

**PUBLIC PROTECTION AND  
COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY  
COMMITTEE  
31 OCTOBER 2017**

**PRESENT: COUNCILLOR N H PEPPER (CHAIRMAN)**

Councillors A N Stokes (Vice-Chairman), B Adams, C J T H Brewis, K J Clarke, C R Oxby, L Wootten, R Wootten and M A Whittington

Councillors: R D Butroid, Mrs J E Killey, C N Worth and B Young attended the meeting as observers

Officers in attendance:-

Sara Barry (Safer Communities Manager), Steven Batchelor (Senior Manager), Nick Borrill (Chief Fire Officer), Nicole Hilton (Chief Community Engagement Officer), Pete Moore (Executive Director, Finance and Public Protection), Donna Sharp (County Service Manager (Registration, Celebratory & Coroners Services)), Daniel Steel (Scrutiny Officer) and Rachel Wilson (Democratic Services Officer)

**22      APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/REPLACEMENT MEMBERS**

No apologies for absence were received.

**23      DECLARATION OF COUNCILLORS INTERESTS**

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

**24      MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 19 SEPTEMBER 2017**

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on 19 September 2017 be signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

**25      ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIRMAN, EXECUTIVE COUNCILLORS AND LEAD OFFICERS**

There were no announcements by the Executive Councillors or the lead officers.

**26      ROAD SAFETY PARTNERSHIP ANNUAL REPORT**

Consideration was given to the Lincolnshire Road Safety Partnership (LRSP) Annual Report which sought to provide committee members with an update on fatal, and

killed and serious injury (KSI) casualty figures for Lincolnshire. It also provided data on trends, comparisons and areas of priority.

Members also received a presentation which provided an opportunity to consider information in relation to killed and seriously injured (KSI) statistics for Lincolnshire.

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

- One member commented that they had 34 parishes in their division, and at every meeting they attended there would be questions about road safety, requests for variations in speed limits etc. It was noted that a lot of these requests were received by the Lincolnshire Road Safety Partnership directly.
- It was noted that the LRSP was predominantly a vehicle for partners to undertake work together, share best practice and identify priorities. It was noted that there were two main strategies, the overarching 2015-2025 strategy which set out the priorities and a yearly strategy which sets out the work which would be carried out that year in relation to each of the priorities.
- In terms of work with parishes, there was a speed limit policy in place at the council, and a number of initiatives in relation to speed enforcement including neighbourhood policing teams undertaking enforcement activities.
- It was commented that there were always locally known accident black spots and queried why it seemed like residents had to wait until there was a serious accident before anything was done. Councillors' frustration with this situation was recognised, and members were advised that data from every single injury collision was utilised and where clusters were identified action could be taken which may include local engineering schemes, improvements to signs and lines, junction improvements as a speed reduction for a road was not always the solution.
- Collisions which did not include injury were also recorded. Officers were aware of a lot of locations where collisions but no injuries were recorded, but there was a need to prioritise those locations where fatalities or serious injury were occurring.
- In relation to comparisons with other counties, it was queried whether they were doing the same things as Lincolnshire. Members were advised that there was a wide variety, but Lincolnshire was doing more in terms of the way that activities were undertaken and resources were shared. The LRSP was there to bring together resources and co-ordinate activities. Nationally there was a lot of consistency in the activities and a lot of best practice being shared.
- It was queried whether if funding was directed to those areas with accidents, was the service receiving enough funding. Members were advised that road safety was one of those areas where it could use as funding as it was given. However, compared to other service areas it had managed to maintain its level of service, with only slightly less enforcement, education and engineering work taking place.

