



Public Document Pack  
**TONBRIDGE & MALLING**  
**BOROUGH COUNCIL**

EXECUTIVE SERVICES

---

**Chief Executive**

Julie Beilby BSc (Hons) MBA

Gibson Building  
Gibson Drive  
Kings Hill, West Malling  
Kent ME19 4LZ  
West Malling (01732) 844522

---

Contact: Committee Services  
committee.services@tmbc.gov.uk

27 June 2017

**CABINET - WEDNESDAY, 28TH JUNE, 2017**

Supplements replacing agenda items 5 and 8, for consideration at the Wednesday, 28th June, 2017 meeting of the Cabinet.

**Agenda No    Item**

12.    **Revenues and Benefits - Shared Service (Pages 3 - 16)**

Item FIP 17/17 referred from Finance, Innovation and Property Advisory Board minutes of 21 June 2017

13.    **Introduction of Charges for Food Hygiene Rating Scheme Re-inspection Requests on a Cost Recovery Basis (Pages 17 - 22)**

Item SSE 17/5 referred from Street Scene and Environment services Advisory Board minutes of 20 June 2017

J E BEILBY  
Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank

**Item FIP 17/17 referred from Finance, Innovation and Property Advisory Board minutes of 21 June 2017**

**FIP 17/17 REVENUES AND BENEFITS - SHARED SERVICE**

Further to Decision No D170030CAB, the Director of Finance and Transformation reported progress with the implementation of the Shared Service for Revenues and Benefits. Details were given of the project work required in connection with the harmonisation of IT and digital provision between the Council and Gravesham Borough Council, the proposed timescale and “fast track” capital evaluation to enable the work to progress. The report set out the evaluation for phases 1 and 2 of the project while that for phase 3 would be presented to the Advisory Board as soon as it was available. It was noted that in respect of phase 2, “in house” and “third party supplier” options were being considered and details of the functionality considerations were set out at Annex 2 to the report.

**RECOMMENDED:** That

- (1) the evaluation (assuming costs for a third party phase 2 option) set out at Annex 1 to the report be approved;
- (2) the Capital Plan and Revenue Budget be updated accordingly; and
- (3) the capital and one-off revenue costs be met from the Transformation Reserve.

**\*Referred to Cabinet**

This page is intentionally left blank

**TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL**  
**FINANCE, INNOVATION and PROPERTY ADVISORY BOARD**

**21 June 2017**

**Report of the Director of Finance and Transformation**

**Part 1- Public**

**Matters for Recommendation to Cabinet - Council Decision**

**1 REVENUES AND BENEFITS – SHARED SERVICE**

**Members are advised of the progress with the implementation of the Shared Service, and are invited to recommend to Cabinet and then Full Council that the evaluation of IT and digital solutions be approved.**

**1.1 Introduction**

1.1.1 At the meeting of the Cabinet on 21 March 2017, Members considered a report in respect of the potential shared service for revenues and benefits. The Cabinet resolved that:

- 1) the establishment of a Shared Service for Revenue and Benefits between Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council and Gravesham Borough Council be approved as set out in the report;
- 2) the Director of Finance and Transformation, in liaison with the Cabinet Member for Finance, Innovation and Property and Leader, be authorised to progress detailed negotiations with Gravesham Borough Council (GBC) accordingly;
- 3) Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council would prefer to be considered as the lead authority (and site provider) for the Shared Service and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee be advised accordingly for the purposes of the accommodation review;
- 4) the Director of Finance and Transformation be authorised to commence consultation and discussion with staff as appropriate;
- 5) the target implementation date of July 2018 be noted; and
- 6) further progress reports setting out detailed proposals for the implementation of the shared service be presented to either Finance, Innovation and Property Advisory Board, General Purposes Committee or directly to Cabinet as appropriate.

- 1.1.2 Since the report to Cabinet, staff briefings have taken place at both authorities and a Revenues & Benefits Shared Service Development Project Board has been set up consisting of key staff from both TMBC and GBC. Sub-groups undertake detailed investigative work on specific areas (e.g. property, HR etc) and report directly into the Project Board. A staff portal is being set up to keep staff informed as to progress; including reports to Members.
- 1.1.3 The Project Board agreed that the key 'initial' decisions that are required in order to lay the foundations for the Shared Service relate to the 'host' site, and some IT and 'digital' transformation related matters.
- 1.1.4 It is intended that a report will be presented to the General Purposes Committee on 26 June setting out the recommendations from the Project Board in respect of the hosting of the shared service. This report focuses on issues relating to IT and digital services.

