffe	0	1	3	3	1	4	1	75%	100%	
Tower Hamlets	0	2	2	3	2	4	2	75%	100%	
Worcester	0	1	7	6	1	8	1	75%	100%	Two cement batching plants not inspected, due to work load.
Lincoln	0	4	4	6	2	8	4	75%	50%	One of the low risk Group I gategory installations is currently mothballed so did not require inspecting. Seven of the low risk Group III were not due for inspection during 2012/13.
Babergh	0	1	7	6	0	8	1	75%	0%	1 No. Group I/Low installation: closed down, but permit not mothballed/transferred/surrendered. 1 No. Group III/Medium installation: closed down, but permit not mothballed/transferred/surrendered. 1 No. Group III/Low installation: closed down, but permit not mothballed/transferred/surrendered.
Isle of Wight / Medina	0	1	7	6	0	8	1	75%	0%	

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Tonbridge & Malling	0	2	10	9	0	12	2	75%	0%	We have some Crushers that are permanently operated outside of our Borough, but that move locations throughout the year.
Cornwall UA	0	8	54	46	10	62	8	74%	125%	Two sites are currently mothballed so have not been inspected, five visits to mobile crushers were unable to be completed, none of the petrol stations (82) required visits during 2012/13 and some of the low risk group 2 and 3 sites (vehicle resprayers and dry cleaners were not due visits during 2012/13. There were six sites which did not receive visits due to maternity leave.
Coventry	6	7	10	21	8	29	13	72%	62%	The majority of our dry cleaners and over half of our petrol stations were not due inspection this year due to their low risk rating. In addition to this: 1 x vehicle refinisher not inspected as company in administration, all staff made redundant and process not operating 1 x di-isocyanate process closed before inspection could take place, permit subsequently surrendered 1 x di-isocyanate process mothballed by company therefore not operating or inspected 1 x di-isocyanate process not operating due to recession and therefore not inspected but permit neither mothballed or surrendered as company have not decided on the future of the installation 2 x mobile crushers not inspected as previously stated due to locality We have concentrated our resources on the higher risk processes and, however due to staff shortages we were unable to undertake every inspection
Mid Suffolk	0	0	10	7	0	10	0	70%	N/A	2 x mobile crushers - checked records. Brought to our office 3 x cement batching plants not currently operating
Corby	2	9	13	18	0	26	11	69%	0%	
Waverley	0	0	3	2	0	3	0	67%	N/A	

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
South Tyneside	0	9	6	10	5	15	9	67%	56%	Practical Compounds. Group I Medium Risk have not used their Tar/ Bitumen Process (6.3) since 2011. Letter has been sent do they want to surrender their Permit. Port of Tyne. Group I Medium Risk. Other mineral activities standard permits only (3.5a) did not have a formal check inspection and the operation of the process has been split between 3 sperate operatives. Discussions are taking place to establish who the permit should actually be issued to. Cemex Group I Medium Risk (Had previously been categorised low risk but moved to medium risk by virtue of the guidance requiring distance to residential properties should be multiplied by 2 for mineral and cement & lime processes) had one full inspection only and no formal check visit. It is situated within the Port of Tyne boundary and has had drive by visits almost daily. No complaints received. O'Briens. Mobile crushers have not been situated within the borough of South Tyneside. Roger Bullivant Group 1, Low Risk (Cement batching) was not formally inspected. 14x Petrol Filling Stations to be inspected between 2012 and 2015 3x vehicle refinishing PG6/3a to be inspected between 2013 and 2014
Wyre Forest	0	5	7	8	2	12	5	67%	40%	Some check inspections and some low risk cement and timber processes missed due to work load.
Bournemouth	0	1	2	2	0	3	1	67%	0%	3 inspections that were due were not carried out: 1 was due to the waste oil burner being broken. It was deemed that it was not appropriate to carry out the inspection at that time. 1 which was due at the end of the reporting period (ie March) was in the process of being transferred so the inspection was carried out once the transfer had taken place. 1 slipped through the net.