**PUBLIC PROTECTION AND COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**  
**31 OCTOBER 2017**

- It was noted that whilst Lincolnshire had seen a considerable reduction in fatalities on the roads, so had other authorities, but there was now a slight increase being seen.
- It was queried whether a reduction in speed limits of all roads which came off 'A' class roads had been looked into, as this had been implemented in Norfolk.
- It was commented that in the time since data had started being collated, the number of vehicles using the roads would have increased, and so it would be expected that the number of accidents and collisions would also increase. However, it was also noted that the safety features in vehicles had also increased and so it was difficult to compare like with like.
- It was reported that since the inception of the LRSP the number of people killed on Lincolnshire's roads had halved, but no matter what activities the Partnership carried out – enforcement, education or engineering, there would still be accidents, as it only took one lapse in concentration to cause an accident. There had been a huge reduction in the number of KSI over the years and it was reported that the Partnership would try to identify vulnerable user groups and target campaigns towards them e.g. motorcycle riders.
- In terms of data collation and usage for the targeting of schemes, it was queried what weight was given to accidents which did not involve an injury. Members were advised that there was a wide range of classifications for accidents which were defined by the Department for Transport (DfT), and it was noted that an accident involving a broken bone (including a digit) would be classed as a serious casualty.
- Members were advised that data from all collisions would be used when considering education, enforcement or engineering activity.
- It was queried how it was detected whether an area was susceptible to damage only accidents. It was reported that the LRSP was required to reduce death and injury on the road. However, it was acknowledged that there were exemptions and if an area was identified where it was thought there could be an emerging problem the Partnership was able to access police data.
- It was clarified that the vast majority of collisions in Lincolnshire involved cars.
- It was also reported that the vast majority of collisions also involved some level of user error.
- It was highlighted that Lincolnshire had higher numbers of older drivers when compared to other areas, which could explain why there were a higher number of collisions in the county involving older drivers.
- There was a need to tailor resources to those user groups who were over represented in terms of fatalities.
- Members were offered the opportunity to visit the Road Safety Partnership at any time to view the data and ask any questions they may have.
- If there was a collision which involved an injury then all the details of the incident would be recorded on the LRSP's database.
- It was noted that most collisions happened in fine weather, and there was also no specific time of day when accidents were more likely.
- It was queried whether if data was grouped into four hour intervals, for example, would peaks then be seen. It was acknowledged that if this was done, then peaks would more likely to be seen either just before or just after peak traffic times.

- In relation to average speed cameras, it was queried how effective they were at reducing accidents and how many people were caught by them on the A1. Officers advised that they could bring back specific data on this, but advised that a reduction in accidents had been seen, and more people had been caught. It was also noted that equipment was being replaced with new smaller cameras, which could be attached to existing street furniture and more signing was being installed. However, it was thought that not many people actually understood what average speed cameras did.
- In terms of the reasons why accidents occurred, it was noted speeding was one specific element, but other factors such as aggressive driving or swerving around other vehicles would also involve an element of speed.
- In relation to the corporate scheme which was being carried out in relation to safer driving, it was commented that for a lot of people employed as drivers, the delivery scheduled which were given by the employers were quite tight and so drivers felt that they had to drive faster than normal to meet their schedules. Members were advised that there was a package of initiatives that could be offered to employers. It was noted that work had been done nationally with large companies who had found that they could save significant amounts of money by ensuring their drivers travelled at a more realistic speed. These savings were found through fuel consumption and reduced insurance liabilities.
- One member queried why signs were put up warning people about speed cameras and suggested that they should not be sign posted so that people were caught when they were speeding. It was reported that speed cameras were located in places where there was a clear and demonstrable history of collisions. By warning people of the presence of speed cameras it gives people the opportunity to look at their speed and modify their behaviour.

**RESOLVED**

That the comments made in relation to the report be noted

**27      FIRE AND RESCUE - STATEMENT OF ASSURANCE 2016-17**

A report was received which enabled the Committee to consider the Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Statement of Assurance for 2016-17. Members were advised that the Fire and Rescue National Framework for England set out the requirement for fire and rescue authorities to provide an annual Statement of Assurance on financial, governance and operational matters to show that due regard had been given to the expectations set out in the integrated risk management plan and the requirements included in the Framework. The Statement would be used as a source of information on which to base the Secretary of State's biennial report under section 25 of the Fire and Rescue Service Act 2004.

Members were advised that the department for Communities and Local Government had provided 'light touch' guidance on the content of the Statement, leaving it to the individual fire and rescue authorities to decide how best to present the information. It was noted that as Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue was part of the County Council,

**PUBLIC PROTECTION AND COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**  
**31 OCTOBER 2017**

much of the financial and governance information had already been published in the Council's Statement of Accounts, and other information was readily available in published documents.

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 queried whether the recruitment of retained fire fighters was being actively pursued. Members were advised that a number of measures had been put in place, which were intended to support retained fire fighters and employers.
- It was commented that it was important to acknowledge that Lincoln was an urban area and could not be classified in the same way as the other districts when it came to considering any further cuts. Members were assured that this classification had been reflected in the Statement.
- It was queried whether there were any concerns from a financial point of view as cost per head of population and cost per hectare were lower than the average. Members were advised that the comparison was included to demonstrate the cost-effectiveness of the Service. Whilst it was recognised that budgets were tight, this reflected the position across LCC. Officers did make a case for the budget each year along with other services. It was also commented that this highlighted the issue of fairer funding, which was a campaign that senior councillors had taken to Parliament.
- Members were advised that relationships with neighbouring fire authorities were still good and that Section 16 agreements were in place, which were reviewed on an annual basis.