## **1.2 IT Services and Digital Transformation**

- 1.2.1 As was explained in the report to Cabinet on 21 March, both authorities operate the same key systems (Northgate and information@work) for the delivery of revenue and benefits services which provides a good foundation for the shared service. Both authorities need to invest in digital customer platforms to assist with the transformation of service delivery as was explained in the report, and Members were reminded that the Capital Plan List C already carries a potential scheme for evaluation entitled "Revenues and Benefits Citizen's Access" in this regard.
- 1.2.2 However, in terms of how relevant information is (or is planned to be) presented to the public via our website, the two authorities are at different points and as such there is a need to harmonise the approaches across the two sites.
- 1.2.3 Looking to the future, both authorities want to be able to offer more digital options to the public through the website including the opportunity for customers to complete their own template 'forms' for specific requests, applications or provision of information. Ultimately, as part of a full transformation process, in time, we would want to be able to deliver 'back office integration' maximising opportunities for efficiency. However this is a much later stage and would be subject to a separate evaluation in the future.
- 1.2.4 What is important to note is that many of these developments are strongly desirable irrespective of the implementation of a shared service. However, given that a shared service is to be implemented, it will be necessary to work with our partner GBC to ensure that IT and digital provision is harmonised. Having a shared IT manager with GBC is extremely helpful in this regard.
- 1.2.5 The IT and digital transformation plan can be split into phases. 3 phases need to take place prior to the shared service going live and there is a potential further phase, subject to separate future evaluation, which could occur at a later date.

Phase	Detail of project work required	Cost basis	Timescale
1.	<p>Shared back office platform (with the assistance of the supplier Northgate) to align TMBC and GBC databases and allow access to both by all staff through a 'Shared Service Layer'.</p> <p>This will require a one off revenue/capital cost to be shared by both authorities. Ultimately by doing this work for the operation of a fully shared service, there is the opportunity to deliver future revenue savings in respect of system costs. This has been the experience in other revenues and benefits shared services.</p>	Revenue or capital cost – shared with GBC	Work to commence once host site has been determined (report to go to GPC on 26 June to determine host site).
2.	<p>Improvements to the 'look and feel' of customers' own revenues and benefits information presented via the website.</p> <p>This work is required in any event to provide a better and more streamlined offer to customers, but with the implementation of the shared service this needs to be harmonised with that at GBC.</p> <p>At TMBC information is currently presented via the in-house developed 'My Account' solution. At GBC, this is via a third party supplier.</p>	<p>TMBC cost only.</p> <p>Could be capital and/or revenue</p>	<u>Latest</u> by July 2018, but earlier is strongly desirable.
3.	<p>E-forms package to give customers the opportunity to complete their own template 'forms' for specific requests, applications or provision of information.</p> <p>This is something that we would wish to purchase whether we implement a shared service or not, but given that we are entering into a shared service, purchase will be jointly with GBC.</p>	Capital and revenue costs to be shared with GBC	<u>Ideally</u> by July 2018.
4.	<p><i>Potential further phase: Full 'back-office integration'.</i></p> <p><i>Subject to more detailed evaluation in due course, this could potentially improve efficiency by reducing double handling of data.</i></p>	<p><i>Potential Capital and revenue costs. Joint.</i></p>	<i>If this were proven to be feasible, this would be a future development.</i>

- 1.2.6 In accordance with the Council's budget process, it is necessary to bring forward a 'fast-track' capital plan evaluation for approval to enable the work above to progress. This report sets out that evaluation for phases 1 and 2. The evaluation for phase 3 is still being undertaken and will be reported to Members of this Advisory Board as soon as it is available.
- 1.2.7 Members should note that funding for IT and digital transformation has been set aside in an earmarked reserve, so any decisions involving capital investment will not impact on the Council's capital allowance available for other capital projects. Any one-off revenue costs are also to be met from the earmarked reserve.

### 1.3 Evaluation

- 1.3.1 A capital plan evaluation template can be found at **[Annex 1]**.
- 1.3.2 Members will note that in respect of phase 2, an 'in house' option versus a 'third party supplier' option is being considered. Details of the functionality considerations that are being considered are attached at **[Annex 2]** for completeness.

### 1.4 Legal Implications

- 1.4.1 Any procurement of a digital IT solution will, of course, need to follow appropriate procurement requirements and legal colleagues are engaged in providing advice in this regard. If a full EU tendering process is required, the timescales for implementation will be more extensive.

