

SOUTH YORKSHIRE FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY

24 JULY 2017

PRESENT: Councillor L Burgess (Chair)
Councillor A Atkin (Vice-Chair)
Councillors: M Clements, S Ayris, A Buckley, T Damms,
P Haith, C Hogarth, M Maroof, C Ransome, J Satur and
Dr A Billings (Police and Crime Commissioner)

T/DCFO M Blunden, T/ACO M Mason and S Booth
(South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service)

A Brown, N Copley, D Terris, M McCarthy, M McCoolle and
L Noble (Barnsley MBC)

M Buttery (Office of the South Yorkshire Police and Crime
Commissioner)

A Bosmans (Chair, Fire Local Pension Board)

Apologies for absence were received from
Councillor C Rosling-Josephs, A Frosdick and CFO J Courtney

1 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were noted as above.

2 ANNOUNCEMENTS

T/DCFO Blunden stated that the Service had recently won an LGBT Employer of the Year Award at the Inaugural South Yorkshire LGBT Plus Award in Sheffield, for the Service's supportive and inclusive work with LGBT members as part of the Service's workforce; the Service had overcome competition from 17 different employers across South Yorkshire. The Cutlers' Society had also presented the Service with two awards. WM Nicola Hobbs had won an individual prize for her involvement and impact with diverse communities in going above and beyond her role. She had also been instrumental in supporting the fire cadet programme through seven cadet branches and she had been heavily involved with the Prince's Trust and the Cutlers' Better Learners Better Workers Programme. The Service's Community Fire Safety Officers and the High Risk Co-ordination Team had won the group award for their service to the people of South Yorkshire. The team installed tens of thousands of smoke alarms each year, helped to reduce accidental fires and worked with high risk individuals across South Yorkshire.

Councillor Burgess congratulated the Service, and she requested that the Authority's thanks and congratulations be conveyed to the officers concerned.

3 URGENT ITEMS

None.

4 ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE ABSENCE OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS

None.

5 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS IN RELATION TO ANY ITEM OF BUSINESS ON THE AGENDA

None.

6 REPORTS BY MEMBERS

Councillor Haith referred to a Yorkshire and Humber Employers' Association Meeting that she had recently attended. The main topic for discussion had been the review of the pay spine and its effects on local authorities in relation to raising the lower grades up to the national living wage by 2020; the costs for some of the local authorities would be between 4% and 6% of the payroll. It was noted that the national living wage was already paid in South Yorkshire where the cost would be approximately £60,000, compared to other local authorities and brigades where there would be more significant impact.

Councillor Atkin stated that he had organised a seminar on 18 July 2017 for RMBC elected Members on the work of the Prince's Trust, which had been well received. He invited all Members to the Graduation Day on 27 July 2017 at Rotherham Town Hall, which would commence at 2pm until 4pm.

7 RECEIPT OF PETITIONS

None.

8 TO RECEIVE ANY QUESTIONS OR COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC, OR COMMUNICATIONS SUBMITTED BY THE CHAIR OR THE CLERK AND TO PASS SUCH RESOLUTIONS THEREON AS THE STANDING ORDERS PERMIT AND AS MAY BE DEEMED EXPEDIENT

None.

9 MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL AUTHORITY MEETING HELD ON 26 JUNE 2017

Councillor Ayris queried whether the Section 41 substitute Members would be permitted to deputise in the absence of the Section 41 Members on outside bodies.

L Noble stated that there were no substitutes for the Section 41 Member role on outside bodies. Each Section 41 Member has a nominated deputy as agreed at the Authority's Annual Meeting for the purposes of informing their 'host' local authorities on Authority business.

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the Annual Authority meeting held on 26 June 2017 be agreed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

10 MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY AUTHORITY MEETING HELD ON 26 JUNE 2017

Councillor Burgess requested an update following the Grenfell Tower Fire.

AM Helps provided Members with a South Yorkshire briefing paper on high-rise safety. The Service had been requested to attend 11 NHS premises and had carried out inspections following the National Fire Chief Council's indication of potential unsuitable cladding. The Service had also attended one college, one football ground and one hotel in South Yorkshire, and were working through 20 private high-rise accommodations. In addition, the Service continued to attend TARA meetings to support local authorities and engage with residents.

Councillor Ayris referred to the last Authority meeting, where he had made a number of comments regarding the brevity of the minutes and minute taking. He had also requested information on the length of time that webcasts were archived.