**RESOLVED**

That the comments made in relation to the content of Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Authority's Statement of Assurance 2016-2017 be noted.

**28      PROGRESS REPORT ON THE FUTURE GOVERNANCE OF HERITAGE SERVICES**

It was reported that the Council had been exploring ways of reducing the costs of its Heritage Service whilst also improving and enhancing its public offer. The Committee received a report which provided an update on the progress to date.

(NOTE: Councillor M A Whittington stated that he would not be taking part in this discussion as he was a member of the Commissioning Board)

Members were informed that the working group had met three times, and officers wanted to thank those members who participated as they received robust and challenging feedback. It was reported that the approach that was taken was to provide each of the members of the working group with a resource pack on the Heritage Service which contained large amounts of data on each site including how they operated, staffing structures and costs including various property and leasing

arrangements. The Group also looked at opportunities and risks presented by the different governance options.

It was concluded that more time was needed to make a decision on what the right fit for the service would be. It was also noted that a need to split the focus had been identified to look at what the offer that LCC wanted to make would be and what that service would like before looking at what the best delivery model to make that happen would be. In terms of timescales, it was acknowledged that these would have to be slightly different, with any decision now going into the new financial year, probably either May or June 2018.

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

- It was noted that an e-mail had been received by one of the Members in relation to future access to the Lincolnshire Archives. It was noted that this had been forwarded on to the Chief Community Engagement Officer who had indicated that she would be willing to meet with the gentleman who had written the e-mail, as he had a lot of questions from a professional point of view.
- Members commented that they felt that the working group had been very successful and now felt that they understood the issues much more clearly.
- It was commented that because of the slippage in the timescales, then the right decision would be made.
- Officers were thanked by the members for their frankness with the working group.
- One member commented that this had been one of the best task groups that they had been involved in.
- There was agreement that it had been an excellent working group and that the members had challenged the officers who had come back with the information the group had asked for.

## RESOLVED

That the Public Protection and Communities Scrutiny Committee be satisfied with the assurance given on the progress towards the Future Governance of Heritage Services.

## 29 PUBLIC PROTECTION AND COMMUNITIES 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 would be of greatest benefit. The work programme was reviewed at each meeting of the Committee to ensure that its contents were still relevant and would add value to the work of the Council and partners.

**PUBLIC PROTECTION AND COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**  
**31 OCTOBER 2017**

Members were advised that there would be two occasions when the Committee would be sitting as the Crime and Disorder Committee, first on the 12 December 2017 and secondly on 13 March 2018.

Members were also reminded that there would be an informal session following the meeting in December when the Committee would receive a performance of the 2fast2soon play.

It was noted that work would continue to programme in an item on the proposed changes to neighbourhood policing for a future meeting.

It was also requested whether a report on the Joint Ambulance Conveyance Project pilot could be brought to a future meeting.

**RESOLVED**

1. That the work programme as set out in Appendix A of the report be agreed.
2. That the points raised in relation to the content of the work programme be noted and scheduled in to future meetings.

**30      ANNUAL PREVENT REVIEW REPORT**

Consideration was given to a report which provided the Committee with an update on Prevent activity in Lincolnshire during 2016/17 as a result of changes to the Counter-Terrorism Bill 2014 and the introduction of the Government Counter-Extremism Strategy 2015 and the new responsibilities placed upon Local Authorities.

Members were advised that the focus of the Prevent work was moving more towards targeting the threat from extreme right wing groups. Officers were working with schools, colleges and community groups to raise awareness of the Prevent legislation. However, it was noted that Lincolnshire remained a low risk area.

The Committee received a presentation from Paul Drury, the Prevent Officer, which provided further information in relation to the following areas:

- Principles of the Prevent Duty Guidance
- Current International Threat
- Crown Prosecution Service (CPS)
- Threat: Far Right Extremism
- New wave of Radicalisation
- Extremist Narratives
- Channel

Prior to the start of the debate on this report, members were advised that discussion of this report may result in the requirement for the disclosure of confidential information ("confidential" information refers to information provided to the Council by a government department on terms which forbid the disclosure of that information to the public or information of which to the public is prohibited by or under any enactment or by the order of a court.) and where the requirement for such a disclosure was identified, no further discussion would take place on the item. When

discussion that did not require reference to confidential information was complete, the press and public would be excluded from the meeting before the remaining identified items would be discussed.