### 1.5 Financial and Value for Money Considerations

- 1.5.1 The estimated capital and revenue costs to TMBC of implementing phases 1 and 2 in readiness for the 'live' Shared Service is set out at **[Annex 1]**. An in-house development in respect of phase 2 would be more cost effective, but the feasibility of this is presently being evaluated taking into account other IT priorities and pressures. **Therefore for this purpose it is recommended that the costs based on third party support for phase 2 are approved.** If in house development proves to be feasible, then this will mean that less funding needs to be provided and a saving can be achieved.
- 1.5.2 Funding is set aside in an earmarked reserve for this purpose and therefore will not impact on the Council's capital allowance available for other capital projects. One-off revenue costs are also being met from this earmarked reserve.
- 1.5.3 Ongoing revenue costs/savings will be factored into the overall Shared Service cost framework. Members are reminded that, as reported to Cabinet, we envisage that savings of circa £100k to £150k per annum are achievable after the initial 'bedding in' has taken place.

## 1.6 Risk Assessment

- 1.6.1 Delays in making decisions about IT solutions could mean that the implementation of the shared service does not happen in accordance with our anticipated timescales.

## 1.7 Equality Impact Assessment

- 1.7.1 The decisions recommended through this paper have a remote or low relevance to the substance of the Equality Act. There is no perceived impact on end users.

## 1.8 Policy Considerations

1.8.1 Customer Contact

1.8.2 Procurement

## 1.9 Recommendations

1.9.1 Members are asked to **RECOMMEND** to Cabinet and then Full Council that:

- 1) The evaluation (assuming costs for a third party phase 2 option) set out at **[Annex 1]** be approved;
- 2) The Capital Plan and Revenue Budget be updated accordingly;
- 3) The capital and one-off revenue costs are met from the Transformation Reserve.

Background papers:

Nil

contact: Mike Bytheway  
Darren Everden

Sharon Shelton  
Director of Finance and Transformation

This page is intentionally left blank

## CAPITAL PLAN LIST C – EVALUATIONS

Project		Revenues and Benefits Shared Service – IT and digital transformation	
1	<b>Specification:</b>		
	(i)	<b>Purpose of the scheme</b>	Preparation for Shared Service with GBC
	(ii)	<b>Relevance to National / Council's Objectives</b>	(a) National: Improving customer interaction and communication (b) Council: Achieving digital transformation
	(iii)	<b>Targets for judging success</b>	(a) Provision of a functioning digital system which all staff in shared service can readily access (b) Improvements to on-line presentation of revenue and benefits information, including forms, which taxpayers can access 24/7
2	<b>Description of Project / Design Issues:</b>		
	<p>There are 3 parts to the project which need to take place prior to the implementation of the Shared Service.</p> <p><u>Phase 1:</u> Shared back office platform (with the assistance of the supplier Northgate) to align TMBC and GBC databases and allow access to both by all staff through a 'Shared Service Layer'. This will require a one off capital/revenue cost to be shared by both authorities. Ultimately by doing this work for the operation of a fully shared service, there is the opportunity to deliver future revenue savings in respect of system costs. This has been the experience in other revenues and benefits shared services.</p> <p><u>Phase 2:</u> Improvements to the 'look and feel' of customers' own revenues and benefits information presented via the website. This work is required in any event to provide a better and more streamlined offer to customers, but with the implementation of the shared service any work needs to be harmonised with that at GBC. At TMBC information is currently presented via the in-house developed 'My Account' solution. Options are to develop the current solution in-house with external support (revenue cost) in order to harmonise with GBC's presentation; or to procure a third party solution along the lines of GBC (would involve both capital and revenue costs).</p> <p><u>Phase 3:</u> E-forms package to give customers the opportunity to complete their own template 'forms' for specific requests, applications or provision of information (capital and revenue costs). THIS PHASE WILL BE EVALUATED SEPARATELY</p>		
3	<b>Consultation:</b>		
	Consultation has taken place with Management Team, GBC officers, the Cabinet Member for Finance, Innovation & Property and the Leader.		