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Warwick	0	4	5	6	0	9	4	67%	0%	The Council was going through a lean working review during the year and key staff were seconded to work on this project which has concluded with a major internal re-structuring. This had an impact on service delivery but we hope to have all visits up-to-date during 2013/14 as a result. Most missed visits during 12/13 were to premises where multiple annual visits were required. One of our two medium risk sites is a Council-operated service (crematorium) which is subject to regular inspections outside the LAPPC regime which we have therefore not recorded as such, and the other site is a factory which performs well and if the LAPPC risk rating was consistent with HSW risk rating would be visited at a much reduced frequency.
West Lancashire	0	4	13	11	4	17	4	65%	100%	1 revoked, 1 surrendered, 1 mothballed
Wychavon	0	1	15	10	1	16	1	63%	100%	Some cement and vehicle refinishers missed due to work load.
Rochford	1	3	0	3	0	5	4	60%	0%	Insufficient time and resource to meet all required inspections
Redditch	0	2	10	7	0	12	2	58%	0%	Some inspections missed due to departmental reorganisation and workloads.
Malvern Hills	0	0	7	4	0	7	0	57%	N/A	2 Cement PG3/1(4) processes and one Timber process not inspected due to workload.
Erewash	0	0	9	5	0	9	0	56%	N/A	Capacity issues have meant that inspections have been deferred. Completion of all overdue inspections is planned for September 2013
Amber Valley	0	3	14	9	0	17	3	53%	0%	Inspection rate deteriorated due to resources being diverted onto the implementation of a revised waste and recycling contract. Inspection rate should be back to 100% for 2013/14
Newham	1	2	4	4	3	8	3	50%	100%	With regards to extra inspections, no extra was done on the crematoria because one-inspection was completed in conjunction with, the site check-inspection.
Waltham Forest	2	4	0	4	3	8	6	50%	50%	

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
North Dorset	0	2	2	2	0	4	2	50%	0%	Firstly, see 5.4.5.b text. (mobile crusher) Also, one Group 1 SED coater is in receivership/administration, so we await outcome of this imminently - a new operator is likely to 'emerge from the ashes'. Finally, our dry cleaners were due in March 2013, but this has slipped. (We are an extrememly small team of 1.5 people for all EP functions) However, they will be inspected in the next month.
Herefordshire	0	9	17	11	0	26	9	42%	0%	reduction of staff/ maternity leave
West Oxfordshire	0	1	9	4	1	10	1	40%	100%	Inspection frequency reduced in 2012-13 due to extension of simplified permitting programme
Ceredigion	0	2	3	2	0	5	2	40%	0%	There has been a significant increase in the number of inspections since last year, however the 80% target was not met. A department restructure has resulted in a new dedicated officer (0.2 FTE) with other officers in the Environmental Protection providing structured support. This should result in improved implementation of the LA function, however this is wholly dependant on future budgets constraints. There has been a delay in ensuring the new officer was able to properly undertake these duties due to the lack of regular national training in Environemtal Permitting for new officers.
Wigan	0	18	44	24	18	62	18	39%	100%	The number of inspections is lower than may have been expected because when we programmed in the low risk reduced fee inspections we placed most in 2013/14 or 2014/15 rather than 2012/13 as they had all been inspected in 2011/12. This has lead to fewer inspections this year than would have been undertaken if we had simple done one third each year in the three year plan.
South Ribble	2	6	3	5	0	13	8	38%	0%	

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
South Derbyshire	0	0	14	5	0	14	0	36%	N/A	Certain inspections were not carried in 2012/2013 due to departmental restructure and temporary shortfall in LA-PPC Officers' availability, inspections were prioritised to higher risk installations. An annual inspection schedule for 2013/2014 has been established and forms part of the Council's service planning and performance management framework. This schedule has been developed to ensure inspections not completed in 2012/2013 are carried out in Q1 of 2013-2014.
Broxtowe	0	1	2	1	0	3	1	33%	0%	Reduced inspection frequency meant that many reduced fee installations were not due to be inspected this year. One premises which was due for inspection was permanently closed and has been revoked post 1st April 2013.

