

**COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC SAFETY
 SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
 1 JUNE 2016**

PRESENT: COUNCILLOR C J T H BREWIS (CHAIRMAN)

Councillors L Wootten (Vice-Chairman), K J Clarke, D C Morgan, S L W Palmer, N H Pepper, R J Phillips, Mrs A E Reynolds, Mrs N J Smith and R Wootten

Councillors: C N Worth, M J Hill OBE and B Young attended the meeting as observers

Officers in attendance:-

Nick Borrill (Acting Chief Fire Officer), Trisha Carter (Chief Executive, Lincolnshire Association of Local Councils), Nicole Hilton (Community and Resilience Commissioning Manager), Mark Housley (County Officer Public Protection), Tony McGinty (Consultant Public Health Children's), Pete Moore (Executive Director of Finance and Public Protection), Jasmine Sodhi (Performance and Equalities Manager), Daniel Steel (Scrutiny Officer), Rachel Wilson (Democratic Services Officer) and Lee Pache (Programme Manager, Lincolnshire Police)

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/REPLACEMENT COUNCILLORS

Apologies were received from Councillor C R Oxby.

2 DECLARATION OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interest at this point in the meeting.

3 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 13 APRIL 2016

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on 13 April 2016 be agreed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

4 UPDATE FROM EXECUTIVE COUNCILLORS AND CHIEF OPERATING OFFICERS

The Executive Councillor for Culture and Emergency Services announced the opening of the very popular Poppies Wave exhibit at Lincoln Castle the previous week. It was reported that there had been 27,797 visitors to the castle over the bank holiday weekend, which had exceeded all expectations.

2

COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC SAFETY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

1 JUNE 2016

Members were also advised that it was National Volunteering week, and there had been 5 or 6 volunteer staff at the Castle each day over the bank holiday. No issues with car parking had been reported, and there had been approximately 1500 tweets relating to the Poppies display which included 'Breathtaking', 'Superb' and 'beautiful'. It was noted that the display would be in place for another three months.

Members commented that it was a superb display, and it was an excellent decision to allow people into the castle grounds for free, as it allowed people who might not normally be able to afford to do these things to see the display. It was acknowledged that the opening up of the Castle grounds had changed the dynamics of the uphill area significantly.

In relation to parking, it was noted that this was the responsibility of the City of Lincoln Council, who had done a good job over the weekend, and also a large amount of parking had been provided at The Lawn. There had been a lot of close liaison between the County Council and City Council prior to this event.

5 COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC SAFETY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

Consideration was given to a report which enabled the Committee to comment on the content of its work programme for the coming year to ensure that scrutiny activity was focused where it could be of greatest benefit. Members were encouraged to highlight items that could be included for consideration in the work programme.

It was reported that many of the items highlighted at the last meeting had been scheduled, and that an additional meeting had been planned for December 2016, and members were reminded that the meeting in November would be taking place at North Kesteven District Council as a site visit to Sleaford Library & Heckington Community Hub.

Officers were thanked for including an item on Neighbourhood Policing on the agenda for the December meeting, and members were advised that it was hoped that a representative from the Police would be able to attend.

RESOLVED

That the comments made in relation to the work programme be noted.

6 THE SUSTAINABILITY OF LINCOLNSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL HERITAGE AND ARCHIVE SERVICES

The Council's Community Assets and Resilience Commissioning Manager briefed councillors on the future challenges in respect of the sustainability of Lincolnshire County Council's Heritage and Archive Service.

COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC SAFETY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
1 JUNE 2016

Members were advised that this was a pre-engagement item which sought to facilitate early engagement with members to influence and shape future actions. It was reported that this would be followed by more detailed proposals later in 2016.

