Dear Councillor

The next meeting of the HEALTH & HOUSING COMMITTEE is at 6.30pm on THURSDAY, 26 MAY 2016 at the TOWN HALL, CHURCH STREET, CLITHEROE.

I do hope you will be there.

Yours sincerely

CHIEF EXECUTIVE

To: Committee Members (Copy for information to all other members of the Council)
Directors
Press

AGENDA

Part I – items of business to be discussed in public

1. Apologies for absence.

✓ 2. To approve the minutes of the last meeting held on 31 March 2016 – copy enclosed.

3. Declarations of Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests (if any).

4. Public Participation (if any).

FOR DECISION

✓ 5. Appointment of Working Groups to confirm arrangements/membership of any working groups that belong to this Committee:

   a) Strategic Housing Working Group (4 Members plus Chairman of Planning and Development Committee);
   b) Health and Wellbeing Partnership (6 Members).


FOR INFORMATION


Part II - items of business not to be discussed in public

FOR INFORMATION


meeting date: 26 MAY 2016

RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL
REPORT TO HEALTH AND HOUSING COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No 6

meeting date: 26 MAY 2016

title: CAPITAL OUTTURN 2015/16

submitted by: DIRECTOR OF RESOURCES

principal author: ANDREW COOK

1 PURPOSE

1.1 The purpose of this report is to review the final outturn of the 2015/16 capital programme for Health and Housing Committee and to seek member approval for the slippage of some capital scheme budgets from the 2015/16 financial year to the 2016/17 financial year.

1.2 Relevance to the Council’s ambitions and priorities:
   - Community Objectives – none identified.
   - Corporate Priorities - to continue to be a well-managed council providing efficient services based on identified customer need.
   - Other Considerations – none identified.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The capital programme for this committee consisted of three schemes. These were a combination of:
   - two on-going housing capital grant schemes approved as part of the original capital programme in March 2015; and
   - one scheme approved in June 2015 by this committee - Installation of Cemetery Infrastructure additional work.

2.2 During the financial year this committee has received reports monitoring the progress of schemes within the programme.

2.3 As part of the closure of accounts process, capital programme expenditure has been capitalised and added to the balance sheet or charged to revenue where appropriate.

3 CAPITAL OUTTURN 2015/16

3.1 The table below summarises the overall financial position on the capital schemes for this committee. It shows budget approvals, approved slippage from 2014/15 and actual expenditure in-year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGET ANALYSIS</th>
<th>EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>REQUESTED SLIPPAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original Estimate 2015/16</td>
<td>236,000</td>
<td>244,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slippage from 2014/15</td>
<td>30,150</td>
<td>22,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Approvals in 2015/16</td>
<td>2,630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Approved Budget 2015/16</td>
<td>268,780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Estimate 2015/16</td>
<td>267,330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Expenditure 2015/16</td>
<td>267,330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Actual expenditure on the capital programme was £244,911, which is 91.6% of the revised estimate budget.

3.3 The Installation of Cemetery Infrastructure scheme was completed in-year and on budget.

3.4 The underspend in-year relates to the two on-going housing capital grant schemes – Disabled Facilities Grants (£14,093) and Landlord/Tenant Grants (£8,330). These two grant schemes continue in 2016/17 and slippage of the 2015/16 underspends on these schemes is requested.

3.5 Annex 1 shows the full capital programme budget and expenditure in-year for each scheme and highlights the requested slippage.

4 SLIPPAGE

4.1 Where capital schemes are unfinished at the end of the financial year and there is a corresponding remaining unspent budget to be moved into the next financial year, this is known as slippage. For this committee there are two schemes with slippage requested into 2016/17, as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Centre</th>
<th>Schemes</th>
<th>Slippage into 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISCP</td>
<td>Disabled Facilities Grants</td>
<td>14,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGR</td>
<td>Landlord/Tenant Grants</td>
<td>8,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Slippage for Health and Housing Committee</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,420</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Attached at Annex 2 are the individual requests for slippage forms. Committee is asked to consider these.

5 RISK ASSESSMENT

5.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- **Resources** – A sum of £22,420 has been set aside in the Council’s capital resources to fund the schemes with identified slippage.
- **Technical, Environmental and Legal** – None.
- **Political** – The Council is required to pass on ring-fenced funding received from central government. The Disabled Facilities Grants slippage of £14,090 falls within this area.
- **Reputation** – Those in need of financial assistance look to the Council for this assistance. The provision of it will help to improve the standard of living of the recipients which will enhance the reputation of the Council.
- **Equality and Diversity** – Equality and diversity issues are examined as part of the capital bid appraisal process.

6 CONCLUSION

6.1 Actual expenditure on the capital programme was £244,911, which is 91.6% of the revised estimate budget.
6.2 One of the three capital programme schemes was completed in-year. The other two schemes are on-going housing capital grants schemes. Total slippage of £22,420 from 2015/16 to 2016/17 is requested for these two schemes.

7 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE

7.1 Consider the requests for slippage shown at Annex 2 and approve the slippage of the budgets into the 2016/17 financial year for:

- Disabled Facilities Grants, £14,090.
- Landlord/Tenant Grants, £8,330.
### HEALTH AND HOUSING COMMITTEE

#### Capital Programme Outturn 2015/16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Centre</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Original Estimate 2015/16 £</th>
<th>Slippage from 2014/15 £</th>
<th>Additional Approvals in 2015/16 £</th>
<th>Total Approved Budget 2015/16 £</th>
<th>Revised Estimate 2015/16 £</th>
<th>Actual Expenditure 2015/16 £</th>
<th>Requested Slippage into 2016/17 £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISCP</td>
<td>Disabled Facilities Grants</td>
<td>161,000</td>
<td>11,150</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>172,050</td>
<td>172,050</td>
<td>157,957</td>
<td>14,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGR</td>
<td>Landlord/Tenant Grants</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>18,130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93,130</td>
<td>93,130</td>
<td>84,800</td>
<td>8,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMEXT</td>
<td>Installation of Cemetery Infrastructure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>2,730</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>2,154</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Health and Housing Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>236,000</td>
<td>30,150</td>
<td>2,630</td>
<td>268,780</td>
<td>267,330</td>
<td>244,911</td>
<td>22,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Centre and Scheme Title</td>
<td>DISCP: Disabled Facilities Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Description</td>
<td>Disabled Facilities Grants (DFGs) are a mandatory grant delivered by the Council to assist people with disabilities to be able to stay in their own home. The grant is administered in partnership with Social Services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Service</td>
<td>Colin Hirst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Originally Approved</td>
<td>2015/16 (Annual Scheme)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Estimate 2015/16 for the Scheme</td>
<td>£172,050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Expenditure in the Year 2015/16</td>
<td>£157,957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance - (Underspend) or Overspend</td>
<td>(£14,093)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide full reasons for the (under) or over spend variance shown above?

The total budget had been committed to Disabled Facilities Grants in 2015/16. At 31 March 2016 there were two schemes awaiting completion of work and three schemes awaiting either final tender quotes, occupational health sign off or technical sign off before being approved. These schemes will now be completed in 2016/17. In addition, there are fifteen further schemes on the waiting list at 31 March 2016.

Slippage Request

Please grant the amount of Budget Slippage from 2015/16 to 2016/17 requested.

£14,090

Please give detailed information on the reasons for any request for slippage. Please provide as much information as possible in order to allow the request to be fully considered. Attach any information that you feel may be relevant.

The underspent Disabled Facilities Grant budget is financed by ring-fenced funding from the Lancashire Better Care Fund, so any underspend from 2015/16 must be allocated to Disabled Facilities Grants in 2016/17. At 31 March 2016 there were two schemes awaiting completion of work and three schemes awaiting either final tender quotes, occupational health sign off or technical sign off before being approved. The budget to be slipped into 2016/17 will help fund the expenditure on these schemes.

By what date would the work or services related to any requested slippage be completed, if it were to be approved.

Within 2016/17
## Request for slippage into 2016/17

### Cost Centre and Scheme Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Centre and Scheme Title</th>
<th>LANGR: Landlord/Tenant Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Scheme Description

To offer grant aid for the renovation of private sector properties with the condition that the units are affordable on completion and the Council has nomination rights.

### Head of Service

Colin Hirst

### Year Originally Approved

2015/16 (Annual Scheme)

### Revised Estimate 2015/16 for the Scheme

£93,130

### Actual Expenditure in the Year 2015/16

£84,800

### Variance - (Underspend) or Overspend

(£8,330)

### Please provide full reasons for the (under) or over spend variance shown above?

The total 2015/16 budget had been committed but one approved grant was cancelled prior to year-end because the landlord applicant decided not to proceed with renovating the property identified.

### Slippage Request

| Please grant the amount of Budget Slippage from 2015/16 to 2016/17 requested. | £8,330 |
| Please give detailed information on the reasons for any request for slippage. Please provide as much information as possible in order to allow the request to be fully considered. Attach any information that you feel may be relevant. | The slippage will allow the Council to fund additional Landlord/Tenant Grants schemes in 2016/17. This will both increase affordable housing and the number of properties that the Council has nomination rights over in the borough. |
| By what date would the work or services related to any requested slippage be completed, if it were to be approved. | The slipped funding will be allocated to the first application approved in 2016/17. |
1 PURPOSE

1.1 To consider and approve the Ribble Valley Borough Council’s Food Hygiene Intervention Plan 2016/2017.

1.2 Relevance to the Council’s ambitions and priorities:

- Community Objectives – To promote and support health, environmental, economic and social well-being of people who live, work and visit the Ribble Valley.

- Corporate Priorities – To promote healthier environment and lifestyle.

- Other Considerations – This document meets the Food Standard Agency’s food law enforcement framework and requirement to produce an annual service plan complying with the national template.