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Croydon	0	1	2	1	0	3	1	33%	0%	For the 93 processes operational a total of 51 full inspections and 2 checks were scheduled, of which a total of 47 full inspections were completed. The following full inspections were not completed within the period 2012-13: Group III Medium Risk - 1x Dry Cleaner. Scheduled for March 2013, completed 02.08.13. Inspection postponed until the machine was serviced at the request of the operator. - 1x Waste Oil Burner. Scheduled for February 2013, completed 03.04.13. Unable to raise response from owner which delayed the inspection. - 1x PVR. Scheduled September 2012. Completed 09.04.13, inspection moved following correspondence with the operator to return outstanding information. Note: The risk category for all of the above installations was reduced to low following inspection. Group I Low Risk - 1x Cement batcher. Scheduled for March 2013, completed 04.04.13. Inspection date slipped due to scheduling. The following checks were not completed within the period 2012-13: - 1x check on Group III High Risk Dry Cleaner following full inspection. Solvent data submitted every month, inspection postponed to correspond with the engineers visit. Scheduled October 2012, completed 03.04.13. - 1x check on Group I Medium Risk Crematorium following the full inspection. Scheduled March 2013, completed 11.04.13. Inspection date slipped due to scheduling, however regular contact maintained with the operator. The remaining 42 processes were not scheduled for inspection during 2012-13. LB Croydon schedule Group III Low Risk inspections every two years rather than three yearly as required by Defra. Therefore if the inspection of a low risk installation falls outside of the LB Croydon 24 month inspection window it remains within the 36 month Defra requirement.
Hartley McMaster Ltd							D-47			06/02/2014 To avoid slippage with those installations requiring an annual inspection during 2013-14 the inspection schedule has been adjusted to ensure a more even spread throughout

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Sutton	0	6	1	2	1	7	6	29%	17%	
Hounslow	0	3	9	2	2	12	3	17%	67%	
East Hertfordshire	0	0	35	5	0	35	0	14%	N/A	A number of mobile plant were not operational at any point in 2012/13.
Mole Valley	0	2	23	3	0	25	2	12%	0%	
Crawley	0	1	12	1	0	13	1	8%	0%	
Allerdale	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	0%	N/A	The officer who previously dealt with the LAPPC regime at Allerdale Borough Council left the authority in April 2012, although he did complete the LPCSS Survey 2011/2012 on the councils behalf. In 2012/2013 visits were made to 19 of the Part B installations in order to introduce the new officers implementing the regime and to gather background information on each process where there were gaps in our records. Based on this information an inspection plan has been drawn up for 2013/2014.
Barking & Dagenham	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	0%	N/A	Staff Capacity Staff sickness Some premises were low risk therefore inspection not needed yet
Blackpool	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0%	N/A	No Inspections were carried out this year due to a change over in staff, work has been carried out this year to begin updating all current permits in order for inspections to be carried out soon.
East Devon	0	0	8	0	0	8	0	0%	N/A	
East Hampshire	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0%	N/A	
Eastbourne	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0%	N/A	

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Spelthorne	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	The Group I installation is currently being transferred to a new operator and varied to PG note 3/01, the visit has been postponed until April 2013 when the transfer will be completed and the draft permit available. One of the Grp III medium risk installations was a dry cleaner which closed, and whose permit was subsequently revoked before inspection was due. One Grp III medium risk installation, a service station, had an extra and check inspections associated with enforcement action and subsequent notice. Two Grp III low risk installations, both service stations, received extra and check inspections again associated with enforcement action and subsequent notices. Other Grp II installation was inspected in the previous year. All Grp III dry cleaners have their solvent recording submissions checked, and where necessary chased up, quarterly - this has not been counted as check/ extra inspections as this is a desk based exercise.
Westminster	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Melton	0	1	7	0	0	8	1	0%	0%	
Nottingham	0	3	7	0	0	10	3	0%	0%	Significant resource shortages, re-organisation and prioritisation of other work impacted on activity.

Authorities with fewer full inspections than required – group II installations

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Wigan	1	3	0	3	1	4	1	75%	100%	The number of inspections is lower than may have been expected because when we programmed in the low risk reduced fee inspections we placed most in 2013/14 or 2014/15 rather than 2012/13 as they had all been inspected in 2011/12. This has lead to fewer inspections this year than would have been undertaken if we had simple done one third each year in the three year plan.
Sandwell	1	3	0	3	0	4	1	75%	0%	
Rugby	0	7	0	4	0	7	0	57%	N/A	
Bristol City UA	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	50%	N/A	2 mobile plant are currently based outside the area of Bristol UA
Hammersmith & Fulham	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	50%	N/A	Some of the Group III low risk installations were not scheduled for inspection in 2012/2013. One Group II and two Group III permits were revoked as explained in section 5.4.5c prior to scheduled inspections. Two Group III permits were surrendered after having vacated the premesis also prior to their scheduled inspections.
Neath and Port Talbot	0	4	0	2	0	4	0	50%	N/A	Group 2 - Medium: x2 mobile crushers were not inspected as they were outside the Borough for the whole year. Group 2 - Low: x1 mobile crusher was not inspected as it was outside the Borough for most of the year; x1 mobile crusher was not inspected as this permit has been transfered to Natural Resources Wales and the operator has not yet surrendered their LAPPC permit; and x1 mobile crusher was not inspected as the operator was difficult to get in touch with and did not keep appointments for inspections. Group 3 - High: x1 petrol filling station was not given a check inspection as the manager was not present at the time of the visit.
Rochford	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	50%	N/A	Insufficient time and resource to meet all required inspections
Sedgemoor	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	50%	N/A	