Councillor Burgess stated that the Authority was aware that the minutes must accurately reflect the decisions and actions raised at the meetings. She assured Members that every issue raised would be followed through and a response would be provided. It would be inappropriate to provide verbatim minutes.

Councillor Ransome stated that she understood that the minutes were kept on record for a period of 6 months, and she requested a copy of the webcast recordings for the same period.

M McCarthy stated that Councillor Ransome would be provided with the webcast recordings on disc.

AM Helps referred to Councillor Hogarth's query regarding information that the Service may be able to provide on the sale of chip pans in a retail setting. He stated that following national enquiries, all the sales of deep fat fryers or chip pans were accompanied with safety information together with manufacturer's instructions. He considered that given the breadth of suppliers across South Yorkshire that this would be the most pragmatic way to continue in the future.

Councillor Hogarth stated that his query had been in relation to individuals purchasing a new cooker, and the use of chip pans.

Councillor Ayris stated that he was still confused by Chief Fire Officer Courtney's response to his question in relation to how the whole time employee figures had been influenced by the temporary promotions. He queried whether his response had indicated that the positions had been backfilled.

T/DCFO Blunden suggested that Councillor Ayris' question had related to whether the number of temporary promotions had affected the number of firefighters on fire appliances. T/DCFO Blunden had met with Councillor Ayris shortly after the last Authority meeting to briefly discuss the matter. It was noted that 2016 and 2017 had been the first years that the Service had recruited for a significant number of years, due to the ongoing financial situation since 2010. With the agreement of the 3 year funding settlement, the Service was able to run a recruitment programme for 2017, 2018 and 2019. The Service was aware of the vacancies at firefighter level,

and a round of promotions was currently being undertaken to be concluded with crew and watch manager promotions in September 2017, in line with the Service's normal workforce profile. At this point, the temporary promotions would be backfilled and an understanding would be achieved of the number of firefighters required to ensure that five firefighters would be available to ride on the first appliance, with an aspiration from 1 January 2018.

Councillor Ayris commented that this did not align with Chief Fire Officer Courtney's response that the temporary promotions did not impact on the number of uniformed individuals.

T/DCFO Blunden stated that the full promotion process would be concluded by the end of September 2017.

Councillor Ransome queried whether Members had been provided with the details of how much income had been derived from Safety Solutions UK limited.

S Booth commented that he would ascertain the position and provide this information to Members.

T/DCFO Blunden stated that, as at 19 July 2017, Sir Tom Winsor had written to all police and fire and rescue authorities to indicate that HMIC would take over responsibility for the fire and rescue service inspections from 2018; no further details had been released. T/ACFO Mason would meet with HMIC in early August 2017 to discuss the future inspections for the Service.

Councillor Burgess suggested that time be allocated to look at what the Inspection might entail.

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the Ordinary Authority meeting held on 26 June 2017 be agreed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

10a South Yorkshire Update Following the Grenfell Tower Fire

Councillor Ayris referred to the issue of high rise incidents in South Yorkshire and the use of turn table ladders. He queried whether the current PDA policy was appropriate and whether there was likely to be any change to the policy considered.

T/DCFO Blunden stated that the Service had reviewed its policy; high rise building fires were dealt with from inside of the building, rather than from the outside. The Service was content that the report presented to the Authority in 2012, in relation to turn table ladders for one primary crew and one switch crew was still appropriate.

Councillor Ayris referred to the feedback received at the last Authority meeting in relation to NHS buildings. He queried whether this included trust hospitals, and whether the sample testing had revealed anything additional from what had been reported at the last Authority meeting.

AM Helps stated the Service had visited approximately 11 NHS sites following feedback that the cladding was not of the highest fire resistant standard. An audit and inspection had been undertaken of the sites with the responsible persons,

which had led onto other enforcement issues other than cladding. It was noted that not all of the NHS buildings in South Yorkshire were high rise buildings. The Service would continue to undertake inspections.

Councillor Atkin referred to a question received at RMBC as to whether all hospitals had been inspected. He requested that Members be provided with the details of any hospitals where the cladding was considered not to be up to standard. He referred to the residents of the Beeverleigh high rise building in Rotherham, who were very happy with the attitude of RMBC and the Service, who had visited them following the Grenfell Tower fire to provide reassurance; he requested that feedback be provided to the firefighters concerned. He queried whether the Service considered that the 'Stay Put' Policy was still the best policy.

