

**Cheltenham Borough Council**  
**Cabinet – 14<sup>th</sup> July 2015**  
**Food Safety Service Plan 2015 - 2016**

<b>Accountable member</b>	<b>Councillor Andrew McKinlay, Cabinet Member for Development &amp; Safety</b>
<b>Accountable officer</b>	<b>Sarah Clark – Public &amp; Environmental Health Team Leader</b>
<b>Ward(s) affected</b>	<b>All</b>
<b>Key/Significant Decision</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Executive summary</b>	<p>The Food Standards Act 1999 requires the Council to produce a Food Safety Service Plan</p> <p>The Food Safety Service Plan is the Council’s expression of commitment to the delivery of an improving cost effective and efficient regulatory food service.</p> <p>This Food Safety Service Plan is an annual operational plan giving details of how Cheltenham is going to execute its statutory food safety functions within the Public Protection service under Mike Redman as Director of Environmental &amp; Regulatory Services.</p>
<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>It is recommended that Cabinet approve the appended service plan for 2015-16.</b>

<b>Financial implications</b>	<p>No direct financial implications arising from the report.</p> <p><b>Contact officer: Nina Philippidis, nina.philippidis@cheltenham.gov.uk 01242 264121</b></p>
<b>Legal implications</b>	<p>It is a statutory requirement to produce this plan on an annual basis.</p> <p><b>Contact officer: Fiona Samuda, fiona.samuda@teWKesbury.gov.uk, 01684 272062</b></p>
<b>HR implications (including learning and organisational development)</b>	<p>There is a clear legislative duty of care to ensure that workloads are manageable and reasonable. While for short term absences teams may be able to cover the additional workload using overtime and/ or banking flexi hours this is not sustainable as a longer term solution. Either the overall outputs of the team need to be set to reflect the reduced capacity, or additional resources found to cover so that the original targets can be met.</p> <p><b>Contact officer: Richard Hall , HR Business Partner Richard.hall@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 774972</b></p>

<b>Key risks</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please refer to appended risk assessment for full risk assessment – key risks highlighted here</li> <li>• Reduced capacity due to illness – detrimental impact on overall performance (but namely % of inspections carried out within 28 days of becoming due). Mitigation – focus resource at high and medium risk premises and non-compliant businesses</li> <li>• Reactive services will given their inherent nature always contain the potential for an element of risk. An unplanned event (e.g. a food poisoning outbreak) will require the diversion of resources away from scheduled plans. However, this is and will remain the essence of the service we deliver and will be tolerated and monitored throughout the plan with priority given to the appropriate control of high risk issues.</li> </ul>
<b>Corporate and community plan Implications</b>	<p>The Corporate Strategy contains three high level outcomes for 2015-16:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cheltenham’s environmental quality and heritage is protected, maintained and enhanced</li> <li>• Sustain and grow Cheltenham’s economic and cultural vitality</li> <li>• People live in strong, safe and healthy communities</li> </ul> <p>The Food Service Plan supports these outcomes by working to achieve: improved food safety and hygienic premises; high rating food businesses in the national food hygiene rating scheme (resulting in increased consumer confidence in local businesses); and the control of foodborne diseases – all of which help promote the local economy as well as protecting the health of the people who live, visit or work in Cheltenham. Advice is also given that directly improves or protects the environmental quality of the town – examples range from pests and other vectors; to the disposal of FOGs (fat or grease in drains).</p>
<b>Environmental and climate change implications</b>	<p>None</p>
<b>Property/Asset Implications</b>	<p>None</p>

## 1. Background

- 1.1 The White Paper “The Food Standards Agency – A Force for Change” identified the Food Standards Agency as having a key role overseeing local authority enforcement activities. This plan is required by the Food Standards Agency (FSA) as part of their monitoring and auditing systems.
- 1.2 Service plans are seen to be an important part of the process to ensure national priorities and standards are addressed and delivered locally. Service plans also:
- focus debate on key delivery issues;
  - provide an essential link with financial planning;
  - set objectives for the future, and identify major issues that cross service boundaries; and
  - provide a means of managing performance and making performance comparisons.
- 1.3 The plan follows a standard format provided by the FSA and is required to be submitted to Members for approval

## 2. Reasons for recommendations

- 2.1 It is a statutory requirement to produce a Food Service Plan.
- 2.2 If Members are able to accept the anticipated dip in service performance due to officer illness, it can be mitigated through the prioritisation of high and medium risk food premises inspections (see Section 3 of appended service plan). A mutual aid resilience arrangement may also provide some mitigation (see 3.2).