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Wyre	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	50%	N/A	During 2012/2013 there were two low risk group 1 installations that were not inspected before 31st March 2013 due to difficulties in arranging the inspections with the operators. These inspections were arranged to be carried out early in the current year and this will be reflected in the 2013/2014 return. There were also difficulties in inspecting mobile plant as it is out of the area for prolonged periods of time. This will be addressed in the 2013/2014 inspection programme.The vehicle finishing installations (PG6/34b) were not due to be inspected during 2012/2013, these are on the inspection programme for 2013/2014.
Walsall	2	2	0	2	2	4	2	50%	100%	
Birmingham	0	3	0	1	0	3	0	33%	N/A	
Leeds	2	1	0	1	0	3	2	33%	0%	
Bradford	0	8	0	0	0	8	0	0%	N/A	
Hartlepool	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0%	N/A	
Medway	0	5	0	0	0	5	0	0%	N/A	Not all reduced fee inatallations required visits this year. Some were installation permitted during the year.
North West Leicestershire	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Nottingham	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	0%	N/A	Significant resource shortages, re-organisation and prioritisation of other work impacted on activity.
Maldon	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0%	0%	The high risk vehicle refinisher was visited on several occasions, however the Operator was not present due to ill health. The continued need for a permit is currently being determined.

Authorities with fewer full inspections than required – group III installations

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Greenwich	3	19	0	21	1	22	3	95%	33%	One dry cleaner business reported that they had shut - DCM sold to another business. 2 inspections (full and check) therefore not done. At a 2nd dry cleaner business, check inspection not completed due to difficulty of contacting business owner.
Richmond upon Thames	0	18	0	17	0	18	0	94%	N/A	
Ealing	2	13	0	14	1	15	2	93%	50%	Mobile crushers not in borough for check inspetions
Tunbridge Wells	2	10	0	11	0	12	2	92%	0%	Crusher surrendered permit before viist carried out. Some petrol stations obtained high scores by failing to have paperwork re inspection of systems etc which was resolcved by submission rather than visit. One national drycleaner has a corporate 'difficulty with the accuracy of submitted data rather than on site data which complies.
Tower Hamlets	0	11	0	10	0	11	0	91%	N/A	
Hackney	0	9	0	8	0	9	0	89%	N/A	
Wigan	2	7	0	8	0	9	2	89%	0%	The number of inspections is lower than may have been expected because when we programmed in the low risk reduced fee inspections we placed most in 2013/14 or 2014/15 rather than 2012/13 as they had all been inspected in 2011/12. This has lead to fewer inspections this year than would have been undertaken if we had simple done one third each year in the three year plan.
Shropshire UA	1	7	0	7	1	8	1	88%	100%	
Southwark	0	13	0	11	0	13	0	85%	N/A	

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Spelthorne	0	6	0	5	0	6	0	83%	N/A	The Group I installation is currently being transferred to a new operator and varied to PG note 3/01, the visit has been postponed until April 2013 when the transfer will be completed and the draft permit available. One of the Grp III medium risk installations was a dry cleaner which closed, and whose permit was subsequently revoked before inspection was due. One Grp III medium risk installation, a service station, had an extra and check inspections associated with enforcement action and subsequent notice. Two Grp III low risk installations, both service stations, received extra and check inspections again associated with enforcement action and subsequent notices. Other Grp II installation was inspected in the previous year. All Grp III dry cleaners have their solvent recording submissions checked, and where necessary chased up, quarterly - this has not been counted as check/ extra inspections as this is a desk based exercise.
Hammersmith & Fulham	12	30	0	34	8	42	12	81%	67%	Some of the Group III low risk installations were not scheduled for inspection in 2012/2013. One Group II and two Group III permits were revoked as explained in section 5.4.5c prior to scheduled inspections. Two Group III permits were surrendered after having vacated the premesis also prior to their scheduled inspections.
Windsor & Maidenhead	0	5	0	4	0	5	0	80%	N/A	
Hartlepool	3	2	0	4	1	5	3	80%	33%	
Salford	3	1	0	3	2	4	3	75%	67%	
Waltham Forest	4	9	0	9	0	13	4	69%	0%	
Lincoln	2	1	0	2	1	3	2	67%	50%	One of the low risk Group I gategory installations is currently mothballed so did not require inspecting. Seven of the low risk Group III were not due for inspection during 2012/13.