AM Helps stated that the 'Stay Put' Policy was still relevant, and would continue to be the Service's position until it was reviewed nationally. The Service's priority had been the high rise residential buildings, although feedback had started to be received around some hospital trusts. The hospitals had been requested to review all of their building stock, which was an enormous task; it was not the Service's responsibility to allocate its staff to undertake side by side audits on those premises. The Service's responsibility was to enable its inspectors to provide enforcement where legislation required and to provide support to those premises identified to be vulnerable through cladding fitting. He would provide Members with a current list of the local authority hospitals concerned.

Councillor Hogarth stated that Montagu Hospital, Mexborough had been issued with a Prohibition Notice. He queried how many other issues had been raised at other buildings following the Service's cladding inspections that would not have been identified otherwise.

AM Helps stated that the Service regularly undertook inspections at local authority high rise buildings. The Service had inspected Montagu Hospital in relation to failed cladding, where other fire safety issues had been identified; he considered that this pattern would continue as more inspections were undertaken at hospitals. The Service worked with a hospital co-ordination group which frequently met, and hospitals had their own fire safety trained risk assessors.

Dr Billings referred to the South Yorkshire Briefing paper. He queried the certification of premises being returned to fire authorities, and the difference that it could make.

T/DCFO Blunden stated that professionals across the country had observed that fire and rescue services had very specifically trained individuals, with extensive experience, within their business fire safety teams. The Service had seen a degradation in some of the fire safety standards across the buildings, following the 2006 Regulatory Reform Order, which had implemented changes for it removed from the fire authority's remit. The Service believed that the expertise sat with itself, and would welcome its return from the local authorities to the Authority with sufficient support in terms of funding.

Councillor Haith stated that DMBC's Cabinet had recently approved additional funding for retro-fitting of sprinklers in all Doncaster high rise buildings.

Councillor Ayris referred to the inspections requested by Government specifically in relation to cladding. He sought clarification as to whether the inspections undertaken by the Service would take into consideration glazing and thermal glass windows, following the controversy that this had been part of the issue with the Grenfell Tower.

AM Helps stated that as part of any inspection, the Service would initially look at the risk assessment produced by the responsible person, and that the glazing and correct standards would form part of this assessment.

Councillor Burgess suggested that, given the ongoing interest and concern following the Grenfell Tower fire, Members be provided with an update at the next Authority meeting.

11 SSCR SOCIAL RETURN ON INVESTMENT

A report of the Clerk to the Fire and Rescue Authority was submitted on the Stronger Safer Communities Reserve (SSCR) evaluation – social return on investment.

Ivan Annibal and Jessica Selick from Rose Regeneration, and James Turner from Rocket Science UK Ltd presented the report.

Members noted that on 13 February 2017, the Authority had commissioned Rocket Science UK Ltd to conduct an independent evaluation of the initiative to evaluate the impact of the £1.4m spent or committed to date during Rounds 1 and 2 of SSCR.

A draft version of the report had been presented to the Stakeholder Planning Board on 14 June 2017, where Members had provided useful feedback on the clarity of technical information.

Members noted the following key findings from the evaluation:-

- Every project that had been analysed had delivered a positive social return with on average £7.80 per £1 invested.
- The net value from the eight projects totalled £4.9m, of which SSCR had provided £1.4m to 43 projects.
- The SSCR Fund supported all aspects of a sustainable community.
- The projects had delivered a wide range of community outcomes together with improved fire safety.

Members noted the following recommendations from the evaluation:-

- To include questions on project outcomes in the SSCR application form.
- To focus monitoring activities on project progress towards outcomes.
- The SSCR Fund's focus on prevention and protection to continue.
- To continue to support a 'mixed economy' of projects with different outcomes.

- To use the findings from the report to engage with other public sector partners.

Councillor Ayris gave thanks for the comprehensive report. He queried the test sampling methodology used, based upon the 10 projects selected which tended to be the higher value projects. He suggested that the statistical weighting could not be applied across the piece in relation to the smaller funded projects in comparison to the larger funded projects.

J Turner stated that from a sample of the 43 projects, it would not be possible to achieve a truly random sample from which something could statistically be claimed for all 43 projects; the report referred to those projects looked at, which had identified the value achieved. From those 8 projects alone, there was positive evidence of social return against investment.

Councillor Satur thanked Rocket Science UK Ltd for an in-depth and excellent report.