## CAPITAL PLAN LIST C – EVALUATIONS

Page 12	4	<p><b>Capital Cost:</b></p> <p><u>Phase 1</u> Potential purchase of a server and support from Northgate. Estimated cost: £10k Capital and £10k one-off revenue (to be shared with GBC, therefore TMBC cost is 50% of this).</p> <p><u>Phase 2</u> Final costs will depend upon which delivery option is the most practicable and achievable in the timescales required.</p> <p>a) A primarily 'In house' development with some external support will be more cost effective (estimated one-off revenue costs of circa £15k maximum with no capital outlay). This does not include the opportunity cost of in-house resources. Allowance for annual updates to website with external support – say £5k per annum</p> <p>b) Alternatively, the potential prices for a third party system (for e.g. as used by GBC) is likely to be : Set-up (capital) £60k; and annual revenue costs of £26k.</p> <p>Phase 3 – to be evaluated separately</p> <p><u>Overall cost 'options' to TMBC combining phases 1 and 2 are:</u></p> <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Option 1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Option 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Phase 1 plus</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Phase 1 plus</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">'In-house' Phase 2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">'third party' Phase 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">£</td> <td style="text-align: center;">£</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Capital:</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5,000</td> <td style="text-align: center;">65,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>One-off revenue costs:</td> <td style="text-align: center;">20,000</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ongoing revenue costs:</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5,000 per annum</td> <td style="text-align: center;">26,000 per annum</td> </tr> </table>						Option 1	Option 2		Phase 1 plus	Phase 1 plus		'In-house' Phase 2	'third party' Phase 2		£	£	Capital:	5,000	65,000	One-off revenue costs:	20,000	5,000	Ongoing revenue costs:	5,000 per annum	26,000 per annum
		Option 1	Option 2																								
	Phase 1 plus	Phase 1 plus																									
	'In-house' Phase 2	'third party' Phase 2																									
	£	£																									
Capital:	5,000	65,000																									
One-off revenue costs:	20,000	5,000																									
Ongoing revenue costs:	5,000 per annum	26,000 per annum																									
5	<p><b>Profiling of Expenditure (Capital and One-off Revenue)</b></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 20%;"></th> <th style="width: 15%;">2017/18 (£'000)</th> <th style="width: 15%;">2018/19 (£'000)</th> <th style="width: 15%;">2019/20 (£'000)</th> <th style="width: 15%;">2020/21 (£'000)</th> <th style="width: 15%;">2021/22 (£'000)</th> <th style="width: 15%;">2022/23 (£'000)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>£25k (option 1) Or £70k (option 2)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>						2017/18 (£'000)	2018/19 (£'000)	2019/20 (£'000)	2020/21 (£'000)	2021/22 (£'000)	2022/23 (£'000)	£25k (option 1) Or £70k (option 2)														
	2017/18 (£'000)	2018/19 (£'000)	2019/20 (£'000)	2020/21 (£'000)	2021/22 (£'000)	2022/23 (£'000)																					
£25k (option 1) Or £70k (option 2)																											

## CAPITAL PLAN LIST C – EVALUATIONS

6	<p><b>Capital Renewals Impact:</b></p> <p>Server has an asset life of circa <b>5 years</b> or annual renewal cost of £2k for which TMBC would be responsible for 50% (i.e £1k)</p>															
7	<p><b>Revenue Impact:</b></p> <p>As identified in 4. above, annual revenue costs required to be built into base budget will be dependent on the options selected for phase 2 .</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="309 555 2092 1059"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th data-bbox="719 555 972 719">Option 1 Phase 1 plus 'In-house' Phase 2 £</th> <th data-bbox="1234 555 1496 719">Option 2 Phase 1 plus 'third party' Phase 2 £</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 756 707 783">Annual licence/ support costs</td> <td data-bbox="797 756 875 783">5,000</td> <td data-bbox="1290 756 1379 783">26,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 791 539 818">Capital renewals</td> <td data-bbox="797 791 875 818">1,000</td> <td data-bbox="1301 791 1379 818">1,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 826 748 853">Loss of investment income (4%)</td> <td data-bbox="797 826 875 853">1,000</td> <td data-bbox="1301 826 1379 853">2,800</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 893 389 920">Total</td> <td data-bbox="797 893 875 920">7,000</td> <td data-bbox="1290 893 1379 920">29,800</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Option 1 Phase 1 plus 'In-house' Phase 2 £	Option 2 Phase 1 plus 'third party' Phase 2 £	Annual licence/ support costs	5,000	26,000	Capital renewals	1,000	1,000	Loss of investment income (4%)	1,000	2,800	Total	7,000	29,800
	Option 1 Phase 1 plus 'In-house' Phase 2 £	Option 2 Phase 1 plus 'third party' Phase 2 £														
Annual licence/ support costs	5,000	26,000														
Capital renewals	1,000	1,000														
Loss of investment income (4%)	1,000	2,800														
Total	7,000	29,800														
8	<p><b>Partnership Funding:</b></p> <p>Phase 1 - costs to be shared with GBC Phase 2 – TMBC will need to fund independently</p>															
9	<p><b>Post Implementation Review:</b></p> <p>12-18 months after implementation</p>															

