

Food Hygiene / Food Standards / Health & Safety Inspection Report

This inspection report covers only the areas inspected at the time of the inspection. It does not indicate compliance with any provision of the relevant food safety or health and safety law. It is not a notice requiring works to be carried out. All items marked 'L' are legal requirements and 'R' recommendations for best practice. Please note this schedule of works is NOT exhaustive but list those items which are obvious at the time of the visit. You are reminded the obligation rests with the business to ensure compliance with all legal requirements.

Ref: CP/01169	Date: 26/6/19	Time In: 3:05	Time Out:
Full/Partial Inspection	Revisit Requested	Complaint	Other:
Name of Business: Shoppers R.V.			
Address: 11 Edgwarebury Lane, HAS RH.			
Telephone / mobile number / Email			
Registered Address (if different):			
Business Operator: T & S Bakery Ltd		Business Type: Bakery	
Person(s) seen/interviewed: [Redacted]		Position: Accountant	

Documents / Records Examined

Food Safety Documents

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> HACCP/FSMS/SFBB | <input type="checkbox"/> Training Records |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pest control reports | <input type="checkbox"/> Suppliers Invoices |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cleaning Schedule | <input type="checkbox"/> Import documents |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Temperature records | <input type="checkbox"/> Documents |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Waste transfer notes e.g. Oil / Animal by products | <input type="checkbox"/> Allergen Information |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Other Documents |

Health & Safety Documents

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Induction & Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Maintenance Records |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Risk Assessment | <input type="checkbox"/> Fork Lift Trucks |
| <input type="checkbox"/> COSHH assessments | <input type="checkbox"/> Accident Records |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gas/Electrical certification | |

Areas Inspected:

Bakery / Staff car / Rear walk-in chiller / Dr. Port

Samples Taken:

Inspection Outcome

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Advice – verbal/written | <input type="checkbox"/> Service of Detention/Seizure Notice |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Inspection report & schedule – (left on site) | <input type="checkbox"/> Service of Improvement Notice/s |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Written Warning letter and schedule – (to follow) | <input type="checkbox"/> Premises closure formal/voluntary |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Consideration of legal action |

FOOD HYGIENE RATING

Food Hygiene Rating – Criteria Assessed

Food Hygiene Rating – Criteria Assessed	Annex 5 Score
Compliance with food hygiene and safety procedures	15
Compliance with structural requirements	10
Confidence in management/control procedures	10
Total Score	35
Food Hygiene Rating	2.

N.B If your Total Score is greater than 0 please refer to the Inspection Report Schedule of Works

Has the officer clearly explained to you the outcome of this inspection so that you understand what you need to do (if anything) and why when? Yes ☐ No ☐

Inspecting Officer (print)

Position: **Env. Health Officer**

Inspecting Officer (Signature):

Officer email: **[Redacted]@barnet.gov.uk**

Person seen (print):

Officer telephone: 020 8359 **[Redacted]**

Person seen (signature):

Position: **FCO**

If you wish to discuss any items relating to this inspection report, please contact the inspecting officer. If your concerns remain unresolved or you should like to discuss other matters regarding the visit, please contact the Team Leader on: 020 8359 7453. The Council's 'Complaints Procedure and Enforcement Policy' is available at: www.barnet.gov.uk

FOOD HYGIENE RATING

This authority operates the national Food Hygiene Rating Scheme. This is designed to help consumers choose where to eat out or shop for food by giving them information about the hygiene standards in food outlets at the time they are inspected. Your rating has been calculated on the basis of the standards found at the time of inspection. Your inspection report outlines the inspector's findings and highlights the priority actions and improvements that are needed to ensure that you are complying with the Food Safety & Hygiene (England) Regulations 2013.

A sticker showing your rating following your recent inspection will be given at the time of the inspection or sent in due course. You can tell your customers how good your hygiene standards are by placing the sticker in the window/door. If you do not have a suitable glass surface, you can request a wall sticker. You must remove and destroy the sticker/certificate showing your previous rating. Only one rating – the most recent rating – should be displayed. To continue to display a previous rating may constitute an offence under the Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008. Your Food Hygiene Rating will also be published on the Food Standards Agency's website at: www.food.gov.uk/ratings within three and five weeks from receiving this letter.

Safeguards







If you think that the rating is wrong or unfair – in other words it does not reflect the hygiene standards at the time of your inspection – you have 21 days in which you can **appeal** against this. You should appeal in writing to the Lead Officer for Food at Environmental Health, 9th Floor Barnet House, 1255 High Road, London, N20 0EJ but I would recommend that you get in touch with me first so that I can help you to understand how your rating was worked out.