1.3 The content of this document will be a principal constituent of any future Ribble Valley Borough Council Environmental Health Service Plan with the items contained within the action plan being incorporated accordingly.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 In October 2000, the Food Standards Agency published initial detailed guidance to local authorities entitled “A Framework Agreement on Local Authority Food Law Enforcement”. Subsequent guidance continues to require that local authorities produce a Food Hygiene Intervention Programme (Plan) relating to food law enforcement and set out how the local authority will meet their statutory obligations.

2.2 The latest revision of the Food Safety Act Code of Practice titled ‘Food Law Code of Practice (England)’ was released in April 2015. This guidance consolidates and updates previous food control guidance to reflect changes in National and European Union Food Directives and Regulations. Local Authorities are required to implement and operate in accordance with this guidance.

3 ISSUES

3.1 Attached as an Appendix to this report is a recently completed annual Food Hygiene Intervention Plan in relation to Ribble Valley Borough Council. I would draw your attention in particular to Section 7 which details performance figures for 2015-16.

The inspection figures for 2015-16 below were set against the following challenges:

- Unusually high number of inspections (503, usually 260) in the 2015-16 programme due to changes in the Code of Practice in 2014 which moved many inspections from the 2014-15 programme to the 2015-16 programme.

- An EHO (maternity cover) post was not filled for a proportion of the year.

- Senior EHO investigated a fatality at a Moto Cross event.
• Event safety work at the Royal Lancashire show involved involvement by three Enforcement Officers.
• There was a lengthy and complex Health and Safety investigation at a local hotel complex involving alleged electrocutions, exposure to asbestos and unsafe working procedures.
• An extended period (6 months) of absenteeism by the Environmental Health Manager.

In 2015/16:

• 202 service requests were recorded of which 195 (96.5%) were actioned within the target response time of 2 working days.
• 112 confirmed cases of infectious diseases were investigated in relation to food-born organisms.
• 131 food samples were submitted for microbiological examination. (This Authority had the third highest use of credits for sampling in the County.)
• 100% of the highest risk category of food businesses (A-C) including approved manufacturers where inspected. 95% of category D premises were inspected and 66% of the lowest risk premises were inspected. Out of a programme of 503 inspections, 439 were carried out. (87.3%)
• Premises which were found to be ‘broadly compliant’ remained roughly the same at 94%.
• The number of premises inspected, and the high level of compliance make it highly unlikely that this Authority will be selected for audit by the Food Standards Agency.

3.2 I am pleased to report again that we have received no complaints against the delivery of the service.

3.3 Three years ago on 1 June 2011, the National ‘Food Hygiene Rating Scheme’ was successfully introduced within the borough. The scheme has been well received and has been an undoubted success. The ratings for food premises in Ribble Valley continue to improve and are as follows, Risk Rating 5 being best:

Risk Rating  5: 592, 4: 89, 3: 25, 2: 7, 1; 9 and 0: 1

The above represents 94% of the borough’s food premises being ‘broadly compliant’.

Effort and resource will continue to be focused on the lowest 3 categories with the purpose to raise these premises to achieve at least ‘broad compliance’ and a rating of at least 3. Poor performing premises will be reviewed by Officers at their monthly section meeting and targeted for enhanced attention, and possibly enforcement action.

3.4 As part of the food service ‘quality control’, as part of a Lancashire initiative, an inter authority audit was undertaken by food officers from a neighbouring Council. The audit was generally successful and reassuring with only relatively minor issues being identified; these issues being subsequently addressed.

3.5 A copy of the Food Hygiene Intervention Programme will also be placed on the Ribble Valley Borough Council website for reference purposes in the ‘Environmental Health’ section.

3.6 It is believed appropriate for the programme to be submitted to the Health and Housing Committee for approval to ensure local transparency and accountability.
4 RISK ASSESSMENT

4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- **Resources** – There are no immediate implications but Committee is asked to recognise the ongoing demands on the service.

- **Technical, Environmental and Legal** – There are no environmental or legal implications. Failure to provide this document contravenes Food Standards Agency requirements and could result in an audit of the service. This is also an essential performance management and review document.

- **Political** – This document confirms the Council’s intended service provision in relation to this important statutory function.

- **Reputation** – This document meets this Council’s obligations in relation to producing an obligatory annual Food Safety Service Plan in accordance with national framework.

- **Equality & Diversity** – N/A.

5 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE

5.1 Approve the Ribble Valley Borough Council Food Hygiene Intervention Plan 2016/17 for implementation in the current financial year.

5.2 Note the satisfactory performance for the year 2015-16.

5.3 Reconfirm the continuing priority of food premises inspection for Environmental Health service provision.

HEATHER COAR MARSHAL SCOTT
HEAD OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICES CHIEF EXECUTIVE
For further information please ask for Heather Coar, extension 4466.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

1. Framework Agreement on Local Authority Food Law Enforcement - July 2004
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1.0 Service Aims and Objectives

1.1 Aims and Objectives

**Service Aims**
- To respond promptly and courteously.
- Be accessible, open and fair.
- Be professional & proportionate
- Provide quality services.

**Service Objectives**
- Ensure the safe and hygienic production, storage, distribution and sale of food and drink through the enforcement of legislation, the provision of advice and information to consumers and the operators of food businesses and the co-ordination of training to food businesses and other employees by:

- undertaking an annual programme of food hygiene inspections and enforcement in accordance with statutory requirements, relevant Codes of Practice and guidance;
- supporting the annual inspection programme with an annual microbiological food sampling programme;
- investigating complaints within service standards and to take appropriate action in accordance with relevant Codes of Practice and Guidance;
- acting as “home authority” to any food businesses originating with the borough of Ribble Valley and to carry out home authority enquiries referred by other agencies; and
- complementing the annual inspection programme with targeted promotional advice and educational initiatives together with providing information and advice on food safety to food businesses and consumers.
1.2 Context - The Council’s Vision

Council’s vision developed with the Ribble Valley Strategic Partnership states that: “Ribble Valley will be an area with an exceptional environment and quality of life for all; sustained by vital and vibrant market towns and villages acting as thriving service centres meeting the needs of residents, business and visitors.”

The Council’s overarching corporate priority is ‘to ensure a well-managed Council providing efficient services based on identified customer needs’.

Environmental Health activity is driven by 3 of the 4 Council’s ambitions, namely:

- To ensure a well-managed Council providing efficient services based on identified customer needs’.
- To help make people’s lives safer and healthier;
- To protect and enhance the existing environmental quality of our area.

From these ambitions, the Council’s Corporate Strategy has identified a number of objectives to be delivered through the Council’s supporting Action Plan.

There are also other corporate documents that influence service delivery including the Sustainable Community Strategy, the Community Safety Plan, Data Quality Policy, Equality Framework for Local Govt., Customer Care Policy, Consultation Strategy and Citizens Charter.

Along with these key corporate documents, it is important that the services are delivered in a manner that not only protects but provides satisfaction to the public. Therefore it is an integral element of all the services delivered that they are done so efficiently and effectively, by appropriately qualified and experienced staff.

As a frontline council service, environmental health services commit to treat all customers fairly, with respect and professionalism regardless of gender, race, nationality or ethnicity, age, religion or belief, disability or sexual orientation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY OBJECTIVES AND POLICY STATEMENTS</th>
<th>Specific Food Safety Ambitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Links to Sustainable Community Strategy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Service Committee Policies - Health &amp; Housing Committee:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To improve the health of people living and working in our area</td>
<td>➢ To protect and where possible improve the environment and the general public health of the community, by taking all reasonable measures available;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ To ensure that all premises where food is manufactured or sold comply with the public health legal requirements; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ To ensure that all other eligible organisations and establishments comply with the relevant public health requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ the Council is committed to providing technical support to new and existing food businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To encourage economic activity to increase business and employment opportunities</td>
<td>➢ Support &amp; complement the National Food Standards Agency reduction targets to reduce gastroenteritis in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To encourage the adoption of healthy lifestyles in the local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To support the regeneration of Market Towns as sustainable service centres</td>
<td>• Health Prevention Strategy:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ To promote public awareness and understanding of the importance of good food hygiene through appropriate media channels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promote local produce and local employment opportunities and promote and support the development of the Ribble Valley Food Trail</td>
<td>➢ To investigate infectious diseases and outbreaks and prevent the further transmission in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Health Prevention Strategy:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ e.Government:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ to develop greater provision of information and service through this media in line with Corporate Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To support the priority outcomes of the Strategic Health Improvement Group within the Ribble Valley Local Strategic Partnership (LSP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To seek continuous improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To treat everyone equally and ensure access to services is available to all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.3 Links to annual ‘Corporate Strategy’

The Council produces an annual Corporate Strategy. This strategy contains key summary service information, performance information and includes key actions for the forthcoming year. It is anticipated that this year’s Corporate Strategy will not contain anything specific in relation to Food Safety.

#### 1.3.1 Service development history

As part of the recommended food enforcement ‘quality control’ measures and as part of an adopted Lancashire authority initiative, a periodic inter authority audit is undertaken of our food enforcement systems by food officers from a neighbouring Council. I am pleased to report that this audit has been generally successful and reassuring with only relatively minor issues being identified. These issues being subsequently addressed.

Detailed individual Service Plans for Food Safety and Health and Safety are prepared on an annual basis. A General Environmental Health Service plan is proposed to cover the other functions carried out by this team.

These plans will complement the corporate vision, values and objectives set out in the Council’s Corporate Strategy.
### 2.0 Background

#### 2.1 Profile of the Local Authority

Ribble Valley Borough is situated in North East Lancashire, and with an area of 226 sq miles is the largest geographical district in the County. The Borough Council is one of 12 District Councils, 1 County Council and 2 Unitary Authorities within the County of Lancashire. Within the borough, some functions relating to food safety are the responsibility of Lancashire County Council eg Trading Standards and Food Standards Inspections.

Over 70% of the borough is in the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, a clear reflection of the landscape quality of the area.