The Committee received a presentation which provided more detailed information relation to the following areas:

- What we have to do
- What we should do
- The cost of doing 'nothing'
- What members can expect next
- Maximising the assets we manage
- The options we are exploring

Members were provided with the opportunity to ask questions to the officers present in relation to the information contained within the report, and some of the points raised during discussion included the following:

- Members commented that it was refreshing that officers were looking for options which did not cost too much, and were pleased that it was coming to scrutiny so early on in the process.
- It was queried whether the estimated £3.5m cost to refurbish the existing building would be better spent on a new location.
- It was queried whether bringing private contractors in to run the online archives was being considered, and would members of the public have to start paying to carry out their research. Members were advised that the commercial aspects of this project were more about film and TV companies being able to use the Council's sites, such as the Castle. It was also noted that there were some companies, such as Siemens which had its own archives. Members were advised that the Council currently had a very cost effective service, with a high level of expertise.
- It was acknowledged that certain aspects of research were charged for, such as when people needed documents printed and also access to certain records. However, if people came into the Archives then access was free.
- It was commented that it was an excellent project, but it would cost a lot of money, and so it was queried whether the GLLEP would be involved in providing any funding. Members were advised that with a project such as this it was likely that additional partners would be included.
- It was reported that all possible options would be investigated, but there were no specific profit making partners involved at the moment, they were all public sector, such as the University of Lincoln.
- It was commented that people with an interest in genealogy were not averse to paying a small charge for copies of documents etc.
- Members were informed that performance figures were produced which identified the different categories that people were interested in. It was noted that it was a mixed economy, but the majority were local and interested in their own family tree, there were also academics from around the region and a small percentage of professional academics.

- Concerns were raised about the centralisation of the counties archives in Lincoln, as it could be difficult for older people across the county to access these records.
- Members were advised that officers went out to schools with selections of artefacts and treasures. There was also a small capacity for going into residential homes.
- The majority of material was accessible online, as it gave greater access to a greater volume of data.
- It was suggested that there could be a strong link with economic development, as if more of the archives were publicly accessible it could make Lincolnshire more of a tourist destination. It was also suggested whether there were any opportunities for commercialisation by producing replicas of some of the artefacts held in the archives, and this could also involve local craftspeople. Members were advised that various commercial activities were already explored, but the set up costs for production of replica items could be enormous. There was a need for balance with what could be delivered.
- A huge expense was expected in order to keep the Friars Lane building in a suitable conditions, and it was queried what was more important – maintaining the archive in this location or getting an up to date facility. It was also queried what the Friars lane building would be worth as a redevelopment project. Members were advised that the priority was the care and preservation of the treasures and documents, and officers could provide assurance that Lincolnshire's history was being looked after in the most cost effective way in a fit for purpose facility. However, this building was not easily accessible to the public. It was not believed that the capital receipt from the building would be enough to provide a state of the art facility. Officers were looking into the possibility of utilising some of the authority's existing assets.
- Members were advised, that there may some two step options, with a customer facing part in Lincoln and storage for those materials already digitised somewhere else.
- It was confirmed that officers were looking at what other authorities had done to address similar issues.
- The Committee requested that it be kept up to date on progress with this project.

RESOLVED

That the comments made in relation to the presentation be noted.

7 LINCOLNSHIRE ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL COUNCILS - UPDATE

Consideration was given to a report which updated members on the Lincolnshire Association of Local Councils (LALC) activities in respect of support for local councils, partnership working with LCC, and the training provision during the period September 2015 – May 2016.

COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC SAFETY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
1 JUNE 2016

The Chief Executive of the Lincolnshire Association of Local Councils was in attendance to update the Committee, and it was reported that year on year LALC was getting busier, with numbers of seminars and the number of different subjects. By the end of 2015, over 70 training sessions had been delivered. Some of the subjects covered included food hygiene, first aid and charity law. There was a need to supplement the training provided by LALC with more specialist training providers as the requests for more specialised training sessions increased.

The Committee was advised that there were three members of staff, and that 2016 would be a transitional year as the current Chief Executive was retiring.

Members were provided with an opportunity to ask questions to the officers present in relation to the information contained within the report, and some of the points raised during discussion included the following:

- A Member congratulated the Chief Executive for the positive impact that LALC training had had on their local town council, as a big difference in the way it worked could now be seen. The training had increased confidence and enabled the town council to act more professionally, as councillors were now talking about working to best practice.
- Members thanked the Chief Executive for her work over the last few years.
- One member commented that the training had been of benefit when moving from district to county council level.
- It was noted that parish and town councillors were essentially volunteers as they were not paid an allowance, and many parishes only had one officer.
- Pressure was building up on town councils as they were being asked to take on more and more duties.
- Some of the big areas of concern for the public included environmental protection, as the legislation written down was quite vague and was open to interpretation. It was also commented that different councils provided different services, and queried whether there was a need for a degree of consistency. Members were advised that the duties of parish and town councils were less than the powers, and LALC was looking at what they had to provide and what they could provide.
- It was reported that town and parish councils did not get any outside funding, other than where they attracted funding. The main source of income was the precept. It was a fine balance between taxing too much and not providing enough services.
- There would be a difference between communities of what services were provided due to a difference in the levels of precept and the number of residents in a parish.
- There was a move to more partnership working between parishes.