Councillor Ransome also gave her thanks for the report. She queried the cost of an independent evaluation, and she requested a definition of proxies.

I Annibal stated that proxies were the values that could be ascribed to an output, which had increased from 120 to 140 proxies in assigning a gross £ value to each of the outcomes. Through a process of peer review journals, a total of 140 proxies had been identified to provide a value for various aspects within society.

D Terris commented that all agencies were working hard to try to develop a prevention and early help approach. She wondered whether, through the Community Safety Partnership, there was anything further that could be done to enhance the purchasing or spending power to ensure that the benefits were maximised.

AM Helps referred to the original feedback and evaluation. The Service intended to ensure that its future activities formed part of a social return and investment evaluation to be discussed with the four local authorities who had their own methods of measuring outcomes. The findings would be presented to partners for further consideration.

Dr Billings welcomed the report and he stated that one of the values of the report was the connections, together with the need to build capacity and resilience within communities. He congratulated the Authority in commissioning the evaluation.

Councillor Buckley stated that the Authority was occasionally criticised for the decisions made and the utilisation of finance. He referred to the benefits achieved from Rounds 1 and 2, and added that he looked forward to seeing the same success of Round 3.

Councillor Burgess thanked the individuals for attending the meeting and for the work undertaken.

RESOLVED – That Members:-

- i) Noted the contents of the report and in particular its key findings at Appendix A.
- ii) Agreed to implement the five recommendations set out at Appendix A to the report when determining the evaluation of bids to the Round Three process.

12 STRONGER SAFER COMMUNITIES RESERVE - ROUND 3 COMMUNITY GRANTS

A report of the Clerk to the Fire and Rescue Authority was presented to update Members on arrangements for the next round of the SSCR community grants programme.

Members noted that a further £2m had been added to the Fund in February 2016. The total amount available equated to just over £2.6m. The Authority had agreed at its meeting in July 2016 to a revised delivery model for residual funds. The Fund would be divided into the following categories:-

- Strategic level work with Health partners.
- Technical fire safety.
- Small grants scheme. With approximately £750,000 available for use on community projects in each district.

Members' attention was drawn to the launch event to be held on Friday 4 August 2017 at SYFR Training and Development Centre, Handsworth where some of the SSCR funded projects would be showcased and the timeline and application process for Round 3 applicants would be outlined. It was the intention to open up Round 3 for applications on 1 September 2017 and to close on 29 September 2017, following which the Assessment Board would meet to determine the bids for funding within the bidding process.

Councillor Ayris queried the safeguards in place within the process when allocating or making decisions regarding the funding bids, to ensure that there was no duplication with other funders.

M McCarthy commented that safeguards formed part of the application process. Internal Audit had been commissioned following Rounds 1 and 2, to review both exercises and to make recommendations as to whether they considered a process was in place that could withstand robust challenge. Members noted the thorough evaluation process undertaken, together with the degree of information provided to potential bidders. The contract provided to successful bidders clearly set out the expectations required before the funding was released. The outcomes of the two Internal Audit reviews had made minor recommendations, and, to date, no significant problems had been encountered with any of the 43 funded projects. He gave thanks to R Bywater who had been very thorough in ensuring absolute transparency and engagement with all of the project sponsors and ensuring that information was provided in time.

Councillor Hogarth stated that it was important that any funding should be utilised to maximise outcomes. He suggested that assistance should be offered to complete the applications.

M McCarthy referred to the great deal of interest received from the larger third sector groups for the first two rounds of SSCR, but acknowledged that the number of groups funded had fallen in the smaller community 'grass roots' projects, and this had been acknowledged as part of the evaluation process.

RESOLVED – That Members noted the timeline and arrangements for Round 3 of the SSCR community grants programme.

13 SPRINKLER FUND PROJECT APPROVAL

A report of the Chief Fire Officer and Chief Executive was presented to seek approval for the release of funds in support of the following three match funded projects:-

- Great Places Housing.
- Target Housing Bid.
- SYHA Bid.

Councillor Ransome stated that she was most impressed that the three funding applications related to properties for extremely vulnerable individuals with mental health problems; she supported the proposal for the release of funds in support of the projects.

Councillor Haith highlighted the point that the three funding bids had all been received from Rotherham. She queried whether bids had been received from elsewhere in South Yorkshire.

