

## **PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 20 January 2016

### **Present:**

Councillor Alexa Michael (Chairman)  
Councillor Chris Pierce (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillors David Cartwright, Will Harmer,  
Samaris Huntington-Thresher, Tom Philpott,  
Michael Tickner and Richard Williams

Terry Belcher, Dr Robert Hadley and Alf Kennedy

### **Also Present:**

Councillor Kate Lymer, Jim McGowan, Paul Lehane, Nigel  
Davies and Chris Hafford, Karen Ryan and Kate Frail

### **STANDARD ITEMS**

#### **37 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

Apologies were received from Cllr Julian Benington.

Apologies were received from Joanna Davidson from Victim Support, and  
Kate Frail attended as substitute.

#### **38 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr David Cartwright declared an interest as a member of the London Fire  
and Emergency Planning Authority.

#### **39 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING**

No questions were received.

#### **40 MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC PROTECTION AND SAFETY PDS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 3<sup>rd</sup> NOVEMBER 2015**

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting held on the 3<sup>rd</sup>  
November 2015.

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on the 3<sup>rd</sup> November  
2015 be agreed as a correct record.**

## **41 MATTERS ARISING**

Report CSD16015

Members considered matters arising from previous meetings.

The Committee noted that an update on the Counter Terrorism and Security Act 2015 would be brought to Members at the March meeting.

The Chairman updated the Committee on numbers involved with Community Payback to date. The Community Rehabilitation Company had reported that a "Payback" group ran one day per week and allocated 8 places per team. On average, they expected 32 service users on a 4 week month and 40 on a five week month.

The Head of Environmental Protection updated the Committee with details of arrangements made by other boroughs concerning charges levied for CCTV evidential packages.

It was noted that most boroughs levied a £10.00 basic fee under the Data Protection Act. There were a few boroughs that charged a supplementary fee for further information. LBB were charging a supplementary fee of £50.00 in addition to the initial £10.00 fee. There was a borough that charged £100.00. for supplementary evidential packages. The opinion was that the charges were legal, but this would be confirmed by obtaining formal legal advice.

Mr McGowan updated the Committee concerning CCTV problems that had arisen over the previous week. It was clarified that an engineer had accidentally blown a CCTV server. The part was immediately returned to the manufacturer for urgent repair. The part was swiftly repaired and re-fitted, with the intention that it be back up and running for the Friday evening. Cllr Cartwright asked what the cost for this was. No cost fell to LBB, the engineering company responsible for the error would be covering any costs.

Cllr Cartwright requested that the information concerning food allergens be re-sent.

**RESOLVED that the Matters Arising report be noted.**

## **42 CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE**

The Chairman updated the Committee as follows:

The Chairman attended the Bromley Youth Council Executive on Thursday 17th December where the members of Bromley Youth Council gave an update on their Young People and Public Transport project. They will be making a verbal report on the project at the March meeting of the Public Protection & Safety PDS.

The Re-Opening Ceremony of Orpington Fire Station will take place on Wednesday 17th February 2016.

The Chairman was greatly relieved to hear the news that Metropolitan Police budgets were not being cut back in this year's Budget as public safety was paramount, especially at present where extra resources were needed in the fight against terrorism.

**RESOLVED that the Chairman's update be noted.**

#### **43 POLICE UPDATE**

The Police update was provided by the Borough Commander.

The Committee were updated on how MOPAC 7 offences were performing against the financial year baseline of 2011/12. At the previous meeting it was reported that the overall crime figures had decreased by 16.5%. It was reported at this meeting that the overall crime figures had decreased by 17.2%.

The Borough Commander expected that Bromley Police would end the five year period with a final overall reduction in crime of between 18 and 18.3%. Currently the MET was sitting at 18.4%.

It was noted that there had been a substantial decrease in the number of burglaries. There had been an overall reduction to date in these offences of 25.8%. This had resulted in a net decrease in burglaries of 900 per annum.

