Authority	Establishments	No of	Total % of Broadly compliant	Total % of	Total % of	Total % of	Total % of Broadly compliant	Total % of	Total % of Interventions achieved	Total % of	Total % of Interventions achieved -	Total % of Interventions achieved -	Total % of Interventions achieved -	Total % of	Total	Total No of	of formal	Total No	Total No of	Total No of	formal	f Total No	of Total No of formal enforcement	Total No of formal enforcement
		Establishments		Broadly	Broadly	Broadly		Broadly compliant		Interventions achieved -				Interventions achieved -	number o			l of formal		formal		formal		
		not yet rated for		compliant	compliant	compliant									samples	enforceme						enforceme		
	(mo amatou)	intervention	premises	premises - A	premises - B	premises - C	premises - D	premises - E	domovod		Premises Rated B	Premises Rated C	Premises Rated D		taken	actions tak				actions take				- actions taken
		intervention	premises	premises - A	premises - B	premises - 0	premises - D	premises - L		T Tellises Nateu A	i iciliises italea B	i icinises italea o	Tremises Nated B	Tremises Rated L	Laken	actions tak	actions	taken -	- Seizure,	actions take	taken -	taken -	Improvement	Remedial
																Prosecutio	ns taken -	Voluntary	dentention	Suspension	/r Emergency	Prohibtion	Notices	Action &
																Trosecutio	Simple	closures	and	evocation of		Orders	Notices	Detention
																	Caution	Closures	surrender of		Notices	Orders		Notices
																	Cautions	•	food	арріочаі	Notices			Notices
LONDON BOROUGHS																								
Barking & Dagenham	993	3	70 8	88.0% 2	6.7% 3	.0% 87.4	% 100.0%	6 100.0%	6 72.19	% 100.0%	64.5%	6 88.8%	69.89	6 27.6	% 1:	20	4	0	4	0	0 4	C	0 1	1
Barnet	2162	2 20)2 8	5.2%	4.3%	5.4% 83.1	% 95.7%	6 99.6%	6 50.79	% 92.0%	92.9%	6 72.5%	6 15.5%	6 5.7	%	83	2	1 1	0	3	O C) C	<u>ر</u> 1′	0
Bexley*	N/A	A N	Ά	N/A	N/A	N/A N	/A N//	A N//	A N/	A N/A	N/A	A N/A	A N//	A N/	'A N	I/A N	I/A N	'A N/	A N	/A N/	A N/A	N/A	A N//	A N/
Bromley	1753	3	3 8	6.3%	0.0%	2.6% 87.5	% 98.4%	6 100.0%	6 95.9 ⁹	% 88.9%	97.4%	6 96.0%	93.29	6 95.2°	%	69	1	1	1	0	0 0		ر 1′	6
Camden	2744	4 1:				.8% 91.1				% 96.8%	97.8%					08	0	2	5	3	0 3	3 0	<u>4</u> ′	2
City of London	1516	6	8 8	88.3%	0.0%	.4% 90.4	% 98.4%			% 100.0%	97.4%	6 94.4%	42.09	45.6	%	9	0 2	29	4	0	0 0		<u>ه</u> 6′	8
Croydon	2557	7 2:	29 8	31.2%	0.0%	75.4	% 96.4%	6 99.8%	6 82.0 ⁹	% 97.8%	86.6%	6 76.5%	6 86.09	6 97.0	%	54	0	0	6	0	0 4	C	ა <u>ვ</u>	6
Ealing	2017	7	19 8	2.8%	2.4% 5	0.4% 83.7	% 97.8%			% 54.0%	61.6%	6 24.7%	6 7.79	6 11.6	%	98	1	0	6	0	0 1	1	1	0
Enfield	2360	0 20)7 8	32.4%	0.0%	78.5	% 92.8%			% 100.0%	100.0%	6 100.0%	6 100.09	6 100.0°	% 10	67	6	1 1	1	4	0 0) C	J	4
Greenwich	1722		13 8			.9% 86.0					99.6%					28	1	1	2	1	0 1	C	<u>۱′</u>	2