AM Helps stated that the Service was in receipt of 2 or 3 additional bids, which would be staged for Authority approval. It was noted that the difference between Round 3 and previously funded SSCR projects, was that the Service hoped to secure a match funding element whereby for every £1 the Authority provided, the person bidding would also provide the same amount, which would provide a great opportunity to make the very best of this limited fund.

Dr Billings expressed concern that the three buildings concerned did not have sprinkler systems in place. He queried whether the Service had a sense of other buildings that were equally in need of sprinkler systems, and whether they were prohibited from the scheme as they were unable to match fund or unaware of the scheme.

AM Helps stated that the Service was one of the only authorities in the UK that had a sprinkler position statement. Members were referred to legislation which required certain types of buildings to have sprinkler systems, and other legislation which recommended sprinkler systems. The Service wanted to ensure that partners saw the benefits and merits that sprinklers would bring to the safety of their residents, together with longevity of their buildings and the safety to firefighters in the event of a fire. He requested Members convey the message around the sprinkler fund

project to their local organisations and Section 151 officers, to make the best use of the limited amount of funding available.

Councillor Atkin referred to the sprinkler system launch event, to which 50/60 housing organisations had been invited. A presentation had been received from South Yorkshire Housing, who had been good advocates for the project. He requested Members to inform everyone of the launch of the SSCR Round 3 on 4 August 2017.

Councillor Burgess hoped that all Members would convey the message of SSCR Round 3 and she suggested further discussion on how the message could be conveyed corporately. She requested AM Helps provide feedback on how this could be achieved at the next Authority meeting.

RESOLVED – That Members:-

- i) Agreed to fund the three Fire Sprinkler Projects from the Safer Community Reserve Sprinkler Fund.
- ii) Be provided with details of how the sprinkler fund project was conveyed corporately, to the next Authority meeting.

14 2017/18 BUDGET MONITORING REPORT

A report of the Director of Support Services was submitted to inform Members on the likely financial performance for the year ended 31 March 2018. The report did not provide an update on the capital spend, given the nature of spend involved and the anticipated spend profile.

S Booth referred to the anticipated planned contribution to reserves of £1.246m when the budget had been set on 13 February 2017, the current estimate was £1.574m. The increase was principally in relation to additional funding i.e. Section 31 monies which the Service was notified of by Government; the latest notification had been received in June 2017 which would see a rise in Section 31 monies around business rate funding and recycling of the top slice of Government monies that fire authorities were prone to, of which the Service received £102,000. The Service had a small underspend of £52,000 which would be identified.

Councillor Hogarth queried the reasoning for the overspend of the total transport expenses, which had been overspent by 25% at a total of £7,000.

S Booth stated that he would respond to Councillor Hogarth.

Councillor Ransome queried why the £63,000 increase in the business rates had not been foreseen.

S Booth stated that the Government had undertaken a revaluation of the business rates, with a list published at the beginning of the calendar year in 2017. A £0.5m increase in rateable values had been ascertained, which had not been fully taken into account when setting the budget.

Councillor Ayris queried the methods implemented to resolve the under-utilisation of retained duty staff resources and under-establishment. He also queried whether the indirect employee costs were a one off.

T/DCFO Blunden referred to a previous discussion in relation to the utilisation of retained duty staff (RDS). The Service's commitment to the Authority was that, by the end of the year, there would be a significant difference in the use of RDS. The Service had encountered difficulties in recruiting and retaining RDS, who historically were drawn from businesses or local individuals within a 5 minute footprint of a retained station. Across the fire and rescue services over the last 7 years, there had been a significant change to people's employment habits, with people travelling much further to their place of work. This had a significant impact on recruiting enough people to provide RDS day time cover. The Service has undertaken a review of its retained duty system, including the recruitment, to enable a continuous recruitment process and for individuals to be fed onto a course every 3 months. He expected to see a significant difference to the budget by the end of the year. The indications were that the indirect employee costs were a one off.

Councillor Ayris referred to the nil variation for support staff. He referred to a discussion at the last Authority meeting in relation to the use of agency staff, and he queried whether it incorporated agency staff, any recruitment agencies and finder fees. He also queried the Section 31 income, and the reason why it had increased.

S Booth referred to a report previously presented to the Authority on procurement and property matters, which referred to the recruitment of an interim Head of Procurement and Supply Chain, with the anticipation to do so within the current budget via the savings generated through best procurement. He stated that Section 31 monies derived from Central Government were usually in relation to either 'new burdens' to compensate for taking on additional responsibilities or compensation for loss of business rates income resulting from changes in business rates legislation. The Service had received notification on 26 June 2017 in relation to the refund of unused revenue support grant monies that had been top sliced and now returned to public bodies in proportion to the funding received.