If you have improved hygiene standards since your inspection, or if there were unusual circumstances at the time of the inspection that might have affected your food hygiene rating, you have a '**right to reply**' so that you can explain this to potential customers that look up your rating online.

If you make the improvements to hygiene standards that are highlighted in your inspection report, you can **request a re-visit** with a view to giving you a new and higher food hygiene rating. There will be a charge of £185 for each re-visit carried out at your request. The re-visit will be carried out within three months of receipt of your application and payment. Payment can be made card by telephoning 020 8359 7995 or by cheque made payable to London Borough of Barnet.

More information about these safeguards and the form to be completed to request a re-visit can be found on the FSA's website at: <http://www.food.gov.uk/multimedia/pdfs/enforcement/fhrssafeguards.pdf>

How is your food hygiene rating calculated?

Total Score	0 – 15	20	25 – 30	35 – 40	45 – 50	>50
Highest Permitted Individual score	5	10	10	15	25	
Rating						

NOTICE OF OUR POWERS

Under the following legislation, Food safety Act 1990, Food Safety & Hygiene Regulations 2013, Health & Safety at Work etc Act 1974 and Regulation EC No. 178/2002 an authorised Officer may at all reasonable (when open to trade) times on production of his/her identification, enter any business premises under the legislation listed below for the purpose of inspection and/or enforcement. Admissions to a private dwelling (home) shall not be demanded unless 24 hour notice of the intended entry is given to the occupier.

SUMMARY OF YOUR RIGHTS

For further details, please refer to the following:

1. Food law inspections and your businesses (Food Standards Agency)
2. What to expect when a health and safety inspector calls (Health and Safety Executive)
3. London Borough of Barnet Enforcement Policy

These rights, which are taken from Code B of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (Code of Practice for the Search of Premises and the Seizure of Property Found on Persons or Premises) (the 'Code'), provides a mechanism whereby you may be entitled to compensation for any damage caused as a result of the inspection.

BUSINESS TRADING NAME & ADDRESS:-

Sharon's, 11 Edgwarebury Lane,

SCHEDULE OF WORKS REQUIRED

HAB 8/H.

TIME SCALE(S)
FOR COMPLIANCE

C= CONTRAVENTION

R= RECOMMENDATION

C or R

A visit was made today in response to your requested visit.

I did not find that "everything" as stated on your Request for a to visit form, was correct.

The following matters were found:

(1) Staff W.C.

Wash hand basin blocked with tissue paper.

Please provide a small bin for waste paper in the W.C. cubicle.

(2) Dry Store.

Spillages of flour are still visible on the plastic pallet was also dirty & needs to be cleaned.

The dry-store is filled with sacks of flour to the ceiling & at least 2 sacks deep - you must be able to clean the dry store regularly. Such cleaning must be recorded & verifiable; if not already provided provide cleaning schedule for main floor that need to be cleaned on a daily, weekly & monthly basis.

Signature of person seen:-

Signature of Officer

Revisit

☐ Yes ☐ No

HEALTH & SAFETY RISK RATING FORM

Confidence in Management

Rating	Descriptor
1	Best Practice: Management know the relevant health and safety standards, have put them into effect and check they are applied correctly. There is clear evidence of effective self-regulation with standards being monitored and refined. Full compliance with the approach listed in HSG65 and/or MAST 45ME's.
2	Strong evidence that management are up to the task: Management generally enthusiastic and competent with either: effective systems in place for other business processes (e.g. quality assurance) but with knowledge gaps for health and safety requirements, or good health and safety knowledge with systems requiring improvement. There is potential for good performance and reasonable compliance with the HSG65 approach and/or MAST 45ME's.
3	Some evidence management are up to the task: Management are knowledgeable about relevant health and safety standards but there has been little effort to adopt a proactive approach to health and safety management. However, senior managers volunteer their thoughts as the inspection progresses and appear to be committed to adopting a more proactive approach. There is general confidence that the recommendations resulting from the inspection will be put into place.
4	Management are ambivalent about health and safety: Management have only a certain amount of knowledge of relevant standards and there is little or no evidence that a proactive approach to ongoing health and safety management has been adopted. However, senior managers recognise the need to satisfy explicit statutory requirements and there is some prospect that a more proactive approach may be adopted in future. Limited involvement of workers in health and safety management. There is some confidence that the recommendations resulting from the inspection will be put into place.
5	Management are not up to the task: Management have significant shortcomings in their knowledge of relevant standards. Management do not appear to be willing to instigate a proactive approach and have not recognised that health and safety is an issue where they need to be personally involved. There is uncertainty as to how they will respond to the findings from the inspection.
6	Management avoid the task and/or connive in cutting corners: There is a negative approach to accepting legal duties and management dispute the relevance or validity of recognised benchmark standards. Totally ineffective in the management of health and safety. The findings from the inspection are likely to be ignored.