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Croydon	1	8	0	6	0	9	1	67%	0%	For the 93 processes operational a total of 51 full inspections and 2 checks were scheduled, of which a total of 47 full inspections were completed. The following full inspections were not completed within the period 2012-13: Group III Medium Risk - 1x Dry Cleaner. Scheduled for March 2013, completed 02.08.13. Inspection postponed until the machine was serviced at the request of the operator. - 1x Waste Oil Burner. Scheduled for February 2013, completed 03.04.13. Unable to raise response from owner which delayed the inspection. - 1x PVR. Scheduled September 2012. Completed 09.04.13, inspection moved following correspondence with the operator to return outstanding information. Note: The risk category for all of the above installations was reduced to low following inspection. Group I Low Risk - 1x Cement batcher. Scheduled for March 2013, completed 04.04.13. Inspection date slipped due to scheduling. The following checks were not completed within the period 2012-13: - 1x check on Group III High Risk Dry Cleaner following full inspection. Solvent data submitted every month, inspection postponed to correspond with the engineers visit. Scheduled October 2012, completed 03.04.13. - 1x check on Group I Medium Risk Crematorium following the full inspection. Scheduled March 2013, completed 11.04.13. Inspection date slipped due to scheduling, however regular contact maintained with the operator. The remaining 42 processes were not scheduled for inspection during 2012-13. LB Croydon schedule Group III Low Risk inspections every two years rather than three yearly as required by Defra. Therefore if the inspection of a low risk installation falls outside of the LB Croydon 24 month inspection window it remains within the 36 month Defra requirement.
Hartley McMaster Ltd							D-54			06/02/2014 To avoid slippage with those installations requiring an annual inspection during 2013-14 the inspection schedule has been adjusted to ensure a more even spread throughout

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Bedford Borough UA	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	50%	N/A	
Cotswold	1	1	0	1	1	2	1	50%	100%	currently have 2 standard processes which are mothballed
Coventry	4	4	0	4	1	8	4	50%	25%	The majority of our dry cleaners and over half of our petrol stations were not due inspection this year due to their low risk rating. In addition to this: 1 x vehicle refinisher not inspected as company in administration, all staff made redundant and process not operating 1 x di-isocyanate process closed before inspection could take place, permit subsequently surrendered 1 x di-isocyanate process mothballed by company therefore not operating or inspected 1 x di-isocyanate process not operating due to recession and therefore not inspected but permit neither mothballed or surrendered as company have not decided on the future of the installation 2 x mobile crushers not inspected as previously stated due to locality We have concentrated our resources on the higher risk processes and, however due to staff shortages we were unable to undertake every inspection
Chichester	1	1	0	1	0	2	1	50%	0%	Two group 2 inspections not completed due to shut down of sites from start of 2013 and not restarted before 31.3.13
East Staffordshire	1	1	0	1	0	2	1	50%	0%	Group 1 - High - One Full inspection, 3 check visits and 1 other visit undertaken
North Kesteven	2	2	0	2	0	4	2	50%	0%	
Plymouth	4	1	0	2	1	5	4	40%	25%	Due to staff shortages and restructures Inspections are now carried out according to RA or in event of a complaint
Barnsley	0	3	0	1	0	3	0	33%	N/A	Some Group II and III Installations were not visited as they werent sheduled to be this year following the introduction of the 2 and 3 year inspection loop.
Sheffield	0	3	0	1	0	3	0	33%	N/A	Lack of resources allocated to this area , officer on maternity leave

