Agenda Item 15



Author/Lead Officer of Report: (Debbie Hanson. Health Improvement Principal)

Tel: (0114 2735733)

Report of:	Greg Fell		
Report to:	Cabinet		
Date of Decision:	21 st November 2018		
Subject:	Investigation of Implications for Water Fluoridation		
Is this a Key Decision? If Yes, reason Key Decision:- Yes			
- Expenditure and/or savings over £500,000			
- Affects 2 or more Wards			
Which Cabinet Member Portfolio does this relate to? (Children and Families)			
Which Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee does this relate to? (Health)			
Has an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) been undertaken? Yes ☐ No ✓			
If YES, what EIA reference number has it been given? (Insert reference number)			
Does the report contain confidentia	al or exempt information? Yes ☐ No ✓		
If YES, give details as to whether the exemption applies to the full report / part of the report and/or appendices and complete below:-			
"The (report/appendix) is not for publication because it contains exempt information under Paragraph (insert relevant paragraph number) of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended)."			
Purpose of Report:			
implications of water fluoridation	net to enable the Local Authority to investigate the n in Sheffield including feasibility, costs, plant ications for other Local Authority areas.		

Recommendations:

To request Cabinet approve the Local Authority investigate the implications of water fluoridation in Sheffield including feasibility, costs, plant location, coverage and the implications for other Local Authority areas.

It should be emphasised that this is purely a fact-finding process to inform subsequent decision-making and that it does not represent a decision by the local authority to proceed with water fluoridation.

Following the outcome of this investigation, if the Local Authority takes the decision to proceed with the process set out in legislation, all the information gathered will be used as evidence in the formal feasibility report.

Background Papers:

(Insert details of any background papers used in the compilation of the report.)

Lead Officer to complete:-			
in resprindicate Policy (been in comple	I have consulted the relevant departments in respect of any relevant implications indicated on the Statutory and Council	Finance: (Insert name of officer consulted)	
	Policy Checklist, and comments have been incorporated / additional forms	Legal: (Insert name of officer consulted)	
	completed / EIA completed, where required.	Equalities: (Insert name of officer consulted)	
	Legal, financial/commercial and equalities implications must be included within the report and the name of the officer consulted must be included above.		
2	EMT member who approved submission:	Greg Fell	
3	Cabinet Member consulted:	Jackie Drayton	
4	on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklis submission to the Decision Maker by the EM	n that all necessary approval has been obtained in respect of the implications indicated statutory and Council Policy Checklist and that the report has been approved for sion to the Decision Maker by the EMT member indicated at 2. In addition, any all forms have been completed and signed off as required at 1.	
	Lead Officer Name: Debbie Hanson	Job Title: Health Improvement Principal	
	Date: 12th November 2018		

1. Background

1.1 The oral health vision is for all Sheffield residents to be able to speak, smile and eat with confidence and without pain or discomfort from their teeth or mouths.

The oral health improvement strategy 2018-21 identifies how Sheffield is tackling all areas to improve the cities oral health. However there are no artificial water fluoridation schemes in this area. As part of the strategy, Scrutiny agreed that Sheffield City Council should explore the implications of water fluoridation in Sheffield including the cost.

2. HOW DOES THIS DECISION CONTRIBUTE?

2.1 Since April 2013 decision-making regarding water fluoridation has been the responsibility of local authorities. There is extensive legislation detailing the process required to be undertaken to be able to consider implementing a water fluoridation scheme.

Legislation requires that the following steps are undertaken:

- Develop an 'operable and efficient' proposal
- Make initial proposal to the Secretary of State and receive consent to proceed
- Consult with other affected local authorities (for minimum of 3 months)
- Form joint-committee with other affected local authorities
- A public consultation for a minimum of 3 months is required by law to ensure full and balanced hearing of all views.
- Final decision and 'formal proposal to the Secretary of State'
- Secretary of State to form an agreement with the water company if satisfied that process has been compliant with the statutory process
- Implementation

The findings from this investigation will inform the decision to proceed with the process specified by legislation above.

3. HAS THERE BEEN ANY CONSULTATION?

3.1 No formal consultation has taken place on any proposal for a community water fluoridation scheme. Should a decision be taken to proceed, full public consultation will take place as part of the process identified above.

4. RISK ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION

- 4.1 Equality of Opportunity Implications
- 4.1.1 This investigation is a technical exercise and so does not have implications in terms of equality of opportunity.
- 4.2 <u>Financial and Commercial Implications</u>
- 4.2.1 Although no budget stream was identified for the investigation, it will be funded through the public health grant.

Existing Public Health officers will be leading the investigation and Yorkshire Water have estimated their costs below.

Phase 1 £15-20k

Outline investigation based on water treatment facilities, their match with Authority priority areas and areas served by them with the aim of identifying major areas of overspill and those un-treated

Phase 2 circa £50k

More detailed review of priority areas (if different to whole Authority area) and consider at outline the feasibility of tailoring dosing points or supplies to make such a scheme more targeted in delivery

- 4.3 Legal Implications
- 4.3.1 See 2.1 regarding legislative process to progress to full decision regarding fluoridation. The Health and Social Care Act 2012, by amending the Water Industry Act 1991 (the Act), returned responsibility for those decisions to local authorities with public health responsibilities.
- 4.4 Other Implications
- 4.4.1 None
- 5. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED
- 5.1 None

6. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 We are asking for agreement to investigate the implications of water fluoridation for Sheffield because we need to understand the costs and extra work needed for the city should we proceed.

This first necessary step is to gain an understanding of the public water

supply arrangements in the Sheffield area. Key initial questions to be answered by Yorkshire Water are:

- Is it technically practicable for the responsible water company to fluoridate the geographic area of Sheffield?
- Will doing so necessitate also fluoridating other adjacent localities and, if so, will this involve other local authority areas?

Depending on discussions with the water company this may be essentially a desk-top exercise thereby minimising initial costs. It should be emphasised that this is purely a fact-finding process to support subsequent decision-making and that it does not represent a decision by the local authority to proceed with fluoridation.

Once the investigation has taken place and the full implications of the cost and infrastructure are available further discussions will take place as to whether to progress to the legislative stage of the process. Should this be the case, a full report will be brought back to cabinet for discussion and agreement made to progress further or not.