Councillor Burgess stated that she hoped to arrange a Corporate Advisory Group meeting in relation to the budget.

Councillor Ransome referred to the additional fees in relation to support staff, and she queried where this was indicated within the report. She also queried whether the finder's fees were included within the individual's salaries, and the duration of the finder's fees.

S Booth stated that the total cost would be within the support staff aspect of the budget and would include agency fees. Members noted that a monthly charge would be made for the finder's fees.

RESOLVED – That Members:-

- i) Noted and considered the projected revenue underspend of £0.052m for the financial year ended 31 March 2018.

- ii) Be provided with the reasoning for the overspend of the total transport expenses, which had been overspent by 25% at a total of £7,000.

15 LIFE TEAM - FUNDING PROJECT EXTENSION

A report of the Chief Fire Officer and Chief Executive was submitted to request Members to consider and approve the Local Interventions and Falls Episodes (LIFE) Stronger Safer Communities Reserve (SSCR) funding Business Case to secure further revenue funding until 31 March 2018 and to enable the LIFE Team to continue their invaluable work, whilst securing further long term funding options.

Members noted that the LIFE Team had been introduced as a joint emergency services pilot in Sheffield in August 2016, and had been funded through the SYFR SSCR fund to improve the quality of life outcomes for individuals through a preventative approach, reducing risk and vulnerability, and to reduce the cost and demand on emergency services.

Councillor Satur acknowledged that the LIFE Team was a good scheme. However, she stated that she was not in favour of the Authority providing additional funding from the SSCR Fund to the LIFE Team, which had previously received £48,000 and almost £23,000 from that fund. She suggested that consideration be given to securing funding from elsewhere, and queried the provision from SYP and YAS.

Councillor Hogarth referred to the results of the pilot, and he queried whether there were plans to extend the project outside of Sheffield.

AM Helps stated that SYP had contributed from the beginning of the project by allocating two community safety support staff, which matched the number of the Service's staff funded through SSCR, and enabled two vehicles to operate with four staff across Sheffield. The Service had considered evaluation from Huddersfield University which had indicated that it was a very positive project. Consideration would be given to ascertain other partners across South Yorkshire who may be interested in contributing to ensure the scheme was sustainable moving forwards. SYP, YAS and the Service would engage with partners in the local authorities, between now and the end of the financial year, to demonstrate what the LIFE Team could offer, with a view to securing a match or three way funding process moving forwards.

Councillor Satur queried which of the Authority's budgets the funding was anticipated to come from in the future.

AM Helps stated that the Service anticipated that the funding would come from the Fire Service's Operating Budget. Members noted that early conversations had indicated that local authorities were interested in the project.

Councillor Satur stated that all South Yorkshire councils had no spare monies. She queried the position if the local authorities were unable to contribute.

AM Helps referred to the early indications from partners who had expressed an interest in the scheme being rolled out across South Yorkshire. Ultimately, if the project was not viable due to funding, then a report would be presented to the

Authority to seek approval for a different approach. He stated that the project added real value to provide early intervention in a cost effective way.

Councillor Haith suggested that the funding be taken from the projected revenue underspend of £0.052m.

S Booth referred to the various funding options available to the Authority which included the SSCR Fund, the Authority's other reserves or from the revenue budget on the expectation it was likely to deliver a slight underspend in this financial year.

Councillor Atkin stated that this was the third time that SSCR funding had been requested for the project. He suggested that if funding came out of the third pot of SSCR, that it would result in less funding being made available to the community.

AM Helps stated that the view would be that funding would be identified from the third pot of SSCR.

T/DCFO Blunden stated that the Service's position was that, should funding not be secured from 1 April 2018, then the Service would not be in a position to fund the project to be delivered on behalf of another agency. Both SYP and the Service were actively involved with the re-invention of the neighbourhood policing teams and discussions with the four local councils as to what could be achieved. He stated that both Deputy Chief Constable Roberts and himself were of the opinion that if funding could not be achieved, then a paper would be presented to the Authority and to the OPCC and, that unless directed otherwise, no further action be undertaken from 1 April 2018. He reassured Members that an extended bid had not been undertaken on the second bid submitted to the Authority, to ensure that the evaluation report demonstrated that there was some value to the project, to enable the principle of the project to be effectively sold onto the local authorities.