## 3. Alternative options considered

- 3.1 This plan relates to the delivery of a statutory function so no alternative options are available.
- 3.2 The use of mutual aid with neighbouring authorities to increase resilience in times of officer illness or peak demand will be explored, although it is expected that Cheltenham Borough Council would reciprocate any such arrangement either financially or through resource provision at a later date.

## 4. Consultation and feedback

- 4.1 A copy of the plan is made available on the council’s website .

## 5. Performance management – monitoring and review

- 5.1 Food Safety Officer performance management takes place on a monthly basis through recorded 121s with the team leader.
- 5.2 The Food Safety Service reports on two performance indicators on a quarterly basis to the Divisional Management Team. These are PP10 – grow the number of food businesses rated 3 and above – and PP11 – the percentage of food businesses that are broadly compliant with food legislation. Please refer to section 3 of the service plan for details of these two performance measures and percentages of inspections achieved.
- 5.3 An annual statutory return is also produced through the Local Authority Enforcement Monitoring System (LAEMS) and monitored by the Food Standards Agency.
- 5.4 The operation of the Food Hygiene Rating Scheme is monitored by the Food Standards Agency against the Brand Standard.

<b>Report author</b>	Contact officer: Sarah Clark, Team Leader sarah.clark@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264226
----------------------	--

<b>Appendices</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Risk Assessment</li><li>2. Food Safety Service Plan 2015-16</li></ol>
<b>Background information</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Food Law Code of Practice 2015 <a href="http://www.food.gov.uk/enforcement/enforcework/food-law-code-of-practice-2015">http://www.food.gov.uk/enforcement/enforcework/food-law-code-of-practice-2015</a></li><li>2. Food Law Practice Guidance – currently being revised and not yet available</li></ol>

The risk				Original risk score (impact x likelihood)			Managing risk				
Risk ref.	Risk description	Risk Owner	Date raised	Impact 1-5	Likelihood 1-6	Score	Control	Action	Deadline	Responsible officer	Transferred to risk register
	Lack of officer resource due to long term illness - If the service does not have enough officer hours to deliver the programmed inspections due in this financial year on top of the statutory requirement to assess all new food business within 28 days of them opening, then hazards in the food business activity may manifest as risks to public or individual health	SC	08.05.2015	2	6	12	A	<p>Mitigate as far as possible by targeting resource at high risk (category A and B) and medium risk (category C) premises and do not inspect low risk (category D and E). This action would be appropriate risk management ,as measured by the division’s performance standards (eg % of broadly compliant food businesses) - see section 3 of Food Safety Service Plan.</p> <p>The service will explore mutual aid with neighbouring authorities to increase resilience although CBC would be expected to contribute financially to such an arrangement or to provide resource in exchange at a later date. Alternatively, the food safety team would require an</p>	14.07.15 – to be raised via Cabinet report	SC	

								increased budget in order to deliver a higher inspection rate than that proposed in this report.			
	Emergencies –if the service suffers a lack of resource due to major emergency or food/infection related incident, then there could be a failure to carry out planned interventions or investigate food complaints/incidents.	SC	19.06.15	3	3	6	R	Likely to be short-term if risk is realised so can reduce risk with mitigation: a) mutual aid from neighbouring districts to cover high risk interventions or complaint investigation (arrangement through Glos Food Safety Liaison Group) b) notification to FSA of incident and possible impact on performance c) use of agency contract staff to backfill if necessary	In place	SC	
	If Idox Uni-Form does not function as a stable case management system, then risk data relating to any business in Cheltenham cannot be accessed and planned interventions cannot be programmed	SC	19.06.15	5	2	10	R	Reduce risk by: a) reporting all issues to ICT and user group rep b) have now produced paper versions of inspection forms and Legal Notices etc c) reliance on paper files	In place	SC	
	If there are conflicting priorities facing the food safety service, then this could result in less businesses being inspected each year overall – examples of these other	SC	19.06.15	2	3	6	R	Reduce risk by prioritisation – for example, review if the service has the capacity to deliver the HIF project; do not participate in sampling	In place	SC	

	<p>priorities are commercially or project orientated eg Primary Authority Partnership with Edwards &amp; Ward initially (income generator), Food Hygiene Rating Scheme administration; Health Inequality Fund project; consistency, revisits etc; sampling; and Food Standards Agency projects.</p>								programmes this year.			

**Explanatory notes**  
**Impact** – an assessment of the impact if the risk occurs on a scale of 1-5 (1 being least impact and 5 being major or critical)  
**Likelihood** – how likely is it that the risk will occur on a scale of 1-6 (1 being almost impossible, 2 is very low, 3 is low, 4 significant, 5 high and 6 a very high probability)  
**Control** - Either: Reduce / Accept / Transfer to 3rd party / Close