Violence with Injury offences had increased; and the current statistics showed that over the five year period to date, the figures had increased by 8.2%. Robbery offences had decreased, with an overall reduction for the period of 48.2%.

Theft from persons had increased by 5.6% over the five year period. Bromley had experienced an increase in the rate of offences involving the theft of motor vehicles. Over the five year period, this had increased by 3.8%. Bromley had the highest rate of TOMV in London in the last twelve months. There was a particular problem with the theft of mopeds. Similarly, during October and November, Bromley had the highest number of vans stolen in London. The Crays was a hotspot for this type of crime. The Borough Commander was of the opinion that vans were being taken to be used in other crimes, and to be taken to "chopping shops". A "chopping shop" was a location where vehicles were taken to be dismantled for parts. Kate Frail commented that many of the clients that she had dealt with had their vehicles stolen

Theft from motor vehicles was decreasing, and decoy operations were being used. This offence had decreased by 31.1% over the five year period.

Bromley Police were waiting for new targets that would be made known after the Mayoral Elections in May.

The response times to emergency calls were still good. “1” calls were responded to within 15 minutes on 90% of occasions. Calls that required a response within 60 minutes were 91.5% on target. The Police were also measured with respect to how much confidence was placed in them by the public; this had increased by 72%.

There had been an incident in the INTU Shopping Centre on Boxing Day. There were initial fears that this was a terrorist related incident, but this was not the case. It was in fact a gang related incident. One offender had been detained at the scene, and had been charged with violent disorder and the possession of an offensive weapon. A second offender was similarly charged after being treated in hospital for a stab wound. A third suspect had been detained and bailed. The investigation was ongoing. The Borough Commander praised Intu Staff.

Over the Christmas period there were also incidents where pigs were loose on the A21 and there had been a major gas leak in Crystal Palace which had resulted in people being evacuated from the area.

Work was progressing in Bromley schools to educate children concerning the dangers of associating with gangs, and to deter them from getting involved. There were currently three officers in the Gangs Team, dealing with various matters, including cross border issues and enforcement. The Committee heard that Gang activity included the “running” of drugs to different geographical areas, including Portsmouth and Norwich. It was noted that at the next meeting of the Safer Neighbourhood Board in Chislehurst, there would be a Gang presentation.

The Borough Commander updated Members concerning the rollout of “Met Trace”, and stated that Bromley Police had a target rollout of 3822 by the end of March. The Police had rolled out 2546 to date, with 460 refusals. The product was being rolled out in St Mary Cray, Anerley and Crystal Palace.

The Committee were informed that it was likely that the local policing structure would change, that it would not be borough based, but would be part of a BCU (Basic Command Unit) structure. A Basic Command Unit was the largest unit into which territorial British Police forces could be divided. Most forces were divided into at least three BCUs and some had many more. Most BCUs were further subdivided into smaller units. The BCU was usually commanded by a Chief Superintendent.

Neighbourhood policing was still in place, as well as youth policing and Town Centre Teams. It was the case that some elements of the new policing model had been implemented, and this would be expanded upon in March.

Cllr David Cartwright asked how the MET’s aim of increasing the number of armed response officers would affect Bromley police. The Borough

Commander answered that this was unclear at the present time. It was possible that the number of Armed Response Units may double, and that there would be an increase in the number of officers that could be routinely armed.

The Portfolio Holder raised the matter of Voluntary Appropriate Adults (VAA's). These were being used in Hounslow, and she asked if they were being used in Bromley. The Borough Commander responded that they were provided to the Police by a third party organisation. The Portfolio Holder suggested that information concerning VAA's be disseminated in the next edition of the Safer Bromley News to encourage further volunteers.

The Chairman thanked the Borough Commander for his comprehensive update.

**RESOLVED that the Police update be noted.**

#### **44 VICTIM SUPPORT PRESENTATION**

The Victim Support update was given by Kate Frail—Service Delivery Manager for Bromley and Lewisham.

