Authority	Total No of	No of	Total % of	Total % of	Total 9	% of	Total % of	Total % of	Total % of	Total % of	Total % of	Total % of	Total % of	Total % of	Total % of	Total	Total No of	Total No	Total No	Total No of	Total No of	Total No of	Total No of	Total No of	Total No of
	Establishments	Establishments not yet rated for		Broadly	Broadl		Broadly	Broadly	Broadly	Interventions	Interventions	Interventions achieved -	Interventions	Interventions achieved -	Interventions achieved -	number of samples		of formal	of formal	formal	formal enforcement	formal t enforcemen	formal	formal	formal
			r compliant	compliant	compl	liant	compliant	compliant	compliant	achieved	achieved -		achieved -										enforceme	enforcement	
		intervention	premises	premises	- A premis	ses - B	oremises - C	premises - D	premises - E		Premises Rated A	Premises Rated E	Premises Rated C	Premises Rated	D Premises Rated	I E taken	actions take	en ent	nt actions	actions take	n actions taken	t actions	nt actions	actions taken	n - actions taken
																	-	actions	taken -	- Seizure,	-	taken -	taken -	Improvement	t Remedial
																	Prosecution	ns taken -	Voluntary	dentention	Suspension/r	Emergency	Prohibtion	Notices	Action &
																		Simple	closures	and	evocation of	Prohibition	Orders	1	Detention
																		Cautions		surrender of	approval	Notices	1	1	Notices
																				food			1	1	
METROPOLITAN BC																								ı	
Barnsley	1845	5 2	66	85.5%	0.0%	40.7%	83.5%	93.8%	% 99.6%	6 100.0%	6 100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	100.	0% 100	.0% 3	88	0 ()	0	0 0	0	0		5
Birmingham	758	1 7	66 40	87.4%	23.3%	42.3%	85.1%		6 100.0%	6 100.0%	6 100.0	% 100.0	% 100.0	100.	0% 100	.0% 1,7	32	12 ()	0 5	0 0	35	0	25	58
Bolton	2309	9 1	45	83.8%	13.6%	45.5%	84.1%	99.5%	// 100.0%	6 73.6%	6 100.0	% 99.8	% 73.4	.% 49.	6% 51	.9% 1	17	0 (1	0 0	0	0		2
Bradford	4193	3 1	32	92.9%	22.2%	54.3%	86.7%			67.5%	6 97.4	% 99.3	% 93.1	% 29.	2% 14	.0% 4	66	3 12	2	1	0 1	0	1	2	<u>22 </u>
Bury	1449			92.6%	0.0%	58.4%	91.2%									.0 /0	66	1 ()	0	0 C	0	0		2 (
Calderdale	2036			85.6%	11.1%	41.9%	80.8%		6 100.09							.570	23	5 3	3 (0	0 3	3 1	2	2	27 (
Coventry	2334			88.3%	0.0%	53.4%	86.8%				6 100.0					.9%	52	20 2	2	6	0 C	0	0	4	12 (
Doncaster	3080	0 6		85.2%	0.0%	35.5%	85.7%							•			13	1 () 2:	2	0 0	5	0	10	79 (
Dudley	2303			87.1%	11.8%	46.9%	86.2%					i		•			81	2 1	[]	3	0 C) 3	1 0	6	<u>06</u>
Gateshead	1715			91.1%	33.3%	52.7%	86.9%									.4% 1,1		0 0) (0	0 C	0	1 0		4 (
Kirklees	4518	+		93.6%	38.1%	55.0%	90.5%									.070	43	3 4	1	6	0 C) 1	1 0	2	26
Knowsley	66	•		81.4%	0.0%	39.6%	86.6%									.0%	69	0 0		0	7 C) 2	1 0	1	<u>(1)</u>
Leeds	6056	-		90.0%	0.0%	42.4%	87.7%									.4% 1,43		4 1	1	3	0 0	0	1 0	6	<u>35 </u>
Liverpool	5029			86.4%	0.0%	41.0%	84.7%					_				.7% 1,1		5 0)	4	0 0) 1	2	4	+2
Manchester	4746			92.1%	0.0%	47.9%	92.6%					_					05	0 1	2	9	3 0) 0	0	·	0 (
Newcastle Upon Tyne	2208			87.4%	0.0%	30.5%	85.4%										56	4 16	6	4	4 0) 0	1	<u>1</u> '	16 (
North Tyneside	1582	+		87.2%	0.0%	51.3%	91.0%									.0 70	04	0 () ;	3	0 0) 0	0	<u> </u>	1 (
Oldham	192	•		90.5%	0.0%	51.3%	87.6%									,.	01	0 1	<u> </u>	2	6 0) 0	0	<u> </u>	5 (
Rochdale	1786	~		84.2%	15.4%	51.6%	84.7%									. 1 /0	27	0 ()	0	0 0	0	0	·	0 (
Rotherham	2178			79.8%	1.9%	28.2%	76.9%					i				.0 /0	08	0 0)	3	0 0) 8	8	3	30 (
Salford	1919			78.1%	7.7%	35.0%	80.0%		-							.0 70	28	8 23	3	2	4 0) 0	1 0		5 (
Sandwell	1964			68.8%	5.8%	30.3%	72.2% 88.1%										75 00	5 11	1	8	0 0) 1	. 0	4	12 (
Sefton Sheffield	248 ² 4228			90.4% 92.3%	0.0% 27.3%	47.4% 44.7%	92.4%										60 60	3 ('	0 4) 0	· 0		28 (
Solihull	1613		. •	0=:070	,	, •			% 99.8%	/0 41.27 / 01.00	100.0	70					70	2 2	 	4		2	1 0		10
South Tyneside	1516			87.3% 72.3%	10.5% 0.0%	46.5% 41.1%	83.4% 67.8%	97.3% 92.6%	% 99.8% % 97.9%	6 81.8% 6 85.0%	6 100.0		% 94.3 % 80.9		0% 70	.0% 2° .7% 5	13	1 2		2	1 0		1 0	<u> </u>	31
St Helens Council	1343	2 4		86.7%	44.4%	62.2%	85.9%		% 97.8% % 97.8%	6 91.19				67.	70/ 03		19	2 4	-	0 0	0 0		1 0		71
Stockport MBC	2234			74.4%	12.5%	37.9%	73.0%										65	3 3	2 1	5			1 0		20 0
Sunderland	2137			91.2%	50.0%	64.5%	91.6%										44	0 0) 15	n			1 0		0
Tameside	1812			85.6%	0.0%	40.3%	80.8%										83	2 3	3	nl	1 0		1 1		41
Trafford	2009			77.2%	8.1%	26.6%	82.5%										67 67	1 0	1	3) 0	, 		23
Wakefield	3098			92.5%	27.3%	35.3%	91.1%			6 48.9%						.1% 1	52)	4	4 1	, 0	. 0		10
Walsall	2168			73.3%	15.7%	37.2%	74.4%									.7% 20	62	2 63	-	1	<u> </u>) 2	1		12
West Yorkshire (1)	N/A		J/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A						/A N			N/A 3,1	15	1 0)	n l) 2	, 		
	2346			80.5%	0.0%	40.1%	82.5%									.0% 1,5			<u>' </u>	1) 0	1 0	,	13
Wigan Wirral	271			83.0%	3.2%	48.6%	81.7%									.2%	2	0 1	1 2	n l) 0	1 0		27
Wolverhampton	2076			89.1%	5.9%	44.5%	88.1%										52	10 6	2	nl) 2	,		30 (

⁽¹⁾ only deal with Food Standards