## CAPITAL PLAN LIST C – EVALUATIONS

10	<b>Screening for equality impacts:</b>		
	<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Explanation of impacts</b>
	a. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper have potential to cause adverse impact or discriminate against different groups in the community?	No	It will open up further access channels for resident to communicate with the Council
	b. Does the decision being made or recommended through this paper make a positive contribution to promoting equality?	Yes	As above
	c. What steps are you taking to mitigate, reduce, avoid or minimise the impacts identified above?		<b>N/A</b>
11	<p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <p>At this stage the feasibility of in-house development for phase 2 is being considered against other priorities. Therefore for this purpose it is recommended that the costs based on third party support for phase 2 are approved with funding for the capital and one-off revenue costs being met from the Transformation Reserve. If in house development proves to be feasible, then this will mean that less funding needs to be provided from the Transformation Reserve.</p> <p>Revenue costs will be offset against savings from the shared service.</p> <p>Recommendation is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approve and transfer to List A</li> <li>• Update Capital Plan and Revenue Budget be updated accordingly with the capital and one-off revenue costs met from the Transformation Reserve</li> </ul>		

### Key Functionality Considerations

#### Requirements for the MyAccount solution in Revenues & Benefits

1	My Account Portal – a simple and intuitive system which drives customer self-service, encourages repeat usage making the web the first choice channel
2	Online account details / instalments – customers can view overall details of their accounts including discounts and exemptions, instalments and payments that have been made and that are due.
3	Electronic Bills/Letters – customer can view their bills and letters online Council Tax Bills (1st Annual & Ad Hoc) Business Rates Bills (1st Annual & Ad Hoc) Benefit Notification Letters (1st Annual & Ad Hoc) Council Tax Support Letters Landlord Notification Letters Landlord Schedules
4	Electronic correspondence (letters, statements) – customer can receive text and/or email notification when letters are updated on line.
5	Ability for customer service staff to view exactly the same information as the customer providing an enhanced service with calls answered faster and information easily accessible
6	Easy links to apply for a DD and to make a payment
7	Access to a suite of intelligent online forms that use autocomplete and conditional formatting logic, so that customers do not have to answer unnecessary questions or type in more information than they need to
8	Provides access to services that are mobile responsive natively and scale to multiple device, screen size and input types
9	E-Forms with the potential for future back office integration – customers can complete a form online which can be passed to Northgate Information@Work. In the future, it may be possible to upload directly to Northgate back office.
10	Ability to integrate into the councils corporate My Account solution
11	All services accessed through a single authentication. Federated authentication means other council services are accessible through a single login. Allows additional services to be linked as more become available
12	The solution must be accessible (as far as is possible) 24/7, to aid with contingency and resilience
13	Print suppression functionality to enable the suite of letters to be separated from bills that need to be printed and then made available electronically rather than posted. Printing will take place on either two sites or possibly through one
14	Details of IT staff resource needed for implementation and on an ongoing basis

In terms of savings and efficiency, it is anticipated that the following benefits will be realised;

- Provides a new channel for customers to contact us by
- Savings by migrating contact to a low cost channel.
- Single 24/7 access to accounts for customers
- Reduced contact to contact centre and back office including telephone calls, face to face and emails.
- Frees up resource to deal with complex contacts
- Easy and Intuitive to use
- Reduces paper, print, postage and administration
- Audit trail of users, signups and activity
- Customers can be signed up over the phone or face to face
- Wait times for telephone calls will decrease providing better service for customers
- Integrates with the corporate EDMS system

**Item SSE 17/5 referred from Street Scene and Environment Services  
Advisory Board minutes of 28 February 2017**

**SSE 17/5 INTRODUCTION OF CHARGES FOR FOOD HYGIENE RATING  
SCHEME RE-INSPECTION REQUESTS ON A COST RECOVERY  
BASIS**

The report of the Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health advised that the Food Standards Agency (FSA) had recently confirmed a change of policy which enabled local authorities to use existing powers within the Localism Act 2011 to introduce charges to recover the cost of re-inspection requests under the food hygiene rating scheme. Details of the proposed level of charge, which aligned the voluntary scheme in England to the statutory schemes in Wales and Scotland, were set out in the report.

**RECOMMENDED:** That Cabinet approve the introduction of a charge of £160.00 for a Food Hygiene Rating Scheme re-inspection.