The borough has a population of approx. 58,091 (2014), with Clitheroe, the main administrative centre having 15,000 inhabitants. Clitheroe lies at the heart of the borough, whilst Longridge, the other main town, lies in the West. Longridge has a population of 7,724. The remainder of the area is mainly rural with a number of villages ranging in size from large villages such as Whalley, Sabden and Chatburn through to small hamlets such as Great Mitton and Paythorne.

The borough has a mixed economy, with good employment opportunities and a consistently low rate of unemployment. Given the rural nature of the area it is not surprising that agriculture is a primary employer through the District. Large manufacturing activity is represented by major national and multi-national companies such as Hanson Cement, Tarmac, Johnson Matthey, Ultraframe, 3M, and British Aerospace Systems.

The Ribble Valley has excellent communications which open up the area to the rest of the country. The A59 trunk road, a main artery from the west coast through to the east, dissects the borough, and links to the M6. Main line rail services are available from Preston, which is only 40 minutes from Clitheroe. In addition, Manchester Airport is only 50 minutes away from Clitheroe and provides links to over 200 destinations worldwide.

#### POLITICAL MAKE-UP OF THE BOROUGH

- 40 Local District Councillors
- 33 Parish Councils (and 7 Parish Meetings)
- 2 Town Councils
- 1 Member of Parliament
2. SERVICE STRUCTURE

2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICE STRUCTURE

HEATHER COAR
Head of Environmental Health Services

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

JUDITH PALIGA
Cemetery & Grounds
Maintenance Officer

ROBERT WATSON
P/T Market Officer

CHRIS SHUTTLEWORTH
Emergency Planning (P/T)
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Clerical Officer
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JULIE WHITWELL (P/T)
KEN ROBINSON (P/T)
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VACANT
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MATTHEW RIDING
Environmental Health Officer (Housing)

ADELETE GERAGHTY (P/T)
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HEALTH/FOOD INTERVENTION PLAN
### Political Arrangements

Food Safety falls under the terms of reference of the Health & Housing Committee. The Food Hygiene Intervention Plan is presented to the Council’s Health & Housing Committee for approval and adoption.

### Provision for Specialist Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Analytical Services</td>
<td>Lancashire County Scientific Laboratory (Public Analyst Services), Preston plus specialist service providers as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Examiner</td>
<td>Food, Water &amp; Environmental Microbiology Laboratory, East Lancashire NHS Clinical Commissioning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Authority</td>
<td>CHP/DPH – Dr Nicola Schinaia, Director of Public Health, Public Health England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Sector Enforcement</td>
<td>Local Government Regulation (LGR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.3 The Scope of the Environmental Health Section’s Food Service

As a Borough Council the Authority is responsible for the full range of food hygiene duties under Regulation(EC) 178/2002 and The General Food Regulations 2004.

Food Standards and Animal Feed Products are the responsibility of the Lancashire County Council Trading Standards Division.

Within the Chief Executives Department, the Environmental Health Section also delivers the following services alongside food safety.

- Health & Safety/ Smokefree Workplace
- Local Authority Air Pollution Control (LAAPC/ IPPC)
- Air Quality Control & Review
- Investigation of Nuisance Complaints
- Management of Clitheroe Market
- Management of Clitheroe Cemetery
- Infectious Disease Notifications
- Pest Control & Dog Warden Service
- Housing Standards
- Animal Welfare Licensing
- Emergency Planning
- Building Control

### 2.4 Service Delivery Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive’s Department</td>
<td>(01200) 425111 (switchboard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Walk</td>
<td>(01200) 414446 (direct)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:environmental.health@ribblevalley.gov.uk">environmental.health@ribblevalley.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>Web Site: <a href="http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk">www.ribblevalley.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opening Hours: 08.45 – 17.00 Monday – Friday

Out of Hours: 01200 444448
2.5 Demands on the Environmental Health Section

There are ever increasing service demands on the environmental health team in relation to the issue of delivering health and safety enforcement including event safety, the cleaner environment agenda, animal welfare, nuisance complaints, housing standards enforcement, private water supply regulation, industrial air quality regulation, public health, emergency planning, safe & green building construction and generally protecting the public health of the local community.

In relation to Food Safety, the area contains a mix of manufacturing, retail and catering premises. Catering and retail are the dominant sectors within this mix. The businesses are predominantly small to medium sized establishments.

The borough has a normal cross-section of food businesses but has a significant and much higher than average number of ‘approved’ premises, the majority being on-farm dairies, which are by their nature relatively high risk, complex and resource intensive. The Food Standards Agency ‘Approved Premises’ Audit undertaken in January 2015 identified this as a material factor that needs to be emphasised and recognised in relation to ensuring sufficient regulatory resource.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Premises (as at 01/04/2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of Food Premises (Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories A-B (High Risk &amp; Approved premises)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories C-E (Others)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrated (excluding approved premises)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughterhouses (seasonal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturers/Packers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importers/Exporters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants and other caterers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing Non Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Approved’ Premises *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises where the Section acts as “Primary Authority”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External factors impacting on service delivery:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(* included in the figures above )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6 Enforcement Policies
Corporate adoption of the Enforcement Concordat – 2000
Food Safety Enforcement Policy (Revised January 2011)
General Environmental Health Enforcement Policy (Revised June 2005)

3.0 Service Delivery
3.1 Food Premises Inspections

It is Ribble Valley Borough Council’s policy to carry out programmed inspections in accordance with both the minimum inspection frequencies specified in the Food Standards Agency ‘Food Law’ Code of Practice (England) (April 2015) and as stipulated in Food Law Practice Guidance (England) [October 2015].

Premise Profile:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Programmed Number of Inspections Required During the Year (01/04/16 – 31/03/17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category A</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category B</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category C</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category D</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category E</td>
<td>143 #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Rated/Overdue</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Approved’ Premises (* included in above)  
*19

218 to visit

# 143 Cat ‘E’ premises to be dealt with by Alternative Inspection Strategy

Estimated number of revisits:

Estimated number of officer hours for these visits (including management and administration):

Local areas of targeted inspection:

**Approved Premises** - On-Farm Dairies and Milk Products Plants (15)  
**Approved Premises** - Meat Product Plants (4)  
Estimated number of Officer hours for these targeted visits: (150)
### Local Performance Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% High Risk food premises inspection carried out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% Other food premises inspections carried out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.2 Food Complaints/Service requests

It is the policy of Ribble Valley Borough Council to give a first response within 2 working days to all food and food premises complaints/service requests. The 2015/16 performance target was to respond to 90% within 48 hours. In 2014/15, we actually responded to 96.3% of 202 food related service requests within 48 hours.

- Estimated number of food complaints/service requests: 264 (Average over 5 years)
- Estimated number of Officer hours: 400

#### 3.3 Home Authority Principle

Ribble Valley Borough Council subscribes to the current Better Regulation Delivery Office (BRDO) Primary Authority Principle. The Authority has not been approached by any local company likely to be within the remit of a Primary Authority arrangement.

- Estimated resources spent on Primary Authority Work: 0

#### 3.4 Advice to Business

The Authority has a policy of offering advice to any business which has trading premises within our area.

- Planning/Building Control consultation responses, licensing enquiries and property searches: 100 (approx.)
- Approximate officer hours: 125
- Estimated number of advisory visits: 30
- Approximate number of Officer hours: 45
- Approximate number of food related enquiries involving significant work: 25
- Approximated number of Officer hours on general customer advice: 50

**Total:** 275
### 3.5 Food Sampling and Inspection

The general policy of Ribble Valley Borough Council is to sample food and drink, supplied, produced and sold within the borough, in accordance with a planned sampling programme, to assess its safety and quality and where necessary, in response to food complaints/investigations. Where resources allow samples will be taken as part of national or regional surveys.

| Estimated number of Officer hours to be devoted to food sampling and inspection: | 175 |
| Estimated number of complaint samples which will be submitted for examination/analysis: | 0 |
| Estimated number of surrender visits: | 0 |
| Estimated number of hours on surrender visits: | 0 |

All formal food samples are submitted to The Lancashire County Public Analyst for compositional analysis or to Food Water and Environmental Microbiology Service, for microbiological examination.

### 3.6 Control of Investigation of Outbreaks and Food Related Infectious Disease

Average number of notifications of gastrointestinal disease: 100

Average number of outbreaks: 5

| Estimated number of Officer hours to be devoted to food related infectious disease investigation and control: (total outbreak investigation estimated 200 Hours) | 300 |

### 3.7 Food Safety Incidents

It is the policy of Ribble Valley Borough Council to comply with Food Standards Agency Food Law Code of Practice (issued April 2015) and the associated Food Law Practice Guidance (issued October 2015) in relation to the handling of Food Hazard Warnings and Food Safety Incidents.

Estimated number of Food Hazard Warnings: 50

| Estimated number of Officer hours to be devoted to the handling of Food Hazard Warnings: | 10 |

### 3.8 Liaison with other Organisations

The Authority participates in the following liaison groups related to food safety issues in order to ensure that enforcement action taken within the Borough of Ribble Valley is consistent with those of neighbouring local authorities:

- Lancashire Chief Environmental Health Officers 6
- Food Officer Sub-Group (FOG) 24
- FOG/Public Health Laboratory Service Liaison Group 0
- East Lancashire Microbiological Forum 9
- United Utilities (North West Water) Liaison Meeting 5

| Estimated number of Officer hours devoted to liaison activities: | 44 |
### 3.9 Food Safety Promotion

The Authority will seek to be involved in promotional/training activities in relation to food safety:

- 2016 Food Safety Week – ‘reducing waste in the food industry’
- Food Hygiene Courses directed to & normally undertaken by local training colleges

_Estimated number of Officer hours devoted to Health Promotion_

| 20 |

### 3.10 Food Safety Training for Officers

It is Required under the current Food Law Code of Practice, that Enforcement Officers achieve a minimum of 20 hours of training per officer each year. 10 hours must be on Food safety topics. The remaining 10 hours can be on general enforcement skills. Training is provided to address needs identified within the officer annual appraisal system and Regulator Development Needs Assessments (RDNA).

| 80 |

### 3.11 Food Safety Management

_Estimated number of hours on Food Safety Management and administration_

| 200 |

### 3.12 Total estimated officer hours required to deliver Food Safety function:

| 3195 (1.9 FTE) |

### 4.0 Resources

#### 4.1 Financial Allocation

The Food Safety Service financial costs are contained within the main “Environmental Health Services” cost centre. This cost also contains the majority of costs relating to the provision of the Environmental Health Service eg Health & Safety, LAAPC, Complaint Service requests, animal welfare etc.