Hackney	2975	5 8	75 6	0.7%	2.0%	59.3	% 93.6%	6 99.5%	65.49	% 98.9%	97.5%	63.89	42.39	6 16.1	% 20	07	3	7	9	1	0 2	2	2 6'	5
Hammersmith & Fulham	808	8	0	31.4%	0.0%	94.3	% 100.0%	6 100.0%	47.89	% 50.0%	50.0%	6 50.0%	40.49	6 36.6	%	72	0	0	0	0	0 0) (J .	7
Haringey	1685	5	10 7	75.5%	0.0%	.0% 71.5	% 91.4%	6 99.2%	88.29	% 100.0%	98.7%	98.5%	81.39	44.9	% 1:	39	0	1	9	4	0 2	2 1	1 3'	5
Harrow	1652	2 4:	34 7	8.1%	4.3%	.4% 72.7	% 92.7%	6 99.7%	93.19	% 77.8%	100.0%	6 96.7%	91.69	68.5	%	97	1	3	8	2	0 0	C	0 54	4
Havering	1557	7	35 8	0.6%	0.0%	76.3	% 94.1%	6 100.0%	6 51.19	% 100.0%	96.0%	6 56.4%	30.39	6 16.9	%	90	0	0	0	9	0 0	C	<u>۱</u>	1
Hillingdon	2365	5	15 4	4.2%	6.7%	80.2	% 0.0%	6 0.0%	96.49	% 90.0%	97.8%	6 98.6%	6 90.29	⁶ 85.4	% 1	55	0	0	1	0	0 1	1	1	0
Hounslow	1446	6	75 8	6.6%	5.0%	2.9% 83.3	% 93.9%	6 99.5%	6 100.09	% 100.0%	100.0%	6 100.0%	6 100.09	/6 100.0	%	55	0	1	3	0	0 0		J 4	1
Islington	1942	2	0 7	4.2%	1.1%	.4% 77.8		6 99.4%	97.39	% 100.0%	99.7%	6 99.0%	97.69	66.4	% 18	80	2	7	6	3	0 0		<u>5</u> ′	8
Kensington & Chelsea	1738	8 10	9 7	75.9%	0.0%	.9% 77.7	% 95.4%	6 100.0%	89.79	% 98.7%	99.4%	6 94.0%	75.5%	6 44.1	% .	40	5	3	1	3	0 4	C	ر 1′	0
Kingston-Upon-Thames	1400	0 19	93	6.6%	0.0%	.3% 90.5	% 88.9%	6 97.1%	91.09	% 100.0%	100.0%	92.8%	49.5%	/6 100.0	% 1	18	0	1	1	1	0 0		3/	0
Lambeth	2779	9 24	8 81	88.3%	0.0%	0.4% 83.2	% 93.8%	6 100.0%	78.69	% 88.9%	81.9%	83.8%	59.0%	60.7	% 14	47	0	0	1	0	0 1	C	<u>)</u>	8
Lewisham	1716	6 12	29 4	5.4%	0.0%	51.5	% 47.3%			% 100.0%	100.0%	6 100.0%	6 100.09	/6 100.0	%	81	0	0	0	2	0 0		<u>7</u> ′	9
London Borough of Brent	2060	9	95 7	4.6%	5.6%	73.0	% 96.4%	6 99.8%	72.39	% 96.0%	95.5%	86.5%	6 31.79			20	0	0 2	26	3	1 2	2 0	J 3	4
London Borough of Southwar	rk 2686	6 3	54 7	8.3%		.6% 80.7		6 100.0%	65.5%	% 100.0%	100.0%	48.0%	48.69	60.8	% 34	40	13	31	2	0	0 6	5 1	15'	2
Merton	1562	2 (55 8	88.4%	0.0% 4	.2% 88.7	% 99.3%	6 100.0%	77.39	% 94.1%			6 48.6% 6 23.0%	6 85.7	% 14	44	0	1	3	4	0 1	C) <u> </u>	2
Newham	1767	7	38 7	75.2%	1.1%	.4% 68.8	% 93.8%	6 99.7%	85.19	% 93.3%	94.0%	83.0%	83.9%	80.8	%	0	0	0	0	0	0 0	C	<u>ر</u>	0
Redbridge	1496	6 :		6.9%		2.8% 96.3										0	0	0	0	0	0 0	C	<u>)</u>	0
Richmond-Upon-Thames	1513	3 18				75.8					93.0%	75.1%				69	0	0	0	0	0 0		J	1
Sutton	1399	9 :	29 8	9.7%	3.3%	0.7% 88.0	% 98.1%	6 100.0%		% 100.0%	86.3%	87.6%	6 98.79	6 100.0	% 1:	34	0	0	0	0	0 0	0	J 1	1
Tower Hamlets	2284	4	55 8	35.0%	3.3% 4	86.7	% 88.7%						6 99.0%			03	9	4	6	18	0 0	7	/ 5'	9
Waltham Forest	2092	2 25	55 7	75.3%	0.0%	73.6	% 93.6%	6 99.0%	⁶ 49.5%	% 88.5%	86.7%	45.6%			%	96	1	0	0	1	0 22	2 0	J 7'	5
Wandsworth	2270	0 4				5.0% 86.3				% 100.0%	100.0%					77	0	0	0	0	0 0	0	0 28	.8
Westminster	4843		33 8			5.0% 86.8								1		24	11	3	2	1	0 10	10	0 8/	.4

^{*} unable to provide data