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 noted that participation in the Channel programme was voluntary and a lot of people did respond to it. Officers were only aware of one person in 7 years who had turned it down.
- The concerns regarding the activities carried out by some of the right wing groups, such as operating foodbanks, and providing accommodation for homeless veterans, was around the narrative that accompanied them which was toxic.
- It was commented that a lot of the problems around this issue were related to the media as it gave 'free advertising' to these groups when they carried out attacks, as well as giving people ideas about how to do things in future. It was noted, that for the first time in history, when events are unfolding, that information was able to be manipulated by social media.
- Social media companies acknowledged that use of these platforms was an issue in tackling these activities, but on a daily basis there were 700,000 attempts to spread malicious information and radicalisation. Members were advised that when one site was shut down, there were another 20 ready to replace it. It was noted that when one was taken down, it created a void, and there was a need to find an alternative which could fill it.
- It was noted that this was an ongoing battle for social media platforms, as no matter how quickly things were taken down, new ones would appear.
- It was suggested that the Channel and Prevent programmes should be seen as safeguarding activities, as people did not always feel that they had the right to challenge religious beliefs in the same way. This needed to be approached in the same way as safeguarding.
- One member commented that when they were young they were able to talk very openly, but now it felt like people could not express their views as freely without being accused of intolerance.
- There was a need for an environment where people could speak freely without being judged, as the right to freedom of speech had been hard won and should be protected. However, there was also a need for balance and for people to be able to challenge extremist ideas. It was noted that in some countries the criminalisation of some views had led to movement's being pushed underground and attacks on specific groups had increased.
- It was queried how the message about the Prevent and Channel work was going to be communicated, and it was suggested that a councillor development session could be held on this subject. It was commented that councillors could be key to this as they would know their communities better than officers could. This suggestion was supported by the Executive Councillor for Community Safety and People Management.
- The difference between the far right and extreme right was clarified (although it was noted that there was a difference of opinion in the academic world



**PUBLIC PROTECTION AND COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**  
**31 OCTOBER 2017**

regarding defining the two groups) in that the far right tended to be a political movement, with a focus on housing and rights for workers etc., whereas the extreme right had a much more radicalised ideology based on race.

- It was queried to what extent this activity was cyclical and whether it fed off social factors. It was also queried whether the extremist Islamic groups and the extreme right groups were feeding off each other. It was acknowledged that there was a commonality with the past, but the biggest difference now that the world had never experienced before was the impact of social media and how people could communicate ideas instantly to vast numbers of people across the world.
- There was a need to recognise whether a person was just disenfranchised or if they had bought into a belief system.
- It was noted that running the support groups for veterans etc. required funding and it was queried how those being operated by extreme right groups were recognised. Members were advised that the Police were aware of groups like National Action and the individuals associated with them, and were able to shut down activities when necessary. Although it was important to remember there was a difference between illegal activities and unappealing behaviour.
- A vast amount of intelligence came from communities. When something did not look right, feel right or sound right, there was a need for people to know who to report it to.
- It was suggested whether something similar to Signs of Safety which was used in schools for identifying safeguarding issues could be developed to recognise problems.
- It was commented that it was amazing how one personality could have an influence on a young person.
- It was noted that there was a psychological aspect to this as people were pack animals who wanted to be surrounded by people who were the same as them, but society had evolved to a place where differences were to be explored not feared. If people were comfortable in where they were in life they were unlikely to get caught up in propaganda. However, there was now a situation where the generation below were less well off than older generation.
- It was noted that a Hate Crime survey had been launched by the Community Safety partnership as there were very low reporting rates for hate crime, and it was hoped that this survey would help the community to understand the picture better.
- In terms of funding for local authorities for taking on the new responsibilities for Prevent activities, it was noted that the Home Office had made a £40million budget available to authorities, and it was expected that those with the greatest perceived risk would receive the most resource. The money would be split between 9 regions, and Lincolnshire was part of the east midlands Region, and colleagues from other authorities in this region were supportive of Lincolnshire's concerns about funding and have assured the authority that the county would receive its fair share and have pledged to ensure that all authorities would have a full-time Prevent Officer and the appropriate administrative support.

As a question had been asked which required the disclosure of confidential information, the Chairman confirmed that there were no members of the press and public in the room and the Committee moved into confidential session.

**RESOLVED**

1. That the comments made in relation to the report be noted.
2. That a Councillor Development session be held in relation to the work of the Prevent and Channel programme.

The meeting closed at 12.02 pm