The individual service costs have been partially disaggregated. This has been established by the periodic use of time allocation exercise to determine average Officer time spent undertaking each function.

A breakdown of the Officer time estimated and used to calculate the service costs is contained within the Best Value ‘Year One’ Review which were based on calculated service costs used for CIPFA purposes.

The overall expenditure for the Environmental Health Service cost centre over the previous year and forward budget for 2016/17 is as follows. These figures also include income and expenditure related to Enforcement and capital finance costs.
### Environmental Health Section

#### Food Hygiene Intervention Plan 2016/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Health</th>
<th>2015/16 Actual</th>
<th>2016/17 Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Expenditure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises Expenditure</td>
<td>16,451</td>
<td>18,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Related</td>
<td>2,808</td>
<td>4,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Services</td>
<td>18,958</td>
<td>21,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party Payments</td>
<td>4,090</td>
<td>5,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Services</td>
<td>364,250</td>
<td>383,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Financing</td>
<td>4,270</td>
<td>4,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Grants &amp; Reimbursements</td>
<td>-895</td>
<td>-1,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer &amp; Client Receipts</td>
<td>-45,281</td>
<td>-39,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET SERVICE COSTS</strong></td>
<td>364,658</td>
<td>396,530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Food Safety/ID Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Safety/ID Costs</th>
<th>2015/16 Actual</th>
<th>2016/17 Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Services</td>
<td>1,479</td>
<td>1,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Services</td>
<td>60,054</td>
<td>61,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Financing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>61,533</td>
<td>63,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET SERVICE COSTS</strong></td>
<td>61,533</td>
<td>63,272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2 Staffing Allocation

The Environmental Health Section is responsible for the delivery of a range of services in addition to food safety, namely:

- Nuisance Complaint Investigation (commercial & residential);
- Local Authority Air Pollution Control (LAAPC);
- Air Quality Assessment and Monitoring;
- Health and Safety Regulation and the licensing of tattooists, body piercing and acupuncture;
- Infectious Disease Control;
- Animal Welfare Licensing;
- Pest Control and Dog Warden Service.
- Housing standards
- Caravan Sites
- Private Water Supplies
- Environmental – litter, fly tipping
The total resources currently available within the section for the above is: 7.2 (FTE)
This is made up of:
- Enforcement Officers 5.5 (FTE)
- Administrative Support 1
- Environmental Health Manager 0.7 (FTE)

of the above, the resource to deliver the food safety service is: 1.90 (FTE)

of which:
- Qualified to inspect Cat. A – B premises: 1.90 (FTE)
- Qualified to inspect Cat C – E: as above

For the year 2016/17, the food service should be deliverable within existing resource. Within Environmental Health, priority continues to be given to completing the sampling and risk assessment of private water supplies to meet the extended 31 December 2014 Drinking Water Inspectorate national deadline.

The Food Standards Agency ‘Approved Premises’ Audit undertaken in January 2015 identified that Ribble Valley has a much greater than average number of approved premises for which they are responsible to regulate and because of the important nature of this responsibility, the Council is asked to ensure sufficient competent regulatory resource is allocated and maintained.

As in previous years, there is ongoing work in relation to the National Food Hygiene Rating Scheme. In line with national guidance, priority will be given to food premises not achieving a ‘broadly compliant’ rating of 3 with the aim of achieving a 100% with a rating of 3 and above.

If during the year it becomes apparent that the service is unable to complete the intended inspection programme, priorities in all areas of work will be reassessed and resources will be allocated to the food service on ‘risk based’ principles with priority being given to the regulation and inspection of “high risk” (Category A - C) and ‘approved’ premises. It is unlikely that this year’s relatively conservative programme will not be achieved.

Members will be informed of any such re-allocation.
### Analysis of Present Position

**5.0** Analysis of Present Position

**5.1** Set out below is the standard SWOT analysis of the Environmental Health Food Safety service:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strengths</strong></th>
<th><strong>Weaknesses</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Well-developed strategies and policies for the service in line with national guidance.  
- Service well aligned with corporate strategy/policy.  
- Well established performance monitoring procedures.  
- Experienced, professional and dedicated staff.  
- Low staff turnover.  
- Clear commitment to quality service delivery.  
- General achievement of Food Safety Act Code of Practice inspection annually.  
- Introduced National Food Hygiene Rating Scheme in 2011  
- Relatively high rate of compliance in the Borough. | - Minimal resources (always firefighting).  
- Proactive work at risk in event of public health emergency/reactive work demands i.e serious accidents/fatalities, outbreaks etc.  
- Potential remuneration problem in event of vacancies.  
- Increasing complexity of regulation and enforcement - requirement to specialise to achieve & maintain competency.  
- Diminishing pool of officers nationally.  
- Lack of capacity to contribute meaningfully to wider public health agenda - Public Health England. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Opportunities</strong></th>
<th><strong>Threats</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Multi-skilled public health professionals.  
- Need to develop proactive public health agenda with other partners - eg healthy eating, smoking cessation, alcohol interventions etc. (although the Healthy Lifestyle section at this Authority do fulfil this role in many respects.)  
- Facilitate local food safety training needs.  
- Develop new targeted ‘intervention’ approach to enforcement  
- Work with other agencies to develop multi-agency lead inspector approach. | - Increasing complexity of issues - increasing pressure for greater specialism to meet competence criteria.  
- Food safety service audit by Food Standards Agency if fail to meet targets and deliver mandatory duties.  
- Increased information gathering and recording - increasing inspection costs.  
- Shortage of EHO’s entering profession.  
- Pressures to PCT/Public Health Network to concentrate resources on health care service delivery rather than prevention partnerships.  
- Ever increasing duties and demands in relation to private water supplies, clean environment, industrial air pollution regulation and dog control and capacity to achieve. |
6.0 Quality Systems

It is our policy to carry out all areas of food service delivery in accordance with our Food Safety documented procedures and to fulfil any inter authority audit requirements as required with neighbouring authorities.

7.0 Review

7.1 Periodic review

This Food Hygiene Intervention Plan will be reviewed annually and reported to members. The review will link into the annual budgetary process and the review of associated plans. Performance monitored on monthly basis and quarterly by management review of progress.

7.2 Annual Performance

The figures below were set against the following challenges:

- Unusually high number of inspections (503, usually 260) in the 2015-16 programme due to changes in the Code of Practice in 2014 which moved many inspections from the 2014-15 programme to the 2015-16 programme.
- An EHO (maternity cover) post was not filled for a proportion of the year.
- Senior EHO investigated a fatality at a Moto Cross event.
- Event safety work at the Royal Lancashire show involved involvement by three Enforcement Officers.
- There was a lengthy and complexed Health and Safety investigation at a local hotel complex involving alleged electrocutions, exposure to asbestos and unsafe working procedures.
- An extended period (6 months) of absenteeism by the Environmental Heath Manager.

In 2015/16:

- 202 service requests were recorded of which 195 (96.5%) were actioned within the target response time of 2 working days.
- 112 confirmed cases of infectious diseases were investigated in relation to food-born organisms
- 131 food samples were submitted for microbiological examination (This Authority had the third highest use of credits for sampling in the County)
- 100% of the highest risk category of food businesses (A-C) including approved manufacturers where inspected. 95% of category D premises were inspected and 66% of the lowest risk premises were inspected. Out of a programme of 503 inspections, 439...
were carried out. (87.3%).

- Premises which were found to be ‘broadly compliant’ remained roughly the same at 94%.
- The number of premises inspected, and the high level of compliance make it highly unlikely that this Authority will be selected for audit by the Food Standards Agency.

7.3 Compliance with Local Performance Indicator

In addition to the service performance statistics listed in paragraph 7.3 above:

- Enforcement of food safety legislation has been implemented in accordance with the Ribble Valley ‘Food Safety’ Enforcement Policy (Rev. January 2011) and associated standard procedures.
- In the year 2015/16, there have been no complaints received about the Food Safety enforcement activity.

7.4 Identification of significant variance from Service Plan

- To be monitored quarterly and any significant variation from the plan to be reported promptly to the Health & Housing Committee.

7.5 Service Improvement

7.5 (i) The following areas of service development were identified for 2016/17:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate Objective</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Method of Measurement</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Responsible Officer</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Links</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To focus EH resources to achieve FSA inspection targets</td>
<td>To undertake 100% of programmed audit/inspection of food premises</td>
<td>Food Standards Agency ‘Statutory Food Law Code of Practice’ (April 2015)</td>
<td>No of inspections/audits completed</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>Senior EHO (Food/Health and Safety) and EHT’s</td>
<td>Employ consultants if necessary</td>
<td>LPI</td>
<td>100% achieved by 31/3/17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To meet mandatory government guidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate Objective</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Method of Measurement</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Responsible Officer</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Links</th>
<th>Achieved by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To focus EH resources to achieve FSA inspection targets</td>
<td>To undertake 100% of programmed audit/inspection of food premises</td>
<td>Food Standards Agency ‘Statutory Food Law’ Code of Practice (April 2015).</td>
<td>No of inspections/audits completed</td>
<td>218+ 143 by alternative inspection</td>
<td>Senior EHO (Food/Health and Safety)</td>
<td>Employ consultants if necessary</td>
<td>LPI</td>
<td>31/3/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To meet mandatory government guidance</td>
<td>To review Food Safety procedures and update to comply with Food Standards Agency ‘Food Law’ Code of Practice (April 2015).</td>
<td>Standard Procedures reviewed and standard documents updated</td>
<td>Review by 31.3.16</td>
<td>Senior EHO (Food/Health and Safety)</td>
<td>Within existing</td>
<td>FSA</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.5 (ii) Action Plan for the next 12 months:

Legend:
- FSA – Food Standards Agency
- LPI – Local Performance indicator
Sampling Policy 2016/2017

1. Introduction

1.1 Ribble Valley Borough Council recognises the important contribution that food sampling makes to the protection of Public Health and the Food Law Enforcement functions of the Authority.