The Chairman thanked the Chief Executive of LALC for attending the meeting to update the Committee.

RESOLVED

1. That the comments made in relation to the report be noted.

2. That the Committee continue to endorse partnership working wherever possible within their local communities.

8 QUARTER 4 PERFORMANCE - 1 JANUARY TO 31 MARCH 2016

Consideration was given to a report which provided key performance information that was relevant to the work of the Community and Public Safety Scrutiny Committee. The Council's Performance and Equalities Manager provided an online demonstration to the Committee of how members would be able to view the new style of reporting in a secure area on the Lincolnshire Research Observatory (LRO) website. Members were advised that following approval from the Executive, this information would be made available to the public.

Members were provided with the opportunity to ask questions to the officers present in relation to the information contained within the report, and some of the points raised during discussion included the following:

- Members commented that they appreciated how much clearer the information was now.
- It was suggested whether some of the targets should be banded.
- Members were advised that some changes to the front page of the webpage had been made following the presentation of the Quarter 1 information at this Committee.
- The targets were set by the individual service areas and discussed with the portfolio holders.
- Reduce fires and their consequences – it was queried whether there was a further breakdown of those which were accidents and those which were arson. Members were advised that most were accidents, as a primary fire referred to those which involved property or dwellings. The majority of these were cooking related, and the Service would continue with its prevention work.
- Secondary fires were generally those which did not have a cost associated with them.
- There was surprise at how many people did not take advantage of the free advice from Fire and Rescue.
- Smoke alarm ownership was at its highest level.
- One member queried how cuts to the fire service could be justified when there had been 100 additional fires in the past year. However, members were advised that the decision on funding reductions had not yet been taken, and the impact of potential reductions to services would be considered. The main focus of activity was in prevention work.
- It was queried whether the number of deaths related to the misuse of drugs was reported. Members were advised that a lot of work already took place around substance misuse and early prevention. However, officers agreed to circulate this information to members.
- It was noted that more compliments than complaints had been received for this quarter, and members commented that this was positive as it often took more effort to give a compliment.

COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC SAFETY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
1 JUNE 2016

- Concerns were raised regarding the increase in alcohol related anti-social behaviour incidents and alcohol related violent crime incidents, and it was queried whether this could be due to the more relaxed licencing laws or a lack of deterrent as there were not enough people on patrol.
- Members were advised that work around domestic abuse was ongoing as it was a significant issue nationally. It was recognised that the authority needed to address this challenge, and officers were working with other local authorities and Public Health.
- It was noted that there was an even bigger challenge around alcohol in the home. Officers were working with colleagues in children's services and the child protection registrars to enable early intervention.
- It was not thought that there was any correlation between changes to neighbourhood policing and these types of crimes.

RESOLVED

That the comments made in relation to the performance information presented be noted.

9 CONSIDERATION OF EXEMPT INFORMATION

RESOLVED

That an amended process leading to the exclusion of press and public, only if information contained within paragraphs 3.5 to 3.18 of the report was discussed, be followed. The remainder of the report to be considered as part of the public meeting.

10 BLUE LIGHT COLLABORATION PROJECT

Consideration was given to a report which outlined the work conducted around the Lincolnshire Blue Light Collaboration programme. This report was due to be considered by the Executive between 6 June and 6 July 2016.

It was reported that since April 2015, work had been undertaken by a small project team, under the guidance of a steering group, formed by the senior managers of Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue, Lincolnshire Police, EMAS, Police and Crime Commissioner and Lincolnshire County Council to scope the feasibility of the elements of the programme, and key elements of the programme would include:

- A combined Lincolnshire Police and Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Headquarters
- A Joint Blue Light Campus
- Rationalisation of the wider blue light estate
- A combined Lincolnshire Police and Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Command and Control Centre.