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Enfield	0	13	0	1	0	13	0	8%	N/A	The vast majority of the permitted installations in the London Borough of Enfield are Group III low risk and therefore only require one full inspection every three years. In 2012/13 there were 42 installations due for inspection, all of which were inspected and this matches the figure given in section 5.4 and in 5.6.3. With this figure in mind the London Borough of Enfield inspected 100% of the installations due for inspection.
Bournemouth	0	28	0	1	0	28	0	4%	N/A	3 inspections that were due were not carried out: 1 was due to the waste oil burner being broken. It was deemed that it was not appropriate to carry out the inspection at that time. 1 which was due at the end of the reporting period (ie March) was in the process of being transferred so the inspection was carried out once the transfer had taken place. 1 slipped through the net.
Aylesbury Vale	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0%	N/A	With the exception of mobile plant, all scheduled inspections were undertaken.
Babergh	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	1 No. Group I/Low installation: closed down, but permit not mothballed/transferred/surrendered. 1 No. Group III/Medium installation: closed down, but permit not mothballed/transferred/surrendered. 1 No. Group III/Low installation: closed down, but permit not mothballed/transferred/surrendered.
Burnley	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Cardiff	0	5	0	0	0	5	0	0%	N/A	
Conwy	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
East Dorset	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Haringey	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Harlow	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0%	N/A	
Herefordshire	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	reduction of staff/ maternity leave
Mid Devon	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Mole Valley	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Newark & Sherwood	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	Any shortfall in inspection figures will be due to: Not inspecting Grp II mobile plant (4 out of 5 such operators carry out their activity away from our district). Check inspections for some Grp I medium risked operators scheduled in next accounting year, April onwards. Not all Group III low risked operators due this year as most now on a 2 or 3 yearly cycle.
Newcastle upon Tyne	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Northampton	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	Two of the low risk group one installations are mothballed and no inspection wa carried out during this year although contact was made with the operators of the installations. There have been some delays in carrying out group three inspections of petrol stations due to staffing issues. These inspections will be carried out in 2013/14
Nuneaton & Bedworth	0	4	0	0	0	4	0	0%	N/A	New permit for one mobile crusher, plant not yet commissioned, so no inspection possible. New permit for surface cleansing process (medium risk) issued half way through year so only one inspection due / completed.
Portsmouth	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Rossendale	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	The authority has 16 Group III installations, only four of which fell due for inspection in 2012/13 One low risk Group I installation is mothballed. One low risk Group I installation transferred from the Environment Agency at the end of February.
Selby	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	Operator of high risk installation refused access so only visit completed during the year.

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
South Tyneside	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0%	N/A	Practical Compounds. Group I Medium Risk have not used their Tar/ Bitumen Process (6.3) since 2011. Letter has been sent do they want to surrender their Permit. Port of Tyne. Group I Medium Risk. Other mineral activities standard permits only (3.5a) did not have a formal check inspection and the operation of the process has been split between 3 sperate operatives. Discussions are taking place to establish who the permit should actually be issued to. Cemex Group I Medium Risk (Had previously been categorised low risk but moved to medium risk by virtue of the guidance requiring distance to residential properties should be multiplied by 2 for mineral and cement & lime processes) had one full inspection only and no formal check visit. It is situated within the Port of Tyne boundary and has had drive by visits almost daily. No complaints received. O'Briens. Mobile crushers have not been situated within the borough of South Tyneside. Roger Bullivant Group 1, Low Risk (Cement batching) was not formally inspected. 14x Petrol Filling Stations to be inspected between 2012 and 2015 3x vehicle refinishing PG6/3a to be inspected between 2013 and 2014
Tandridge	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%	N/A	
Thanet	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	0%	N/A	DDS operate a concrete crusher which was not in our district during our inspection period.
Wakefield	0	8	0	0	0	8	0	0%	N/A	During the year one Group I (Nettleton & Porter - Hide & Skin process) installation and two Group III (2 branches of Johnsons the Cleaners - dry cleaning activities) installations closed before they could be inspected. Furthermore, a Group II installation (Autorestore Ltd, formerly ADR Accident Repair - vehicle refinishing) was mothballed prior to being inspected.

	Installations			Inspections Carried Out		Inspections Expected		Inspections Rates		
Authority Name	**High**	**Med.**	**Low**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Full**	**Check**	**Reasons**
Westminster	0	24	0	0	0	24	0	0%	N/A	
Wycombe	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0%	N/A	All scheduled inspection were undertaken in period.
Breckland	3	0	0	0	3	3	3	0%	100%	Vehicle Resprayers to be carried out 2013/14 Petrol Stations to be carreid out 2014 and 2015
North Tyneside	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	0%	0%	high group2 were stone crushers found on full inspection to drop to low risk on inspection , high group 3 delay in inspection lead to visit in next financial year April.
Nottingham	3	1	0	0	0	4	3	0%	0%	Significant resource shortages, re-organisation and prioritisation of other work impacted on activity.

Authorities which have yet to risk assess any of their installations

Carlisle