Ms Frail managed a total of 15 volunteers and caseworkers. Currently there was a concerted recruitment drive for volunteers. She informed the Committee that VS dealt with all victims of crime, this ranged from theft to murder. VS had a dedicated Homicide Team. VS did not provide counselling, but did provide emotional support, and all of their staff were trained.

Meetings with victims took place in a variety of locations, which included the victim's home, VS offices, or rooms in other locations in the community. Victim Support was working in partnership with Safer Neighbourhood Boards, ASB Panels, the Gangs Unit and Community Links. VS wanted to set up Victim Impact Training Days, and outreach sites that would provide ease of access for victims. She was hoping to establish outreach sites at Bromley Civic Centre, Bromley Library, Bromley Police Station, Bromley Fire Station, Citizen's Advice Bureau and Children's Centres.

The Borough Commander offered a room at Bromley Police Station, and it was heard that a room had also been offered by the Borough Fire Commander. Cllr Richard Williams also offered help in locating a room if required.

Ms Frail referred to the Safer Bromley Van (SBV) scheme. Victims of burglary who had been visited by the Safer Bromley Van normally avoided a repeat attack. The service was sponsored by the Safer Bromley Partnership, and was run by VS. The SBV Service provided a home survey to give crime prevention advice, with specific focus on windows and doors.

Victim Support representatives went to court with victims if requested, and provided advocacy services. The contact numbers for Ms Frail were:

0208 776 7071--Penge

0208 698 4583--Lewisham

[kate.frail@victimsupport.org.uk](mailto:kate.frail@victimsupport.org.uk)

Members were keen to visit the VS offices and the Chairman asked Ms Frail to provide some suitable dates to the Committee Clerk.

**RESOLVED that the Victim Support update be noted.**

#### **45            REVIEW OF SBP STRATEGIC GROUP MINUTES**

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting of the Safer Bromley Partnership Strategic Group that had met on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2015.

Cllr Chris Pierce referred the Committee to Section 59 of the minutes relating to ASB (page 29). The ASB update stated that it had been resolved that action be taken to resolve the problem of fly tipping at Star Lane urgently. No "Actioner" had been designated for this. Cllr Pierce asked for an update.

The Executive Director for Environment and Community Services stated that this was a multi council action that was being delivered in conjunction with the Police. It was something that would require monitoring, and that Dan Jones and Environmental Services were leading. An action plan was being pulled together with Police support.

Cllr Michael Tickner asked if CCTV could be used to monitor fly tipping. This was unclear and required clarification. Cllr Pierce stated that he was not a supporter of attempting to monitor fly tipping via CCTV. He cited the example of long country lanes where there would be numerous places to fly tip; he expressed the view that in such locations attempting to monitor fly tipping via CCTV would be ineffective.

The Chairman questioned the Chairman's Update (minute 45) which seemed to suggest that the Police were "allowed" six burglaries a day. The Chief Superintendent reassured her that no burglaries were "allowed" – six burglaries was the number of burglaries that would occur before the target 20% reduction in burglary crime was taken into account.

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Safer Bromley Partnership Strategic Group be noted.**

#### **HOLDING THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER TO ACCOUNT**

#### **46            QUESTIONS TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS ATTENDING THE MEETING**

There were no questions from Councillors or Members of the Public.

**A) STRAY AND ABANDONED DOG SERVICE**

Report ES16001

The report on the Stray and Abandoned Dog Service was presented by the Head of Environmental Protection.

A number of recommendations to the service had been made following a recent Audit report that had been presented to the Audit Sub Committee. This report summarised two of these recommendations relating to kennelling/ re-homing arrangements and the management action being taken. It also made recommendations to Members regarding policies for dealing with dogs confirmed as being a 'banned breed' or deemed unsuitable for re-homing and those that were fit for re-homing but had exceeded the statutory timescale for Local Authority care.