Councillor Ayris stated that he had no hesitation in supporting the project, which fitted in very well with the Authority's approach around collaboration and prevention.

Councillor Clements commented that it was not a question of the merits of the project, but the concern as to where the funding was sourced. He echoed Members' concern at the suggestion that funding would be secured from SSCR. He was uneasy about the funding proposal given the projections for the current financial year, which he was sure the Authority could absorb into any projected underspend anticipated.

Councillor Burgess stated that she considered that Members were generally happy with the project itself, but that funding of the project in the longer term was a separate issue. She queried whether Members would be comfortable to agree the proposal at this moment in time, on the proviso that, if the project was to be rolled out further, alternative methods of funding would be agreed before any recommendations were brought back to continue the project.

Councillor Satur stated that she was in agreement with Councillor Burgess' suggestion, with the proviso that funding was not secured from the community element of SSCR.

RESOLVED – That Members approved the LIFE SSCR funding Business Case at a total of £30,706 with the proviso that if the project was to be rolled out further, alternative methods of funding would be agreed before any recommendations were brought back to continue the project, and that funding would not be secured from the community element of SSCR.

16 POLICE AND FIRE COLLABORATION BOARD PAPERS

A report of the Chief Fire Officer and Chief Executive was submitted to provide Members with papers relating to Community Safety, Civil Protection Group, Fleet options paper and a Communications plan that had been presented to The Police and Fire Collaboration Board on 19 June 2017.

Members noted that The Police and Fire Collaboration Board was chaired by Dr Billings and that its membership included Chief Constable Watson, Chief Fire Officer Courtney, M Buttery and Councillor Atkin, who would be replaced by Councillor Burgess from this point forwards.

Councillor Ransome queried whether the FBU was involved in the discussions around collaboration.

T/DCFO Blunden stated that, should a decision be made to move anyone within the work place, then a statutory consultation period would be entered into. Within the Service, T/DCFO Blunden updated the Joint Consultation Forum, which consisted of the four unions, with an informal discussion on the process of collaboration. Until a decision had been reached by Chief Constable Watson and Chief Fire Officer Courtney with ratification by Dr Billings, no formal consultation would be entered into with any of the unions.

Councillor Ayris stated that it was important to engage the respective unions who should be involved in the collaboration and be provided with an opportunity to provide input for the operational aspect.

T/DCFO Blunden referred to the ongoing conversations over the last 18 months between SYP and the Service in relation to collaboration around fleet management. At the first Strategic Board meeting held in March 2017, it had been agreed by Chief Constable Watson, Chief Fire Officer Courtney and Dr Billings that an options appraisal paper be prepared to bring together the two fleet functions. The Board had agreed that a full business case be developed to be presented to the Board meeting in September 2017 for approval.

Councillor Ransome queried when those talks between SYP and the Service would be drawn to a conclusion.

T/DCFO Blunden stated that Chief Constable Watson, Chief Fire Officer Courtney and Dr Billings had made it clear that a decision now needed to be reached. Members noted the decision that a Joint Civil Contingencies Team would not be progressed further at this time; to be reviewed in 6 months' time in light of any impact or outfall from the Grenfell Tower fire.

Members were provided with details of the Joint Community Business Case, which had been approved by the Board and had instructed the leads at SYP and the Service to determine the structure and impact, which would be reported back to the Authority.

Councillor Buckley stated, as Chair of the Performance and Scrutiny Board, that the Board would look at its Work Programme at its meeting in September 2017. He queried whether there was an opportunity for the Performance and Scrutiny Board to provide a supportive role within the collaboration process.

Councillor Burgess stated that further opportunity should be provided to look at some of the information in greater detail. She welcomed the involvement of the Performance and Scrutiny Board, and she suggested that Councillor Buckley and herself discussed the matter further. She also suggested the potential opportunity of involvement from the Corporate Advisory Group.

Dr Billings informed Members of the confusion in naming the various committees and boards, the conclusion of which had not been reflected within the report. He requested that SYP's three priorities that were stated within the Police and Crime Plan be made clear in any further reports.

RESOLVED – That Members:-

- i) Considered and noted the Community Safety and Civil Protection Business Cases.
- ii) Considered and noted the scoping paper for Fleet.
- iii) Considered and noted the communications plan.
- iv) Considered and noted the implications for South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority.
- v) Noted further discussion for the involvement of the Performance and Scrutiny Board within the process.
- vi) Noted that SYP's three priorities be made clear within any future reports.