Members were provided with the opportunity to ask questions to the officers present in relation to the information contained within the report and some of the points raised during discussion included the following:

- It was confirmed that there no intent for the different services to start sharing roles. It was very clear that they had distinct roles.
- It was queried how a service could be improved when its funding was being reduced. Members were reminded that no decision in relation to the IRMP consultation had been made yet. It was noted that it did not propose to take any fire engines off line. This project was to be an invest to save programme.
- There had been a 38% reduction within Fire and Rescue of senior officers, and members were advised that it was likely that the other services would be looking at similar issues.
- It was confirmed that EMAS was not intending to co-locate their control room with the Police and Fire and Rescue at this time.
- Members were advised that the intention of this project was to build on existing partnerships, and there was recognition that this would provide a foundation for further innovation.
- Lincolnshire's emergency services currently had an ageing and expensive estate to maintain, and 21 sites had been identified for co-location. There was no suggestion that any of the services would leave an area. It was hoped that this would be a catalyst for closer working.
- Members were advised that EMAS was a regional service rather than a Lincolnshire service, and there was no suggestion that they would move their regional HQ to Lincoln.
- It was queried whether there was much opportunity for further collaboration with EMAS and members were advised that the operational station would be part of the Joint Blue Light Campus at South Park. Other sites would be co-located with the fire service.
- In terms of the rationalisation of the blue light estate, it was queried where those sites were. Members were advised that a complete list of sites would be circulated to the Committee after the meeting. It was emphasised that co-location of services did not mean that services would no longer be provided in those towns.
- Members were advised that the Blue Light Campus would be a new build.
- In Grantham, the police station would remain in place and EMAS would work with the fire service, to move into the fire station.
- There would be engagement with residents in the South Park area once plans had been finalised.
- It was queried whether this was right time to be building new buildings as it was felt that some residents would rather see better fire cover or more police on the street.
- At the South Park site, the existing ambulance and fire station would be redeveloped, but it was not planned to demolish the emergency planning centre.
- It was felt that this programme represented good value for money, and analysis had shown that if this project was not progressed, after 7 years the services would be spending money on maintaining buildings that would be spent on front line services.

COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC SAFETY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
1 JUNE 2016

- Members were advised that the county council's investment in this project would be capital funds not revenue monies, and that it was an invest to save programme that would protect revenue budgets.
- It was reported that there were some timescales associated with the funding from the Police innovation fund, and it was important that this project was taken forward in a certain time scale.
- This project was in line with the government intent to introduce a duty to collaborate, and it was queried whether enquiries had been made with potential devolution partners, and if those authorities had made similar plans. It was noted that the boundaries for the PCC's were not likely to change in the immediate future, so in terms of a Greater Lincolnshire area, it would still include more than one PCC. This project was about operational delivery. There were no plans to get rid of Humberside Police. However, Lincolnshire would not be prevented from speaking with other agencies to look at any areas for collaboration.
- Members queried what the chain of command would be for the new headquarters, and were advised that this would be included within the legal framework. It was reported that divisional commander for the police and divisional commander for the fire service would be based there. It was important to note that the services were not being merged, and there would be a Police Commander and a Fire Commander.
- The details of how the combined command and control centre would run still needed to be worked through. However, this was a model which had been operated by other police and fire authorities.
- The efficiency savings would come from reduced running costs such as heating, lighting etc.. There would also be certain efficiencies from being in the same building, as well as better interoperability.
- In terms of the co-location of services, concerns were raised about whether people would still be able to visit their local police station, and members were advised that the public would still be able to visit their police officers or PCSO's, but that it was likely the Police Station would be a different part of the town.
- Members were advised that not going ahead with this project would cost more in the future, as maintenance costs on the existing buildings increased.
- It was noted that there had been an over allowance in terms of cost for professional fees. In determining the budget, officers had not been risk averse and so officers were confident it would not go significantly over budget.
- It was recognised that there was a link between the IRMP and the blue light project.
- It was commented that this was an exciting prospect for the future of the emergency services.

RESOLVED

1. That the Community and Public Safety Scrutiny Committee support the recommendations as set out in Appendix A of the report.
2. That the comments made be forwarded on to the Executive.

10
COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC SAFETY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
1 JUNE 2016

The meeting closed at 12.53 pm