The Committee heard that the Council had statutory obligations to provide a stray and abandoned dog service to comply with the duties prescribed under the Environmental Protection Act 1990, and the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act–Section 68. LBB used SDK Environmental Ltd to collect stray dogs, and the dogs would then be kennelled with Lodge Kennels.

It was previously the case that advance block bookings were made with the kennel to ensure vacant kennel space. This practice would now cease, and kennels would be booked on a pay as you go basis as required.

The previous Audit report had also recommended that the arrangements for re-homing stray dogs be reviewed and formalised. There were two re-homing scenarios to be considered:

- a) A banned breed or a dog unsuitable for re-homing
- b) A healthy dog that could be re-homed, but that had exceeded the statutory timescale for local authority care

The current practice was that dogs that were either a banned breed or unsuitable for re-homing were humanely destroyed. The cost of euthanasia, transportation and disposal was currently £100 per dog. The report recommended that LBB continue with this practice, and that it be formally adopted as a policy.

The Committee considered the current LBB practice concerning healthy dogs (suitable for re-homing) that had exceeded the statutory timescale for Local Authority Care. The current practice was to continue to kennel and re-home these dogs even though LBB had no statutory obligation to do so. The alternate option was to euthanize the dogs at day eight, after the seven day statutory duty had expired. The Committee were pleased to hear that a new

arrangement was being negotiated with Battersea Dogs and Cats Home (BDCH) whereby healthy dogs that could be re-homed could be placed with them for a cost of £40.00 per dog. Contingency plans were in place to cover any instances when Battersea Dogs and Cats Home would not be able to take a dog.

The Chairman asked why LBB had to kennel a banned breed for 7 days if it was as going to be destroyed anyway. Mr McGowan answered that “banned breeds” could still be owned. If a member of the public produced the appropriate documentation, they could still claim the dog. Cllr Richard Williams asked if LBB had made contact with the Dog’s Trust, as the Trust had a policy not to euthanize healthy dogs. Mr McGowan pointed out that LBB would not enter into such an agreement, as LBB would be responsible for ongoing and possibly long term kennelling costs. He noted that in future it would be a legal requirement for all dogs to be chipped, and this should make it easier to return dogs to their owners.

Cllr Chris Pierce asked how the distinction would be made between banned breeds and cross breeds. Mr McGowan responded that this could be done by the Police, BDCH, or a Government recognised vet. The Kennels would be asked on day 4 to establish if the dog was a banned breed, or a cross breed.

The Chairman asked if LBB encouraged responsible dog ownership. Mr McGowan stated that this was indeed the case, and that LBB had in the past undertaken promotions with the Dogs’ Trust, BDCH and with LBB’s contractor. More such initiatives were planned for the summer.

Cllr Samaris Huntington Thresher asked about the SDK website. She asked if this was a website that the public were aware of, and if they could register their dog’s details on the site. She felt that it would be a good idea if the public could register with either the SDK or LBB website, input details of their dog, and get an automatic check for a match. Mr McGowan informed that the public were not able to do this at present, but this was a matter that he would discuss with the contractor.

Mr McGowan explained that the extra cost of re-homing dogs at current rates instead of destroying them was minimal. He also explained to the Committee that destroying healthy dogs may cause reputational damage, and damage relationships with contractors.

He recommended that the Portfolio Holder formally adopt the existing euthanasia and re-homing practices at an estimated cost of £8,400 based on the previous year’s figures. These costs would be contained within the existing £169,140 budget for dog contracts.

## **RESOLVED**

**(1) that the PDS Committee note the recommendations of the audit report, and the management action being taken to implement the recommendations**



**(2) that the existing practice of euthanasia for dogs that were either a banned breed or unsuitable for re-homing, be adopted as a formal policy**

**(3) that the existing practice of kennelling dogs deemed fit to be re-homed that have not been claimed after the statutory period be adopted as a formal policy**

**B) CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - 2ND QUARTER 2015/16**

Report FSD1608

The Committee considered the Capital Programme Monitoring—2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter report for 2015/16.