17 SYFRA LOCAL PENSION BOARD - ANNUAL REPORT

A report of the Clerk to the Fire and Rescue Authority was submitted to present the Local Pension Board's annual report.

Councillor Burgess welcomed A Bosmans, Chair of the SYFRA Local Pension Board to the meeting.

The Local Pension Board had been established on 1 April 2015 by the Authority, as Scheme Manager. The National Scheme Advisory Board had since been established and its Chair - Malcolm Eastwood had met with Members in the summer of 2016 which had been extremely useful. Additionally, A Bosmans had

attended the last Scheme Advisory Board in London (14 June) in an observer capacity.

A Bosmans stated that there was a view that the Board had advanced further than many other Local Pension Boards. The Board had a number of items to be progressed as priorities for the coming year which included gaining assurance that members of the pension schemes were receiving the correct communications and that they were satisfied with the information received from the people who administered pensions, together with the development of a risk register. Guidance on the latter was being provided nationally.

A Bosmans reminded Members of their responsibility as Scheme Manager for the Pension Schemes. He provided assurance that the Board had put in place everything required within the CLG Guidance, and had started to proactively examine issues via a work programme. The Board's membership included a representative from the West Yorkshire Pensions Fund as Scheme Administrator.

Councillor Ayris stated that it was refreshing to see that members of FBU and FOA were members of the Local Pension Board.

A Bosmans said that the CLG Guidance had required Local Pension Boards to have employee representatives to protect pension scheme members' interests.

RESOLVED – That Members noted the second Annual report of the Local Pension Board.

18 MAKE EVERY CONTACT COUNT PRESENTATION

AM Helps stated that the Service had been leading the work across the region with public health in relation to the introduction of health and well-being messages as part of its core business, which included the introduction of CPR at the Lifewise Centre and the inclusion of health and well-being messages in all school educational packages. The Service was moving towards a 'safe and well' offer.

The Authority was shown a video produced by public health, which had been shown at a regional 'Make Every Contact Count' event.

RESOLVED – That Members noted the presentation.

19 EMERGENCY SERVICE MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAMME (ESMCP) UPDATE

A report of the Chief Fire Officer and Chief Executive was submitted to provide Members with an update of the current Emergency Services Mobile Communications Program (ESMCP) and the work within South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue (SYFR) and the region to ensure successful transition.

Members noted that the ESMCP project had been commissioned by the Home Office in order to provide a replacement communications network for the 3 Emergency Services (3ES) i.e. Fire, Police and Ambulance, within the UK over 4G connectivity. Following a review of the national programme timeline, the ESN

which had been scheduled to begin transitioning in autumn 2017, had been rescheduled for summer 2018. Regional funding for Yorkshire and Humber had been provided by the Government at a total of £1,496,262.28 to be released annually at the beginning of each fiscal year. Members would be provided with further detail closer to the transition date.

Councillor Ayris sought clarity that no funding would be required to support the transition, which in the longer term would provide cost savings.

AM Helps referred to the radio devices presently used which would form part of the transitional arrangements. There were no costs anticipated for the Service in terms of the current funding model for transition onto ESN.

Dr Billings stated that this was a huge and significant project, with large risks in the transition, which the emergency services would have to keep under review. He queried whether there were any places where the system did not work currently, and whether there was an indication as to how this would be covered under the new system.

AM Helps referred to a South Yorkshire assessment that had taken place to identify any reception difficulties where mobile communication was poor. Feedback from the suppliers had indicated that South and West Yorkshire were the only two areas within the region with no significant 'black spot' areas. Extended airwave cover would be implemented for significant areas where there was no 4G activity. The Service was assured that it would be able to connect to the mobile communication project system with its appliances. The Service was content that if SYP was happy to transfer onto the new system, that it would be timely for the Service to do so. The Service recognised the significant risk involved, a Risk Register was monitored closely as a region, and the Government's work was monitored in terms of the Select Committee's reporting on the project to Ministers, to ensure that it was viable and kept on track. The Service was content that South Yorkshire was covered in relation to the project.

Councillor Ransome queried whether AM Helps was the lead person on the project.

AM Helps stated that each fire and rescue service had a senior responsible operator, which was his role within South Yorkshire.

RESOLVED – That Members noted the report.

CHAIR