1.2 Food Safety Officers from the Environmental Health Section will be responsible for undertaking the food sampling functions of the Council.

1.3 Consideration will be given to food sampling in the following specific situations:

- National, Regional and Locally co-ordinated surveys/programmes;
- complaints;
- process monitoring;
- inspections;
- Home Authority Principal activities;
- special investigations;
- imported foods.

2. Food Sampling Surveys/Programmes

2.1 Ribble Valley Borough Council will make provision to co-operate and, where possible, participate in all food sampling surveys. However, some surveys may involve foods or food premises which are either in short supply or not available in the Ribble Valley, in which case a reduced number of samples or no samples will be submitted to the laboratory.

2.2 National Surveys

2.2.1 National surveys may be organised through the Food Standards Agency as part of the EC co-ordinated sampling programme.

2.2.2 Local Authority Regulation (LGR) and the Food Water and Environmental Microbiology Services (FWEMS), also arrange National Surveys each year.

2.3 Regional Sampling Programme

2.3.1 A Survey Sub-Committee comprising of officers from the FWEMS, the Lancashire Food Officer Group and the Greater Manchester Food Liaison Group are responsible for drawing up and distributing a sampling programme every four months. This programme determines the number of samples required and the sampling frequency.

2.4 Local Sampling Programmes

2.4.1 Food sampling will be carried out at Approved premises at the officer’s discretion. A local survey may be generated following a food poisoning incident, as a follow-up survey following a local sampling initiative, or where Enforcement Officers Determine a need for sampling as a verification check.
3. **Food Complaints**

3.1 Samples of food received as a food complaint may require microbiological examination or chemical analysis. The FWEMS Laboratory will undertake all microbiological examinations and the County Analyst at the County Laboratory in Preston, is used for any samples which require chemical analysis.

3.2 All food complaints are taken seriously and the results of an examination or analysis may generate the need for more controlled sampling of the food product or from the food premises.

3.3 Consideration will be given to the sampling of locally produced products, in particular dairy, and meat products manufactured in approved premises.

4. **Inspections**

5.1 Food sampling will not normally be undertaken as a constituent part of food safety inspections. However, it will be left to the inspecting officer’s discretion whether samples are taken for monitoring purposes following any inspection.

6. **Primary Authority Responsibilities**

6.1 There have been no requests from any food businesses within the borough for ‘Primary Authority’ agreements. The Authority does, however, act as Originating Authority for some food businesses.

6.2 There is no intention to take routine food samples from any food businesses for which this Authority acts as Originating Authority.

7. **Special Investigations**

7.1 Special circumstances may arise during a year, which will require samples to be taken. These samples will most likely be generated during the investigation of food poisoning incidents. Samples may include environmental samples in addition to food samples.

8. **Imported Foods**

8.1 At present there are no companies or businesses in the Ribble Valley Borough area, which regularly receive imported foods directly upon importation into the UK. Therefore, no routine sampling of imported foods at wholesalers will be undertaken. However, consideration will be given to the directed sampling of imported foods wherever possible, with the targeting of ‘high risk’ animal and non-animal origin imported foods noted during routine inspections or found on display by major retailers.

If, however, circumstances change this Policy will be reviewed in the light of future developments.
1. Introduction

1.1 Ribble Valley Borough Council recognises the important contribution that food sampling makes to the protection of Public Health and the Food Law Enforcement functions of the Authority.

1.2 In developing a sampling programme consideration is given to:

- protecting the consumer through the enforcement of food legislation;
- identifying foods that pose a hazard to the consumer because they contain significant levels of pathogenic bacteria;
- surveillance and sampling of imported foods of animal and non-animal origin, particular attention will be given to products of non-animal origin due to lower sampling levels at point of import;
- assessing the microbiological quality of food manufactured, distributed or retailed in the area against the standards detailed in Regulation (EC) 2073/2005;
- helping determine whether advice or enforcement action would be appropriate where it is suspected that poor practices and procedures exist;
- offering advice and guidance, if appropriate, on food hygiene matters.

2. Scope of Sampling

2.1 Ribble Valley Borough Council is a Shire District Council and, therefore, does not have any responsibility for Food Standards issues such as food composition or labelling, (which usually require analysis of the samples). These matters are the responsibility of the County Council through the Trading Standards Department. Therefore, this Sampling Programme will relate solely to food sampling for microbiological examination.

2.2 Previously, in accordance with the revised Food Standards Agency ‘Food Law’ Code of Practice (revised April 2015), the Sampling Programme has been prepared in consultation with colleagues from the Lancashire Food Officer Group and the Greater Manchester Food Liaison Group along with the Food Examiner from the Food, Water, and Environmental Services (FWEMS) Laboratory Preston.

In the past few years however whilst resources have been deployed to other Environmental Health priorities, a decision was made to only take samples as determined necessary during inspections especially of ‘high risk’ food manufacturers, or as verification checks on new manufacturers.
2.3 The Council engages the services of the FWEMS Laboratory to undertake all microbiological examinations.

2.4 The County Analyst, based at the County Laboratory in Preston, is used for any foods or water which require analysis. These samples are usually related to the investigation of food complaints and, therefore, they will not form part of the annual sampling programme.

2.5 Advice will be sought from the FWEMS Laboratory regarding the size/quantity of the food sample required for examination.

3. **Funding**

3.1 At present, funding for the examination of routine food samples is borne by the FWEMS Laboratory based on a ‘credit allocation system’ which is calculated on the size of each Authority. However, as the Sampling Programme is agreed jointly by two Food Officer Groups, there is the flexibility to share out unused/surplus credits, by agreement, between Authorities if insufficient credits are available for a particular survey.

3.2 Sampling credits are levied for each type of food or examination undertaken. The FWEMS Laboratory maintains the register of credits and a report is issued to each Authority on a quarterly basis.

3.3 Some examinations are classed by the FWEMS Laboratory as ‘new work’ and do not have a credit value allocated to them. Payment for the examination of these samples, along with any fees for analysis of complaint samples, will be made by Ribble Valley Borough Council from the environmental health service sampling budget.

4. **Sampling Programme**

4.1 Food sampling will be carried out as and when deemed necessary by the Enforcement Officers and particular attention will be made to sampling from approved premises and premises producing high risk foods, as part of official control visits.

4.2 The Sampling Programme shall consist of the food sample surveys recommended by the Survey Sub-Committee and agreed by the Lancashire Food Office Group where possible.

4.3 At the end of each sample survey the FWEMS Laboratory shall collate the results and produce a summary of the survey. This summary shall be presented to the next meeting of the Food Liaison Group.
1 PURPOSE

1.1 To consider and approve the introduction of new charges for immigration inspections.

1.2 Relevance to the Council’s ambitions and priorities:

- Community Objectives – To help make people’s lives safer and healthier and to support health, environmental, economic and social wellbeing of people who live, work and visit the Ribble Valley.

- Corporate Priorities – To enable the delivery of effective and efficient services.

- Other Considerations – None.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The Environmental Health Section carried out 4 inspections of houses for immigration purposes last year. This financial year no inspections have been carried out so far.

2.2 Immigration inspections are a discretionary service. The requests for the service have tended to increase year on year creating demand on officers’ time. It is therefore proposed that a charge for this service be introduced to cover this time.

3 ISSUES

3.1 Immigration inspections are carried out on behalf of residents of Ribble Valley applying for family members to come and live with them from abroad. The inspection is required to confirm that the property will not be overcrowded with the additional resident(s) and that the property is in a condition fit to live in. This is a discretionary service, which the Council could choose not to deliver.

3.2 The immigration report is required by the High Commission as part of the immigration application from the country from which the individual is travelling. It is an integral and necessary part of the immigration application.

3.3 Whilst an average of 4 inspections per year is low the requests for service can occur at any time. This is a considerable time commitment for the Environmental Health Officer who undertakes this service. At the present time there is no charge made for the service even though it is discretionary.

3.4 Other Councils, such as Watford Council, Preston Borough Council and Pendle Borough Council charge for immigration inspections, whilst others either do not provide the service at all eg Leeds City Council, or do not charge.
3.5 It is recommended that a minimum charge should be set at £114, which will generally cover the officer’s time in inspecting and preparing the report but for more complicated cases the charge be applied at the rate of £38 per hour.

4 RISK ASSESSMENT

4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- **Resources –** There are financial implications for the Environmental Health team at the present time. If charging were to be introduced then on last year’s inspection figures, the team could raise £450 in fees, which would help cover costs in other areas of the service. The proposed changes would have no effect on staffing levels.

- **Technical, Environmental and Legal –** There are no particular technical, environmental and legal implications.

- **Political/Reputation –** The report represents the Borough Council taking appropriate action to secure income to a well-used and front line service.

- **Equality & Diversity –** To ensure the suitability of accommodation i.e. suitable, safe and not overcrowded where a person lives or stays whilst in the UK.

5 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE

5.1 Approve the request for immigration inspections to be charged at a minimum rate of £114 commencing forthwith.

HEATHER COAR                 MARSHAL SCOTT
HEAD OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICES                CHIEF EXECUTIVE

BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.

