

(For Democratic Services use)

Decision Number: 10 (2016/17)

Portfolio Holder Executive Decision Statement

The Local Authority (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information)(England) Regulations 2012

Subject: ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PARTNERSHIP- CHARGING FOR FOOD HYGIENE RE-RATING INSPECTIONS

Details of Decision taken: I agree to:

- The Environmental Health's team participation in the Food Standards Agency pilot of charging businesses for a food hygiene re-rating inspection.
- That the fee for a food hygiene re-rating inspection be set at £200 (or as otherwise determined using FSA guidance) for the period of the Food Standards Agency pilot.
- That if the pilot is successful, and with the support of the Food Standards Agency, to continue charging on a cost recovery basis.

Reason for Decision

Reason for recommendation:

To recover valuable inspection resource that is currently lost to the team, as a result of the appeal process for the National Food Hygiene Rating Scheme. The benefit to a food business is that the 3 month waiting period that is usually implemented will be waived as part of the fee. The fee will be another incentive for businesses to obtain good food hygiene rating scores.

All Documents considered:

Committee Report for DTAC 1st November 2016
Correspondence from FSA

Details of any alternative options considered and rejected by the Member when making the Decision:

N/A


Financial implications

Fees will be charged on a cost recovery only basis. The invoices will be sent from the EH Partnership Hub and will be managed by Dartford Finance within the hub.

When completed a copy of this record must be sent to the Democratic Services Section by e-mail and a signed copy by internal mail

(For Democratic Services use)

Decision Number: 10 (2016/17)

Legal Implications and Risk Assessment Statement Details of this scheme have been reviewed by legal teams at Sevenoaks and Dartford councils. They are happy for us to proceed. Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011 gives local authorities the power to charge for a service which is not a statutory function.	
Equality Impacts The decisions recommended through this paper have a remote or low relevance to the substance of the Equality Act. There is no perceived impact on end users.	
Local Member (s), other Portfolio Holders and/or Directors/Heads of Service Consulted Richard Wilson Sheri Green (Dartford) Martin Goodman Duncan Milne (Dartford)	
Details of any conflicts of interest a) declared by any executive member who is consulted by the Decision Taker b) and any details of dispensations granted by the Chief Executive in respect of any declared conflict	
Decision taken by:	Portfolio Holder for [xxx] <i>Direct & Training Services</i>
Signed by Portfolio Holder	
Date of Decision	<i>2/9/16</i>
Record made by:	<i>R Wilson</i>
Date of record:	<i>2.9.16</i>

When completed a copy of this record must be sent to the Democratic Services Section by e-mail and a signed copy by internal mail