Health performance

Rating	Descriptor
1	High standards of compliance. Some aspects meet best practice as outlined in industry standards, ACOP's etc
2	Good standards. Minimum legal requirements have been met but little evidence that elements of best practice have been adopted.
3	One or more minor shortcomings. Minimum legal requirements could be met with a little more effort. Since these shortcomings are not serious, they can be dealt with informally via a verbal warning and/or provision of advice.
4	Standards are variable but lower than the benchmark standard. It is necessary to address one or more shortcomings (which are not minor) by giving formal instructions for remedial action to be taken e.g. sending a warning letter.
5	Standards generally unsatisfactory. There is at least one contravention that gives rise to either a substantial or extreme risk gap and formal intervention (i.e. Notice) is required to achieve improvement in standards. Risks are not being adequately controlled.
6	Standards unacceptable. A disregard for expected standards and/or significant breaches has been observed and/or could be expected. Extreme risk gap present as defined by EMM. Unless application of the EMM identifies duty holder factors that provide strong mitigation, issuing a notice or prosecution is likely to be appropriate.

Safety Performance

Rating	Descriptor
1	High standards of compliance. Some aspects meet best practice as outlined in industry standards, Approved Codes Of Practice (ACOP's) etc
2	Good standards. Minimum legal requirements have been met but little evidence that elements of best practice have been adopted.
3	One or more minor shortcomings. Minimum legal requirements could be met with a little more effort. Since these shortcomings are not serious, they can be dealt with informally via a verbal warning and/or provision of advice.
4	Standards are variable but lower than the benchmark standard. It is necessary to address one or more shortcomings (which are not minor) by giving formal instructions for remedial action to be taken e.g. sending a letter.
5	Standards generally unsatisfactory. There is at least one contravention that gives rise to either a substantial or extreme risk gap (as defined by EMM). Formal intervention is required to achieve improvement in standards e.g. Improvement Notices. Risks are not being adequately controlled.
6	Standards unacceptable. A disregard for expected standards and/or significant breaches has been observed and/or could be expected. Extreme risk gap present as defined by EMM. Unless application of the EMM identifies duty holder factors that provide strong mitigation, issuing a notice or prosecution is likely to be appropriate.



Welfare Compliance

Score	State of compliance	Descriptor
1	Compliance	Good, clean, suitable and sufficient provision of welfare facilities. Would be content to use them yourself.
2	Minor non-compliance	Welfare facilities need cleaning, temporary absence of consumables such as soap or towels.
3	Inadequate provision	Inadequate or dirty welfare facilities. Inadequate rest facilities. No heated water or too few toilets.
4	Major non-compliance	Welfare facilities not present or so poor as to be unfit for use. No toilet or washing facilities.

New Category Rating Criteria

Category	Rating Score
A	Score of 5 or 6 on any risk
B1	Score of 4 on any risk
B2	Score of 3 on any risk
C	No score greater than 2

Previous risk rating:- _____

BUSINESS TRADING NAME & ADDRESS:- Sharon's 11 Edgemoorway Lane,	
SCHEDULE OF WORKS REQUIRED H.A.S. BLH	
C= CONTRAVENTION R= RECOMMENDATION	
C or R	
(c)	<p><u>Lack of Pest Proofing</u></p> <p>The rear door of the bakery was open and 100's of small cream pasty items (travelling) were being processed. The filter (pure) contamination by dirt or fibres is high. You need to provide a fly-screen to the back door. In the meantime, keep the door closed.</p> <p>(a) <u>Fridge - Display</u></p> <p>The air temperature of the display fridge was found to be 14°C. Your records are also showing temperatures of 15°C. I understood that your Engineer (Sunking) might matter for you. Your temperature records are recording Salmon Sandwiches - you must be providing better recording systems if you are relying on the 2hr rule - i.e. sold within 2hrs of making.</p> <p>(5) The wash hand basin is still obstructed - you need to rectify this. Please as per previous advice.</p>
Signature of person seen:-	Signature of Officer
	