**\*Referred to Cabinet**

This page is intentionally left blank

**TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**STREET SCENE and ENVIRONMENT SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD**

**20 June 2017**

**Report of the Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health Services**

**Part 1- Public**

**Matters for Recommendation to Cabinet - Non Key Decision**

**1 INTRODUCTION OF CHARGES FOR FOOD HYGIENE RATING SCHEME RE-INSPECTION REQUESTS ON A COST RECOVERY BASIS**

**Summary**

**This report proposes the introduction of charges for requested Food Hygiene Rating Scheme re-inspections/revisits.**

**1.1 Background**

1.1.1 The Food Hygiene Rating Scheme (FHRS) was introduced nationally by the Food Standards Agency (FSA) in 2010. Most businesses preparing and selling food fall within the scope of the scheme. Following a food hygiene inspection businesses are awarded a food hygiene rating of between zero and five. One of the scheme's safeguards allows businesses who have made improvements and wish to improve their rating to request a re-rating inspection. The FSA have recently confirmed a change in policy, enabling local authorities to use existing powers within the Localism Act 2011, to introduce cost recovery for requested FHRS re-inspections.

1.1.2 This proposed change aligns the voluntary scheme in England with the statutory schemes in Northern Ireland and Wales, both of which charge for requested re-inspections/re-visits.

**1.2 Current arrangements**

1.2.1 Following an inspection, a business is advised of its hygiene rating in writing. The covering letter explains how the hygiene rating has been calculated and explains where a business can obtain more information if they wish to appeal, request a re-inspection and/or provide a 'right of reply'. Food hygiene ratings are published on the food hygiene ratings website once the appeal and notification period have elapsed <http://ratings.food.gov.uk/> .

1.2.2 If a business requests a re-inspection, they must explain what they have done to improve hygiene conditions to enable the local authority to determine if they will re-inspect. There is a maximum wait of 6 months before the re-inspection takes place, consisting of a three month 'standstill' period, following which the local authority is given a further three months to carry out the re-inspection. The re-

inspection is unannounced and the business is informed that their rating may go up, down or remain the same.

### **1.3 Changes if fees are charged**

- 1.3.1 The appeal and right of reply safeguards continue to apply but the 'standstill' period no longer applies when a fee is charged. The requested re-inspection must therefore be carried out within 3 months of receipt of the request and fee. There is no limit on the number of requested re-inspections a business can make and the fee may be charged for each re-inspection. The local authority still has discretion as to whether or not to agree to a request.
- 1.3.2 Officers will continue to re-visit businesses to check compliance with food law. These re-visits are part of our statutory duties in-accordance with the Food Law Code of Practice and are not subject to charges and do not impact on the businesses hygiene rating.
- 1.3.3 Prior to any charges being introduced, our website will be updated and a press release issued to inform businesses. Letters informing businesses of their hygiene rating will also explain the new charges.

### **1.4 Legal Implications**

- 1.4.1 The FSA's view is that the adoption and implementation of the FHRS falls within the general power of competence, conferred by Section 1 of The Localism Act 2011. TMBC's solicitor has confirmed this position. The FSA considers that providing a re-inspection upon request by a food business operator, in circumstances where there is no statutory requirement to provide that re-inspection falls within the general power, too.

### **1.5 Financial and Value for Money Considerations**

- 1.5.1 The Welsh scheme charge £160 and Northern Ireland charge £150 for a re-inspection. This is on a cost recovery basis. Using guidance issued by HM Treasury we calculate our fee to be £160.00. This service is not subject to VAT charges.

### **1.6 Risk Assessment**

- 1.6.1 Food business operators are now aware that a good food hygiene rating is beneficial to their business particularly because consumers are increasingly aware of the scheme.
- 1.6.2 Since the introduction of the food hygiene rating scheme the Food & Safety Team have received on average 15 re-visit requests per year; so whilst we aren't able to predict the numbers of requests for re-inspections under the new system, operating on a cost recovery basis means that any additional demands on resource are paid for by the business.

## 1.7 Equality Impact Assessment

- 1.7.1 The decisions recommended through this paper have a remote or low relevance to the substance of the Equality Act. There is no perceived impact on end users.

## 1.8 Recommendations

- 1.8.1 It is **RECOMMENDED** that the cabinet **APPROVE** the introduction of a charge of £160.00 for a FHRS re-inspection.

Background papers:

contact: Melanie Henbest

Nil

Steve Humphrey

Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health

This page is intentionally left blank