The Committee noted that on the 15<sup>th</sup> July 2015, the Executive had agreed a revised CCTV capital programme valued at £340k. This was reviewed again by the Executive on 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2015, and the costs remained unchanged.

No further capital programme schemes were currently planned for the Public Protection and Safety Portfolio. It was noted that under approved Capital Programme procedures, the CCTV capital programme scheme would be subject to a post completion review within one year of completion, and a report concerning this would be presented to the PDS Committee at that time.

**RESOLVED that the Portfolio Holder note and endorse the CCTV Capital Programme agreed by the Executive in December 2015.**

**47 DRAFT 2016/17 BUDGET**

FSD 16009

The Committee considered the Draft 2016/17 Budget report written by the Head of Finance.

The aim of the report was to consider the Portfolio Holder's Draft 2016/17 Budget which anticipated future cost pressures and initial draft budget saving options. Members were requested to consider the initial draft budget savings proposed and to identify any further action that might be taken to reduce cost pressures facing the Council over the next four years.

The Executive were requesting that each PDS Committee consider the proposed initial draft budget savings and cost pressures for their Portfolio, and the views of each PDS Committee be reported back to the next meeting of the Executive. The Executive would subsequently make recommendations to Council on 2016/17 Council Tax levels.

The Committee noted from the report that additional details concerning funding was anticipated, and so caution was to be exercised in considering

future projections. The Committee identified that a significant issue that would impact on local government funding from central government was the planned reductions to the DCLG Resource Departmental Expenditure Limits.

To compensate for significant funding cuts to local government, the Government had introduced new flexibilities such as increased revenue from business rates, the adult social care council tax precept, and the ongoing ability to raise council tax.

The Committee were directed to the table on page 51 of the agenda, dealing with "Variations Compared with the 2015/16 Budget". The table outlined various sources of cost pressure, as well as projected income and savings. The Committee were concerned that despite concerted efforts to generate income and make savings, there was a projected budget gap in 2019/20 of £26.7m.

The Committee noted Appendix 1A which was the draft revenue budget 2016/17 for the Public Protection & Safety Portfolio. It was noted that the 2016/17 draft budget for the Portfolio was £2,016,420.

**RESOLVED that the initial draft 2016/17 budget be agreed as the basis for setting the 2016/17 budget.**

#### **48            REVIEW OF FOOD SAFETY SERVICE**

ES 16008

The Review of the Food Safety Service report was written and presented by Dr Paul Lehane, Head of Food Safety, Occupational Safety and Licensing. Karen Ryan (Food Lead Practitioner) also attended to answer questions. Mr Lehane commenced by stating that we took food for granted. He also referred to Maslow's "Hierarchy of Needs", where food was classified as one of the basic biological and physiological needs for humans.

The report reviewed the role and performance of the Food Safety Service, and set out the Council's legal (statutory) roles and responsibilities under both domestic and European law--in the context of the local, national and international regulatory regimes. Mr Lehane stated that it was a frank and honest report. The Food Safety Team were managing and doing a good job but were struggling with a backlog of work due to a lack of resource. The Service was not broken, but it would not take much to break it.

The Committee were informed that the primary objective of the Food Standards Agency (FSA) was to protect public health from risks which may arise from the consumption of food. This included risks caused by the way in which food was produced and supplied. It also had a generic remit to protect the interests of consumers in relation to food. The FSA was the lead body set up in 2000, and LBB were a statutory food authority. The FSA aimed to ensure that:

- Food was safe, and is what it was supposed to be
- The public had access to an affordable diet
- The public would be able to make informed choices about what to eat

The Committee were concerned at the statistics concerning the number of people in the UK that were hospitalised each year by food poisoning, and that in many cases these incidences resulted in fatalities. It was also the case that much food was mislabelled.

The Committee were troubled to hear that evidence suggested that increasing pressures on the food supply system meant that food security and sustainability for the future would be more volatile.