Revisit	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

* We also discussed the need to wash hands

HEALTH & SAFETY RISK RATING FORM

Confidence in Management

Rating	Descriptor
1	Best Practice: Management know the relevant health and safety standards, have put them into effect and check they are applied correctly. There is clear evidence of effective self-regulation with standards being monitored and refined. Full compliance with the approach listed in HSE/GWS and/or MAST 4SME's.
2	Strong evidence that management are up to the task: Management generally enthusiastic and competent with either: effective systems in place for other business processes (e.g. quality assurance) but with knowledge gaps for health and safety requirements, or good health and safety knowledge with systems requiring improvement. There is potential for good performance and reasonable compliance with the HSE/GWS approach and/or MAST 4SME's.
3	Some evidence management are up to the task: Management are knowledgeable about relevant health and safety standards but there has been little effort to adopt a proactive approach to health and safety management. However, senior managers volunteer their thoughts as the inspection progresses and appear to be committed to adopting a more proactive approach. There is general confidence that the recommendations resulting from the inspection will be put into place.
4	Management are ambivalent about health and safety: Management have only a certain amount of knowledge of relevant standards and there is little or no evidence that a proactive approach in ongoing health and safety management has been adopted. However, senior managers recognise the need to satisfy explicit statutory requirements and there is some prospect that a more proactive approach may be adopted in future. Limited involvement of workers in health and safety management. There is some confidence that the recommendations resulting from the inspection will be put into place.
5	Management are not up to the task: Management have significant shortcomings in their knowledge of relevant standards. Management do not appear to be willing to instigate a proactive approach and have not recognised that health and safety is an issue where they need to be personally involved. There is uncertainty as to how they will respond to the findings from the inspection.
6	Management avoid the task and/or conceive in cutting corners: There is a negative approach to accepting legal duties and management dispute the relevance or validity of recognised benchmark standards. Totally ineffective in the management of health and safety. The findings from the inspection are likely to be ignored.

Safety Performance

Rating	Descriptor
1	High standards of compliance. Some aspects meet best practice as outlined in industry standards, Approved Codes Of Practice (ACOPs) etc
2	Good standards. Minimum legal requirements have been met but little evidence that elements of best practice have been adopted.
3	One or more minor shortcomings. Minimum legal requirements could be met with a little more effort. Since these shortcomings are not serious, they can be dealt with informally via a verbal warning and/or provision of advice.
4	Standards are variable but lower than the benchmark standard. It is necessary to address one or more shortcomings (which are not minor) by giving formal instructions for remedial action to be taken e.g. sending a letter.
5	Standards generally unsatisfactory. There is at least one contravention that gives rise to either a substantial or extreme risk gap (as defined by EMM). Formal intervention is required to achieve improvement in standards e.g. Improvement Notices. Risks are not being adequately controlled.
6	Standards unacceptable. A disregard for expected standards and/or significant breaches has been observed and/or could be expected. Extreme risk gap present as defined by EMM. Unless application of the EMM identifies duty holder factors that provide strong mitigation, issuing a notice or prosecution is likely to be appropriate.

Health performance

Rating	Descriptor
1	High standards of compliance. Some aspects meet best practice as outlined in industry standards, ACOP's etc
2	Good standards. Minimum legal requirements have been met but little evidence that elements of best practice have been adopted.
3	One or more minor shortcomings. Minimum legal requirements could be met with a little more effort. Since these shortcomings are not serious, they can be dealt with informally via a verbal warning and/or provision of advice.
4	Standards are variable but lower than the benchmark standard. It is necessary to address one or more shortcomings (which are not minor) by giving formal instructions for remedial action to be taken e.g. sending a warning letter.
5	Standards generally unsatisfactory. There is at least one contravention that gives rise to either a substantial or extreme risk gap and formal intervention (i.e. Notice) is required to achieve improvement in standards. Risks are not being adequately controlled.
6	Standards unacceptable. A disregard for expected standards and/or significant breaches has been observed and/or could be expected. Extreme risk gap present as defined by EMM. Unless application of the EMM identifies duty holder factors that provide strong mitigation, issuing a notice or prosecution is likely to be appropriate.

Welfare Compliance

Score	State of compliance	Descriptor
1	Compliance	Good, clean, suitable and sufficient provision of welfare facilities. Would be content to use them yourself.
2	Minor non-compliance	Welfare facilities need cleaning, temporary absence of consumables such as soap or towels.
3	Inadequate provision	Inadequate or dirty welfare facilities. Inadequate rest facilities. No heated water or too few toilets.
4	Major non-compliance	Welfare facilities not present or so poor as to be unfit for use. No toilet or washing facilities.

New Category Rating Criteria

Category	Rating Score
A	Score of 5 or 6 on any risk
B1	Score of 4 on any risk
B2	Score of 3 on any risk
C	No score greater than 2

Previous risk rating:- _____