For further information please ask for Heather Coar, extension 3214

REF: HC/EL/HEALTH & HOUSING/26 MAY 2016
1 PURPOSE

1.1 To consider the introduction of new fixed penalty charges for small scale fly tipping offences.

1.2 Relevance to the Council’s ambitions and priorities

- Community Objectives – To help make people’s lives safer and healthier. To support health, environment, economic and social wellbeing of people who live, work and visit Ribble Valley.
- Corporate Priorities – To enable the delivery of effective and efficient services.
- Other Considerations – None.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 Fly tipping is an offence under Section 33(1) of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (EPA 1990) which provides that it is an offence to deposit controlled or extra active waste in or on any land without a permit or in breach of a permit. A person who commits an offence under Section 33(1) is liable on conviction:

- In the Magistrates court - to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 6 months, an unlimited fine or both.
- In the Crown court - to imprisonment for a fine not exceeding 5 years, an unlimited fine or both.

2.2 The Government in 2015 called for evidence on enhancing powers to tackle waste crime. Waste crime within the Ribble Valley is on the increase. This report recommends the proposal for the introduction of a £400 on the spot fixed penalty notice to anyone caught illegally dumping waste.

3 ISSUES

3.1 The Council currently offer a fixed penalty notice under Section 33(1) of the Environmental Protection Act. However, this is differentiated from littering as being equal to or greater in volume than a single black bag. The Council at the moment recover a large amount of costs for clearance and disposal.

3.2 The offence of fly tipping and additional offences of ‘knowingly causing’ or ‘knowingly permitting’ fly tipping are set out in Section 33(1)(a) of the Environmental Protection
Act. The maximum penalty for fly tipping on summary conviction are £5,000 fine and/or 12 months imprisonment. On conviction in a Crown Court the maximum penalties are an unlimited fine and/or 5 years imprisonment.

3.3 From Monday, 9 May 2016 local authorities have been given the power to tackle crime by issuing fixed penalty notices between £150 and £400 for those caught in the act of fly tipping, anything from old fridges or sofas to garden waste or rubble.

3.4 The regulations introduce a new Section 33(a) to the EPA 1990 to allow waste collection authorities in England to issue fixed penalty notices of fly tipping offences in the breach of Section 33(1)(a) of EPA 1990. The fixed penalty notices will be for either:

- Between £150-£400 as specified by the English Waste Collection Authority; or
- £200 if no amount is specified.

3.5 The Government has indicated that fixed penalty notices will only be appropriate for small scale fly tipping. Waste collection authorities such as the Council will also continue to be able to prosecute large scale and/or repeat offenders. At this time there is no supporting guidance to the Council when the regulations come into force as to the amount of penalty that should be paid.

3.6 The fine of £400 will act as a deterrent and we will continue to work with local businesses and home owners to tackle the root cause of the crime and to change the mentality for the few that commit it.

3.7 Whilst acting as a deterrent the fixed penalty notices will also save the Council time and money in punishing offenders as they will provide a quicker alternative to prosecuting fly tippers through the Courts. However prosecutions will remain an option for the Local Authority in punishing large scale waste criminals.

3.8 Latest figures show the number of recorded incidents has risen almost 9% for 2015/16 compared with 2014/15, whilst the clear up costs have increased proportionately.

3.9 Within the rural borough of Ribble Valley landowners are often liable for any waste that is fly tipped on their land and can be prosecuted if they do not clear this away, often at a huge cost to business. The problem seems to have worsened recently in certain areas, possibly as a result of Ribble Valley making changes to our household recycling operations.

3.10 The fixed penalty notices will not solve the problem of fly tipping but it is a positive step in tackling an issue that costs rural businesses, rural residents and the Council up to £150m in clean-up costs every year or an average £800 to rural businesses per incident across the country.

3.11 The new powers have been introduced under The Unauthorised Deposit of Waste (Fixed Penalties) Regulations 2016.

3.12 Due to the lack of guidelines and guidance provided by DEFRA as to what level of fixed penalty notice costs should be, alternative Council's such as Daventry District Council has set its fixed penalty notice for fly tipping at £400, and reduce this to £300 if it is paid within 10 days of the offence.
3.13 Committee is therefore asked to consider what level of fixed penalty should be applied; whether provision should be made for a lesser amount to be paid and what period of lesser payment should be made with it.

4 RISK ASSESSMENT

4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- Resources – The report has financial generation implications as set out above.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – There are implications as fly tipping not only creates an eyesore for residents, it is a potential serious public health risk, creating pollution and attracting rats and other vermin.
- Political – None.
- Reputation – The report represents the Borough Council engaging and improving services as well as a potential financial increase.
- Equality & Diversity – N/A.

5 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE

5.1 Endorse a charge of £400 for each fixed penalty notice served and consider whether the charge is made if the fixed penalty notice is paid within 10 days.

HEATHER COAR  MARSHAL SCOTT
HEAD OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES  CHIEF EXECUTIVE

BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.

For further information please ask for Heather Coar, extension 4466.

REF: HC/EL/CMS/H&H/260516
1 PURPOSE

1.1 To inform Committee of relevant issues which have arisen since the last meeting.

1.2 Relevance to the Council’s ambitions and priorities:

• Council Ambitions – The following reports generally relate to the Council’s ambitions to make people’s lives healthier and safer.

2 PRIVATE WATER SUPPLIES RISK ASSESSMENT PROGRESS

2.1 As a local authority we are responsible for regulating private water supplies within a district. As part of our regulation duties, we will:

• carry out a risk assessment at least every 5 years (risk assessment guidance can be found through the Private Water Supplies Regulations 2009);
• investigate the cause of failure to meet standards;
• enforce regulations and/or improvements where a supply constitutes a potential danger to human health.

2.2 We will also set:

• how often we want to take a sample of water from private water supplies (based on a categorisation of supplies for analysis);
• how much we can charge for risk assessment, taking a sample and testing the water.

2.3 Since the last report in June 2015, progress has continued to be made with supplies in relation to risk assessments. In June 2015, we were well over half way with 46 remaining to complete. As of the beginning of May, we currently have outstanding one large commercial and 6 small supplies, therefore creating a total of 7 risk assessments to be carried out. We also currently have 6 refusals of undertaking the sampling. The project lead officer, Matthew Riding, has made every effort to complete the assessment as quickly as possible and we are looking at an imminent completion date.

2.4 In addition to the Private Water Supplies Regulations 2009 where Ribble Valley Borough Council had 310 private water supplies to sample, there has been the introduction of a rolling programme which was dated from 2015 to 2019. This requires a phased plan work to be commenced from January 2017 which will include private rented accommodation.

2.5 There are a number of private water supply samples that have failed which are required notices to be served under Regulation 18, which is the service of a boiled water notice. This has taken a large amount of time for compliance.

2.6 In moving forward with the department, the outstanding backlog is to be addressed and a deadline to completion set in the forthcoming months.
3 HANSON CEMENT LIAISON MEETING

3.1 A liaison meeting was held on Thursday, 24 September 2015. A copy of the minutes are attached for your information as Appendix A to this report. There has also been a second meeting on Thursday, 24 March 2016. A copy of the minutes are attached for your information as Appendix B to this report.

4 TARMAC LIAISON COMMITTEE

4.1 A liaison committee meeting was held on 19 August 2015. A copy of the minutes are attached for your information as Appendix C to this report.

5 AIR QUALITY – TRIENNIAL UPDATE & ASSESSMENT REPORT 2016

5.1 The mandatory air quality annual status report has is currently being undertaken and will be submitted to DEFRA for consideration and validation by the end of June this year. At this time the report recommendations from the author include the recommendation for the air quality management area to be revoked within the next 12 months. Furthermore, the development of the AQMA action plan is to be put on hold and the development of an Air quality strategy will progressed over the next year, however full confirmation of this will be in the next meeting of this Committee.

6 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH STAFF

6.1 Julie Whitwell, Environmental Health Officer (Health and Safety) has returned from maternity leave and taken up part-time job share with Ken Robinson, who was temporarily undertaking Julie’s role in her absence whilst on maternity leave.

6.2 The role of part-time Environmental Health Officer (Pollution and Commercial) has now become vacant due to a change in staffing and we are looking to appoint a replacement.

7 FOOD SAFETY / HEALTH INSPECTION UPDATE

7.1 The Food Safety inspection figures for 2015-16 below were set against the following challenges:

- Unusually high number of inspections (503, usually 260) in the 2015-16 programme due to changes in the Code of Practice in 2014 which moved many inspections from the 2014-15 programme to the 2015-16 programme.
- An EHO (maternity cover) post was not filled for a proportion of the year.
- Senior EHO investigated a fatality at a Moto Cross event.
- Event safety work at the Royal Lancashire show involved involvement by three Enforcement Officers.
- There was a lengthy and complexed Health and Safety investigation at a local hotel complex involving alleged electrocutions, exposure to asbestos and unsafe working procedures.
- An extended period (6 months) of absenteeism by the Environmental Heath Manager.

Year Summary 2015/16:

- 202 service requests were recorded of which 195 (96.5%) were actioned within the target response time of 2 working days.
- 112 confirmed cases of infectious diseases were investigated in relation to food-born organisms.
131 food samples were submitted for microbiological examination. (This Authority had the third highest use of credits for sampling in the County.)

100% of the highest risk category of food businesses (A-C) including approved manufacturers were inspected. 95% of category D premises were inspected and 66% of the lowest risk premises were inspected. Out of a programme of 503 inspections, 439 were carried out. (87.3%)

Premises which were found to be ‘broadly compliant’ remained roughly the same at 94%.

The number of premises inspected, and the high level of compliance make it highly unlikely that this Authority will be selected for audit by the Food Standards Agency.

7.2 Health and safety inspections will focus on Event Safety, due to the increasing demand within the borough for events such as Beat-Herder, Summer Days Festival and Food Festivals. There will be also the reactive service provision made to deal with accident investigations, as and when required.

8 PEST CONTROL UPDATE

8.1 The service continues to be provided by one part-time officer on a 3 day per week basis. A number of options are being pursued with regard to meeting an increase in demand and to deal with wasp nest services demand in the summer months. However Direct Services staff have been trained to provide extra support in sewer baiting and dealing with wasp nests should the requirement be needed.