Mr Lehane explained to the Committee that the main role of LBB's Food Safety Team was to enforce food safety law. The food laws that required enforcing were:

- Food Safety Act 1990
- Food Hygiene & Safety (England) Regulations 2013
- Official Feed and Food Controls (England) Regulations 2009
- Plus 50 additional statutes.

The Committee heard that the key responsibilities of the Food Safety Team were:

- To register food businesses
- To approve certain types of business
- To maintain accurate records
- To appoint competent staff
- To prepare an annual Food Safety Plan
- To make inspections and take enforcement action if required
- To investigate complaints
- To sample food for analysis
- To provide advice and guidance for businesses
- To Promote food safety

Mr Lehane informed the Committee of activities that were no longer undertaken as a result of savings made during 2015.

Five Key facts were drawn from the report which were:

- There were approximately 2300 food businesses in Bromley
- This figure was growing at the rate of 190 per annum
- The Food Safety Team had a target of 720 inspections
- The Team was staffed by 4.5fte Inspecting Officers
- Last year, the Food Safety Team achieved 69% of inspections due.

The Committee were informed that in Bromley, Food Safety Inspectors were tasked with inspecting 535 premises each; this compared adversely with LB Greenwich, where the figure was just 294 per inspector. However, it was probable that in the future the statistics would lean more favourably towards LBB as cuts in other boroughs took effect.

Mr Lehane referred the Committee to a table detailing current statistics concerning risk based inspections. The Committee noted that 716 inspections were due, 606 inspections were overdue, and 399 inspections had been undertaken. There were no overdue inspections for those premises that had the most serious risk rating of “A”.

Mr Lehane explained the Food Hygiene Rating Scoring System. The conclusions drawn from this was that in Bromley 11.4% of food businesses were classed as “non-compliant” and 88.6% were designated as “compliant”. These figures were better than comparable figures for LB Lewisham, but not as good as LB Bexley or Greenwich.

Mr Lehane outlined some of the highlights for 2015 in terms of Prohibition Notices, Seizure of Food, Voluntary Surrender, Prosecutions and Closure Notices. Mr Lehane informed the Committee that prosecutions were labour intensive.

Mr Lehane explained that due to cutbacks and lack of resources the Food Safety Team would struggle to address the backlog of inspections, and complete the target for new inspections this year. It was the case that without additional resourcing, the Food Safety Team would continue to fail the FSA inspection requirements. If the FSA were concerned about the performance of the LBB Food Safety Team, they could decide to make a formal audit of the food safety service. If there were significant failings the FSA could formally intervene. Mr Lehane posed the rhetorical question as to whether or not the requirements of the FSA were still reasonable in the current climate.

As well as not meeting the FSA inspection targets, other consequences arising from a lack of resources were:

- Some low risk businesses were not being inspected
- Advice and guidance was no longer being provided other than via the website
- Not all complaints were investigated
- Decisions about formal action were based on higher risk and on the impact on the service

The Chairman commented that she appreciated that the Food Safety Team was doing as well as they could in difficult circumstances, and noted that adjoining boroughs would also face cuts. She expressed concern around the risks posed with food inspections not being undertaken. Cllr Richard Williams asked why “Mr Meat” had not been closed down as the breaches in food safety appeared to be serious. Karen Ryan answered that breaches had to be very serious to cause a premises to close. In the case of Mr Meat, the

business was prosecuted but the breaches were not serious enough to force closure. A Code of Practice had to be followed by the Food Safety Team. Mr Lehane elaborated that for a premises to close, there would need to be a serious and imminent threat to public health. It was also the case that a magistrate had to confirm the closure, and that this was subject to challenge.

Cllr Richard Williams noted previous food safety issues concerning Crystal Palace Market, and also the fact that they were going to apply for an alcohol license. He asked if LBB were going to object. Mr Lehane stated that LBB could not object to an alcohol license based on previous food safety issues. There would need to be objections in the usual manner from the normal statutory authorities.

