

Supporting Information and Impact Assessment

| | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Proposal: | Reduce food safety interventions |
| Executive Lead: | Cllr Manning |
| Director / Assistant Director: | Fran Hughes |

| | | | | | |
|----------|-----|-------|---------------|---------|-------------|
| Version: | 3.0 | Date: | February 2017 | Author: | Fran Hughes |
|----------|-----|-------|---------------|---------|-------------|

Section 1: Background Information

| | |
|-----------|---|
| 1. | <p>What is the proposal / issue?</p> <p>The proposal is to reduce the Food Safety budget by a total of £46k in 2017/18. This proposal will mean a reducing the number of Food Safety Officers from 5.81 to 4.81 (A reduction of 1 FTE).</p> <p>The Food Safety Officer Post in question is currently funded by the Public Health Grant but as this grant is being reduced the funding for this post will cease.</p> <p>The Food Safety Service is a statutory service that is audited by the Food Standards Agency. The proposal to reduce the number of Food Safety Officers will see a reduction in food safety inspections undertaken as well as a reduction in the frequency of inspections. This will mean that there will be an overall reduced ability to respond to food safety emergencies.</p> <p>Consequently there are other risks associated with this proposal, namely;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential intervention by the Food Standards Agency, - Potential reputational damage to the Council i.e. as a result of an outbreak of food borne infection which could have been prevented by an intervention from the council. <p>This proposal also means that there would be an overall lack of resilience in this service going forward.</p> <p>While there are risks associated with this proposal recent changes to the Food Standards Agency requirements may mitigate these reductions. It is also expected that the Food Standards Agency will report on a range of alternative delivery models which may assist local authorities in the delivery of services later in the year.</p> |
| 2. | <p>What is the current situation?</p> <p>The council's food safety service currently comprises 5.81FTE plus a principal officer (7 people).</p> <p>These members of staff undertake a variety of statutory duties specified in the</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Food Safety Act and approved codes of practice to protect public safety, health and welfare, food hygiene, food standards and investigation of infectious disease. |
| 3. | <p>What options have been considered?</p> <p>As one of the posts is funded by the Public Health Grant, then the reduction in funding will result in the loss of a post. There is no alternative means of funding this post currently as the council is unable to charge for the delivery of its statutory duties.</p> |
| 4. | <p>How does this proposal support the ambitions, principles and delivery of the Corporate Plan 2015-19?</p> <p>Ambitions: Prosperous and Healthy Torbay</p> <p>Principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use reducing resources to best effect • Reduce demand through prevention and innovation • Integrated and joined up approach <p>Targeted actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoting healthy lifestyles across Torbay • Ensuring Torbay remains an attractive and safe place to live and visit |
| 5. | <p>Who will be affected by this proposal and who do you need to consult with?</p> <p>The proposal has the potential to affect businesses and the wider community of Torbay as well as the Food Safety Team employed by the council.</p> |
| 6. | <p>How will you propose to consult?</p> <p>Consultation on this proposal will be undertaken as part of the general budget consultation. Questionnaires will be made available to members of the public online and in paper.</p> |
| Section 2: Expected Implications and Impact Assessment | |
| 7. | <p>What are the <u>expected</u> financial and legal implications?</p> <p>The Council is required to fulfil the requirements set out by the Food Standards Agency in respect of delivering its statutory duties under the Food Safety Act and associated Codes of Practice. As a result of the proposed reduction in funding from a post within the service will be lost. This reduction has the</p> |

| | <p>potential to limit the capacity of the team to fulfil a full range of services. It will also reduce the amount of public health and nutritional work which the team provides on behalf of the public health team.</p> <p>There are risks associated with the reduction of this service; however, recent changes to the Food Standards agency requirements may mitigate these reductions. It is also expected that the Food Standards Agency will provide a range of alternative measures to assist local authorities in the delivery of services later in the year.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|--------|---------|-----|-----|-------|----|-----|-------|-----------|----|------|--------------|------------|--|
| 8. | <p>What are the <u>expected</u> risks?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in the amount of food hygiene and food standards work undertaken • Risk of challenge from the Food Standards Agency should there be a substantial reduction in levels of intervention • Lack of resilience within the team and ability to keep pace with demand | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. | <p>Public Services Value (Social Value) Act 2012</p> <p>No impact</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. | <p>What evidence / data / research have you gathered in relation to this proposal?</p> <p>Staff consultation has been undertaken.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. | <p>What are key findings from the consultation you have carried out?</p> <p>Feedback from the general budget consultation regarding this proposal is shown below:</p> <p>Q20) Food Safety Interventions:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="563 1561 1189 1825"> <thead> <tr> <th>Do you support this proposal?</th> <th>Number</th> <th>Percent</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>169</td> <td>40.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No</td> <td>225</td> <td>54.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No answer</td> <td>23</td> <td>5.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>417</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Changes to the way the proposal will implemented were identified from the staff consultation.</p> | Do you support this proposal? | Number | Percent | Yes | 169 | 40.5% | No | 225 | 54.0% | No answer | 23 | 5.5% | Total | 417 | |
| Do you support this proposal? | Number | Percent | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 169 | 40.5% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No | 225 | 54.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No answer | 23 | 5.5% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 417 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | |
|------------|--|
| 12. | Amendments to Proposal / Mitigating Actions As a result of the staff consultation, there has been a change to the way in which the proposal will be implemented. Although there will be an overall reduction in officers undertaking dedicated food safety work, the skills of that individual will not be lost and the post will be redeployed elsewhere within the Community Safety Team. Further work will also be undertaken during 2017/18 to ensure that officers retain the essential skills which they need to be able to work across a number of disciplines. |
|------------|--|

Equality Impacts

| 13 | Identify the potential positive and negative impacts on specific groups | | |
|----|--|--------------------------------------|------------------------|
| | Positive Impact | Negative Impact & Mitigating Actions | Neutral Impact |
| | Older or younger people | | No differential impact |
| | People with caring Responsibilities | | No differential impact |
| | People with a disability | | No differential impact |
| | Women or men | | No differential impact |
| | People who are black or from a minority ethnic background (BME) <i>(Please note Gypsies / Roma are within this community)</i> | | No differential impact |
| | Religion or belief (including lack of belief) | | No differential impact |
| | People who are lesbian, gay or bisexual | | No differential impact |
| | People who are transgendered | | No differential impact |
| | People who are in a marriage or civil partnership | | No differential impact |
| | Women who are pregnant / on maternity leave | | No differential impact |
| | Socio-economic impacts (Including impact on child | | No differential impact |

| | | |
|----|---|------------------------|
| | poverty issues and deprivation) | |
| | Public Health impacts (How will your proposal impact on the general health of the population of Torbay) | No differential impact |
| 14 | Cumulative Impacts – Council wide (proposed changes elsewhere which might worsen the impacts identified above) | None identified |
| 15 | Cumulative Impacts – Other public services (proposed changes elsewhere which might worsen the impacts identified above) | None identified |