8.2 Feedback from residents is currently positive. A few residents are electing to receive advice and undertaken their own treatments initially in avoidance to incur the related charges.

8.3 We are currently looking at reviewing the service that is provided by pest control to produce a more effective and efficient service for all parties.

9 DOG WARDEN UPDATE

9.1 The past 12 months has seen a considerable ongoing effort and dedication by our Dog Warden Officers. A significant number of high profile and out of hours weekend patrols have been undertaken within the Longridge area due to increased fouling.

9.2 Arrangements have been made with the Dog Wardens to look at and replace as and when required, the five dog waste bins under the agreed annual rolling programme. Damaged/heavily corroded existing bins are to be replaced and there is currently a review of the location and frequency in emptying of dog bins due to heavy demand by dog owners.

10 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION UPDATE

10.1 Considerable effort has been undertaken in the last 12 months with regards to permitting. The team have also been very proactive in issuing in the last 6 weeks, fixed penalty notices within the Longridge and Clitheroe area with additional resources and the return of a part-time member of staff. It is hoped that this will again increase. The permits that have been have created a large amount of income to the borough which has been an ongoing success. This has taken 12 – 18 months of working with local businesses to ensure that they are compliant within the correct legislation.

10.2 The Environmental Protection team have also been undertaking a considerable amount of planning applications of which they have become heavily involved in proactively seeking noise and odour assessments for proposed developments.
11 COMMERCIAL WASTE ENFORCEMENT UPDATE

11.1 The considerable and ongoing success of Environmental Health assisting the refuse collection service with resolving trade waste issues and related enforcement.

11.2 Income generation for 2014/2015 was at a service high, however has declined in 2015/2016 due to the return of a member of staff from long term sick. From March 2015, 72 new accounts in total, 67 for wheeled bins have been opened with this Council and 5 new accounts for trade waste bags.

12 CLITHEROE MARKET UPDATE

12.1 I am pleased to report that there is considerable interest by Ribble Valley residents in attending the market particularly with the changing season. There is considerable work going into liaison with other departments regarding the regeneration of this area and I am in liaison with Bob Watson, the Market Officer, as to suggested ways of increasing visitor numbers to the existing market until the time of redevelopment comes.

13. EMERGENCY PLANNING UPDATE

13.1 On Wednesday, 11 May 2016, a multi-agency COMAH training day was organised by Johnson Matthey. This was a multi-agency familiarisation session which aimed to raise the awareness at a local level of the multi-agency response for incidents occurring at upper tier COMAH (Control of Major Accident Hazard) Establishment. A presentation was provided with a generic overview of the plans in place and provides specific pre-identified information including the major accidents that can occur at different establishments.

13.2 The training included the Police, Fire and Rescue, Environment Agency, Lancashire County Council Highways, MET Office, OFCOM and Electricity North West. This was a beneficial day for all parties involved.

14. CLITHEROE CEMETERY EXTENSION UPDATE

14.1 The construction of Clitheroe Cemetery extension scheme is now complete. The willow planting at the entrance has worked extremely well in keeping the flooding to a minimum especially over the wet winter months.

14.2 Five beams in the new burial plot have been installed; these provide a stable base for improved memorial fixing and stability together with easier access for grounds maintenance. We have also created a much needed hardstanding area for topsoil and bark mulch which has been planted with a screen of yew trees.

14.3 The new area has been well received and will continue to improve as the planting scheme matures.

HEATHER COAR MARSHAL SCOTT
HEAD OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICES CHIEF EXECUTIVE

For further information please ask for Heather Coar on 01200 414466.
1. Terry Reynolds welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced himself as the newly appointed site manager for Ribblesdale Works. All parties introduced themselves and it became apparent that it was a first meeting for several members.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2.1 Apologies for absence were received from RV Councillors Allan Knox, Richard Sherras and Ian Sayers.

3. MINUTES

3.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 26 March 2015 were circulated and approved as a correct record.

4. OVERVIEW

4.1 Terry suggested that Simon give the presentation that had been prepared and presented to Heidelberg (the parent company) earlier in the week. This gave an overview of the company and more specifically the operations at Ribblesdale.

4.2 Specific reference was made to each of the quarries in relation to plant and production. Reserves remaining allowed for in excess of 40 years in Lanehead and 90 in Bellman.

4.3 Details relating to Kiln 7 were outlined as well as the packing facilities and transportation operation which included both rail and road.

4.4 The Health & Safety record was excellent with more than 500 days since the last employee accident and only 3 notifiable ones since 2009. The key tools used around Health & Safety were outlined.

4.5 With regards to the Environment the reports to the Environment Agency showed a downward trend with only 1 breach this year. This was backed up by Phil Goodwin. Proposed improvements to the plant were explained. Outflow readings for both the Bellman outflow and the settlement pond outflow also showed a downward trend.
4.6 Resident complaints had decreased over several years and the level was now steady with dust being the most common complaint.

4.7 A series of graphs were shown relating to the actual production on site that showed it was continuing in the right direction. The only exception was for alternative fuels which had never really achieved targets set.

4.8 Terry suggested a visit to the control room at the next meeting.

5. LANCASHIRE WILDLIFE TRUST

5.1 Phil Dykes informed the meeting that both Salthill and Crosshill quarries were managed by LWT and that over the last 10 years they had worked very closely with Hanson. He suggested that help could be given with the Biodiversity Action Plan in bringing Lanehead Quarry nature reserve back into a good state which would also be of benefit to the community. This could be done by managing the limestone grassland and the species it supports which requires work to cutting back encroaching tress, repairing the pond and managing the woodland area. There is currently a problem with ‘ash dieback’. LWT procedures would be followed. Details would be discussed directly with personnel at Hanson.

6. AOB

6.1 A question was asked as to whether the damaged stack had been reduced in height during repair. It was confirmed that 30 metres had been taken out and replaced by 30 metres and therefore the stack remained at the same height.

6.2 Lynda asked that the ‘dog fouling’ signs be replaced in the nature reserve at Lanehead.

6.3 A tour of the quarry at Coplow was given to those who wanted to go. Tenders had been received to restore this site and works would commence in 3 weeks time. The Environment Agency would have personnel on site. There was the potential that this site could be opened up to the public in the future. Please note that the main contractors have been selected and work is expected to commence at the end of October.

7 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

7.1 The next meeting of the Hanson Cement Liaison Committee will be held on Thursday 24 March 2016.
HANSON CEMENT LIAISON COMMITTEE
MEETING DATE – THURSDAY, 24 MARCH 2016

PRESENT: Simon Moorhouse - Hanson Cement
Sam Wrathall - Hanson Cement
Linda England - Bellman Committee
Marilyn Wood - West Bradford PC
Jonathan Haine - LCC
Cllr I Sayers - RVBC
Cllr R Sherras - RVBC
Heather Coar - RVBC
Olwen Heap - RVBC

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from RV Councillors Allan Knox, Ian Brown and Ruth Hargreaves; Cty Cllr Albert Atkinson; Terry Reynolds – Hanson Cement; Mary Gysbers – Bellman committee; Phil Goodwin – Environment Agency and Stephen Booth – Chatburn Parish Council

2 MINUTES

2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 24 September 2015 were circulated and approved as a correct record.

3 OVERVIEW

3.1 Simon gave an overview of the company’s performance and the operations at Ribblesdale during 2015. The data had recently been sent to Heidleberg.

3.2 Health & Safety performance – no notifications for 686 days (9 May 2014) which was an injury to a foot when lifting. This was still being investigated.

3.3 Environment – 6 Part A reports to EA (notifiable). Beaches of ELV

3.4 Resident complaints had slightly increased – dust was the most frequent with a couple of noise ones recently. None had been received by RVBC.

3.5 Both Bellman outflow and settlement pond are stable.

3.6 Chatburn Wildlife garden has been formed by Phil Dykes with the help of Lynda England and other volunteers. This has been well received by local residents. However there are still some problems with ash dieback.

3.7 Work had started at Coplow but stopped because of weather. The contractors would be back on site 11 April 2016. A site visit would be arranged for the September meeting.

3.8 Plant clinker/cement production had continued to increase in 2015.

3.9 2016 has been good been production so far. 26 days without stop.

3.10 The use of alternative fuels is slightly down but improvement should be made soon. The use of SRF and the implications of LCC shutting Thornton was discussed.
3.11 The cost of electricity is approximately £8m a year. An energy consumption bonus for staff is under consideration.

4. CHALLENGES FOR SITE

4.1 From April 2017 there would be tougher particulate emission limits.

4.2 Replacement of electrostatic precipitators with bag filters on 7 & 8 cement mills.

4.3 Fugitive emissions from buildings, conveyors and transfer points.

4.4 Refurbishment of wet gas scrubber.

5. ENGINEERING SHUTDOWN 2016

5.1 The site was shut down for 33 days in January/February for extensive repairs/refurbishments/replacements to take place on the following:
   - Crusher
   - Reclaimer
   - Raw Mill
   - CF silo / Kiln feed
   - Pre-heater tower
   - Kiln
   - Greco Burner
   - Cooler
   - Exhaust Gas
   - Scrubber
   - Clinker Transport

6. AOB

6.1 Simon showed a short film taken by a drone over the site.

6.2 Lynda asked for alternative site access to the dog walking area at the top of Old Road since the builders had diverted the footpath during their housebuilding. Sam would investigate.

6.3 Marilyn asked about the sight line of trees on West Bradford bridge. Sam reported that one had been removed but until the leaves came out it was difficult to tell if that was adequate.

6.4 An open day for the public would be held on Saturday 6 August 2016.

7 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

7.1 The next meeting of the Hanson Cement Liaison Committee will be held on Thursday 22 September 2016.

Meeting closed at 3.10pm
NOTES OF TARMAC LIAISON COMMITTEE HELD ON
WEDNESDAY 19 AUGUST 2015

PRESENT
Martin Dobson  Tarmac
Cllr Ian Sayers  Ribble Valley Borough Council
Cllr Ian Brown  Ribble Valley Borough Council
Cllr Paul Elms  Ribble Valley Borough Council
Heather Coar  Ribble Valley Borough Council

APOLOGIES
Apologies for absence were received from James Russell (RVBC) and Jonathan Haine (LCC).