Cllr Michael Tickner congratulated the Food Safety Team on all of their hard work. He asked if LBB were notified about mobile food vendors and if they were inspected. The response was that if the mobile vendor was trading in Bromley, then LBB should be notified, and they would be inspected.

Cllr William Harmer asked about premises selling kebabs. He asked if the way that meat was reheated, was a food safety issue. He also felt that there was a cross over between food safety issues and obesity. Kate Ryan stated that meat on the top of the kebab joint was cut away as it was being heated, so the only meat that was being heated at any given moment was new meat that had not been reheated previously. Mr Lehane stated that the Food Safety Team did not have the resources to work with Public Health on health eating campaigns. The Chairman asked if the Food Safety Team could work with schools to promote healthy eating; Mr Lehane responded that Public Health would have strategies for this.

Cllr Samaris Huntington Thresher asked how long it would take for businesses with a low safety rating to be re-inspected. Karen Ryan stated that it would depend on the specific rating, but they would be flagged for a revisit proactively. Cllr Thresher expressed the view that businesses that had been classed as non-compliant should be reinspected for compliance as soon as possible.

Cllr Thresher raised the issue of questionnaires and wondered if there was a way to speed up the processing of such by using a web based system, and by encouraging businesses to be proactive in the process. Karen Ryan stated that a web based process existed.

Cllr Williams asked if the Food Safety Team had the right to act against mobile food vendors in markets. Karen Ryan answered that the Food Safety Team could act against them on the day if they were on LBB land.

The Chairman noted that one of the Food Safety Team Inspectors was pregnant and asked if cover was being arranged. Mr Lehane stated that he was looking for a replacement, and that the Department aimed to maintain flexibility. He could be required to do some juggling to support the team—as

well as the staff member that was pregnant, he had another member of staff that was very ill.

The Chairman asked what the effect would be on food safety law if there was an exit from the EU. It was explained that British Laws were similar to EU Laws and so it would be anticipated that if there was an exit from the EU, this would not make much difference to the way the service operated.

The Chairman enquired if the FSA could force the Council to put more money into the Food Safety Team if there was an unsuccessful audit. Mr Lehane responded that the FSA would probably make directives and suggest an action plan. They could take over the service, but this was unlikely.

The Chairman recommended that:

- If extra funding became available, it should be directed to the Food Safety Team
- Enquiries be made to see if any resources from Public Health could be used to assist the Food Safety Team
- A policy of healthy eating in schools should be promoted
- The Council should work with the Health Authority in the fight against obesity

Cllr Cartwright referred to the possible consequences arising from the difficulties being faced by the Food Safety Team. He expressed the view that these consequences could be stark and were worrying. He asked the Portfolio Holder to consider if the Executive had been made aware of the risks. The Portfolio Holder noted Cllr Cartwright's concerns, but added that there had been cuts in most areas of the Public Protection budget, and they all posed potential risks. She agreed to bring the matter to the attention of the Executive as requested, and to feed back to the Committee at the next meeting.

Cllr Samaris Huntington Thresher advocated the use of an invest to save approach where possible. She felt that resources should be directed to where savings could be made, and encouraged the use of automation and web based technology where possible.

## **RESOLVED**

**(1) that the report outlining the Review of the Food Safety Service be noted**

**(2) that the Portfolio Holder report back to the Committee with proposed actions at the next meeting**

**49 WORK PROGRAMME AND CONTRACTS REGISTER**

CSD 16016

The Committee noted and reviewed the current Work Programme.

The Committee noted the Public Protection and Safety Contracts Register Summary.

**RESOLVED that the Work Programme and Contracts Register report be noted.**

**50 PPS/PDS VISITS**

The Committee noted that they had been invited to the formal opening of the refurbished fire station in Orpington on 17<sup>th</sup> February 2016.

**51 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

The Committee noted that the next meeting was scheduled for March 2<sup>nd</sup> 2016.

The Meeting ended at 9.15 pm

Chairman