MINUTES
The minutes of the last meeting held on 17 November 2014 were approved as a correct record.

UPDATE ON TARMAC OPERATION

Martin reported that Tim Cowling had moved on with the company and he was now the site manager for Clitheroe as well as Skipton. The company name had changed back to Tarmac – CRH were the new owners. The structure is remaining the same for now with a review after Christmas.

A line for natural gas has recently been installed to use as fuel instead of PFO (light oil). This will be both cheaper and cleaner for the environment. A new burner and dryer will also be required. These are due to be delivered at the end of August.

They are also looking at a RAP system – recycled asphalt planings which will be a money saver and use less bitumen. This will need planning permission and a new permit will be required.

Heather is waiting for the application to vary the permit for the change of company name and fuel type.

COMPLAINTS REVIEW

Heather had not received any complaints, nor had either Tarmac or LCC. However, Martin did make reference to a previous one received about the noise of the siren during a safety practice and informed the committee in advance that they intend to have a drill on 14 October 2015.

AOB

- Members requested a site visit – this was arranged with Martin for Wednesday 18 November 2015 at 10am.

NEXT MEETING

This would be arranged for January 2016 (and June 2016 – half yearly)

Meeting finished 10am
1 PURPOSE

1.1 To inform members of the outside bodies that are under the remit of the Health & Housing committee and their membership.

1.2 Relevance to the Council’s ambitions and priorities

- Community Objectives – to be a well managed council providing effective services.
- Corporate Priorities - to protect and enhance the existing environmental quality of our area; to help make people's lives healthier and safer.
- Other Considerations – to work in partnership with other bodies in pursuit of the Council's aims and objectives.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 At the annual meeting each year the Council makes nominations to various outside bodies.

2.2 Members attend meetings of the outside body and report back to the relevant parent committee.

3 ISSUES

3.1 The following outside bodies come under the remit of the Health & Housing committee. The membership of these outside bodies was decided at the annual meeting of the council on 10 May 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outside Bodies</th>
<th>Member(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carer’s Link</td>
<td>Cllr Joyce Holgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calderstones NHS Partnership</td>
<td>Cllr Bridget Hilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency Liaison committee</td>
<td>Cllrs Richard Sherras &amp; Ian Sayers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanson Cement Liaison committee</td>
<td>Cllrs Richard Sherras, Ruth Hargeaves, Ian Sayers, Ian Brown &amp; Allan Knox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Well Being Board (LCC)</td>
<td>Cllr Bridget Hilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCC Adult Social Care and Health Overview &amp; Scrutiny committee</td>
<td>Cllr Bridget Hilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Regional Older Peoples Champion Network</td>
<td>Cllr Sue Bibby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendle Club, Clitheroe</td>
<td>Cllrs Sue Hind &amp; Ian Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribble Valley Homes</td>
<td>Cllrs Peter Ainsworth, Ged Mirfin, Ian Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarmac Liaison committee</td>
<td>Cllrs Paul Elms, Ian Sayers, Ian Brown &amp; Allan Knox</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Representatives are encouraged to provide reports back giving committee an update on the work of the body and drawing attention to any current issues.

4 RISK ASSESSMENT

4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications

- Resources – the costs associated with members attending meetings of outside bodies is included in the budget for 2016/17.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – no significant risks identified
- Political - no significant risks identified
- Reputation – no significant risks identified
- Equality & Diversity - no significant risks identified

5 CONCLUSION

5.1 Members note the outside bodies under the remit of this committee and their membership.

Marshel Scott Olwen Heap
CHIEF EXECUTIVE ADMINISTRATION OFFICER

BACKGROUND PAPERS
Report on Representatives on Outside Bodies – Annual Council 10.5.16

REF: CE/OMH/H&H/26.5.16
For further information please ask for Olwen Heap, extension 4408
## HEALTH & WELLBEING PARTNERSHIP
### Meeting Date: Wednesday, 30 March 2016 at 4.30pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESENT:</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor S Brunskill – Chairman</td>
<td>Hayley Simms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor B Hilton</td>
<td>Janette Finch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Hirst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA ITEM</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Welcome and Introductions</td>
<td>All present introduced themselves and explained their roles. It was agreed that there had been a long interval since the last meeting, and that there had been developments in the meantime. Colin explained the position with regard to demands that had arisen for staff time and resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Apologies</td>
<td>Received from Councillors M Fenton and M Robinson and Phil Mileham and Sandra Fox.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Minutes</td>
<td>The minutes of the meeting held on 19 October 2015 were approved as a true record. There were no matters arising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Purpose of the Working Group and Confirmation of Terms of Reference</td>
<td>The Terms of Reference had been prepared in 2013, and reviewed subsequently, and were still considered to be relevant. Colin drew attention to possible forthcoming changes, including Combined Authorities and Care Funding. However, agreement was still to be achieved at the Lancashire Chief Executives' Group meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5 Feedback from Councillor Bridget Hilton | (a) Lancashire Health and Wellbeing Board  

Bridget reported on three meetings. The structure of the Board had changed. It was now chaired by the Leader of Lancashire County Council, and increased membership included representatives for vulnerable adults, the Police, the Faith Sector, GPs and providers. A huge contribution had been made by Gary Hall, the Chief Executive of Chorley Borough Council.  

Better Care Funding issues included delays in discharge due to a lack of infrastructure and housing problems – a small sub-group had been set up with Blackburn with Darwen and Blackpool Unitary Authorities. Meetings were being arranged for providers, commissioners and district councils, but it was identified that Ribble Valley has a particular difficulty with cross-border involvement. Reports showed some progress, but targets on successful discharge were still not being met. There were difficulties in sharing data. A reduction of £24,000 in Better Care Funding had an impact on acute hospitals.  

Bridget reported on the action plan for 2016/17 for the Lancashire Health and Wellbeing Board and produced an agenda item from 22 February 2016 meeting of the Board for circulation. |
| SB | |
This explained the requirements for a 5 year Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP), which would be an umbrella plan throughout the county and South Cumbria, covering a number of specific delivery plans, some on different geographical footprints. There would also be a 1 year operational plan for 2016/17, organisation based but consistent with the emerging STP, and forming year 1 of the 5 year plan. This was supported by the CCG’s.

There had been discussion with regard to Combined Authorities, which GP’s had felt would assist with funding. Colin identified differences to the Manchester Model, requiring a careful approach. If the health budget were to be part of the Combined Authority, care would have to be taken about inheritance of the debt. Further, there could be inequalities across the county, and an instance where a reablement package could not take place in a remote rural location was identified, with the outcome of a return to hospital.

b) Lancashire County Council Health Scrutiny Committee

The Director of Public Health had reported that public health funding across Lancashire had been reduced by £4m, meaning that they could only perform statutory functions. This meant that there were no checks with regard to venereal disease, and school nurses no longer gave medication (a move resisted by teachers). There was disappointment with Central Government emphasis on hospitals and not prevention.

c) Calderstones NHS Trust

The Care Quality Commission had now rated Calderstones as ‘good’ across the board. Amalgamation with MerseyCare NHS Trust was planned for 1 July 2016. There has been some impact on staff already, with some having moved to MerseyCare and some being given incentives to stay within the organisation. MerseyCare was a larger organisation, providing for service users with mental health issues as well as learning disabilities.

Some service users at Calderstones had already been discharged to locations close to their homes. The Calderstones houses in Whalley were being improved, with a number having been made available to victims of the flooding in Whalley.

6 Feedback from Hayley Simms

a) Integrated Neighbourhood Team

Hayley introduced Janette Finch, who has been in post as the Integrated Neighbourhood Team Co-ordinator since November 2015. Janette explained her background in physiotherapy. She had established links with her counterparts in East Lancashire and beyond. She had become part of the multi-disciplinary team meetings, of which are core group met regularly including the Voluntary Sector Wellbeing Service and Age UK. From a more restrictive patient list, there were now no people excluded from the scheme. Integrated care plans for complex patients through GP records meant that information was available to hospitals, and
that the patient only needed to tell their story once. The Integrated Discharge Service from hospital was attempting to get early Social Services support, including crisis teams for 96 hours (maximum 7 days). Janette attended the ward round at Clitheroe hospital, enabling her to signpost patients or to identify patients with issues on discharge. Analysis so far was down to practice level, but cannot yet establish particular rural issues. The EMIS system assisted with co-ordinated support.

b) CCG Issues

Hayley reported on a number of issues:

• The over 75 service in Ribblesdale had been devolved to GP’s who received funding for over 75s with complex needs. There was a community matron and practice base support for over 75s. Extended appointments were also being trialled (15 minutes with GPs and 30 minutes with practice nurses or health care assistants).

• A structured education programme across East Lancashire was to be introduced for the Enhanced Diabetes Service, from July 2016.

• Discussions were taking place to review treatment room provision across Ribblesdale.

• Pendleside Medical Practice and the Castle Medical Group had been classified as outstanding by the Care Quality Commission.

• Dr Ian Whyte was to step down as Clinical Head on his retirement in August 2016.

7 Clitheroe Health Village

This issue was still the subject of review. The current challenge is the new emphasis from NHS Property Services, who wish to make an application for housing on the old hospital site, going to appeal if necessary, to assess the value of the site. Their objectives appeared to differ from the health delivery side of the National Health Service. The local preference was still to use the site for a range of health uses from supported units to independent living. An application has been submitted to extend the car parking at Clitheroe hospital.

8 Dementia Alliance

Colin was unable to provide an update, as Dilys Day had been absent from the office due to illness.

9 Date and Time of Next Meeting

This was proposed for Monday, 16 May 2016 at 4.30pm, subject to availability of the room.

The meeting closed at 6.10pm