

**HUMBERSIDE FIRE AUTHORITY  
(SPECIAL MEETING)**

**10 MAY 2013**

**PRESENT:**

**Representing East Riding of Yorkshire Council:**

Councillors Engall, Hodgson, Ibson, Mole, Moore and Suggit

**Representing Kingston upon Hull City Council:**

Councillors Gemmell OBE, Mathieson, Shipley and S Walker

**Representing North Lincolnshire Council:**

Councillors Briggs (Chairperson), Vickers and Waltham

**Representing North East Lincolnshire Council:**

Councillors Sutton, T. Walker and Wallace

Chief Fire Officer & Chief Executive, Deputy Chief Officer/Director of Operations, Secretary/Director of People, Director of Finance & Assets/Section 151 Officer, Assistant Chief Officer/Director of Safety and Committee Manager were also present.

Mr M Allingham, Mr J Jepson and Mr C Vertigans (Independent Co-opted Members of the Governance, Audit and Scrutiny Committee) also attended as observers.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Baxter, Chapman MBE, Nicola, Swift, Turner and Williams.

The meeting was held at the Humberside Fire and Rescue Service Headquarters, Kingston upon Hull. Meeting commenced at 10.30 a.m.

The Chairperson welcomed the Independent Co-opted Members of the Governance, Audit and Scrutiny Committee to the meeting.

**4122 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** – No declarations were made in connection with any of the items to be considered at this meeting.

**4123 MINUTES – Resolved** – That the minutes of the meeting of the Authority held on 23 April 2013, having been printed and circulated amongst the Members, be taken as read and correctly recorded and be signed by the Chairperson.

**4124 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC – Resolved** – That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following items (Minutes 4125 and 4126) on the grounds that they are likely to involve the disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

*(In making its decision the Authority confirmed that having regard to all the circumstances it was satisfied that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information).*

**4125 OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY PROGRAMME - OPTIONS FOR ENGAGEMENT -** The Assistant Chief Officer/Director of Safety submitted a report, further to Minute 4119, reminding Members that a number of options had been developed which could improve the efficiency of operational response by reducing the cost of the provision whilst still ensuring

the Service can meet the Authority's response standards. The details of those options had been presented to Members at a number of Member Days. The report now submitted summarising those options was put before the Authority on 23 April 2013, including an addition circulated as a late paper which summarised an option previously presented to Members, but which had been omitted when the original Appendix that had been circulated, and unfortunately that late paper also included an error. The error, which had been corrected in the report now submitted, related to Option A4, which in fact was an option which Officers felt could be safely implemented if finances dictate that it must be considered. The options could not all be implemented as any decision to implement one might have an effect on other options. The options were split into geographical groupings and within those groupings normally only one option could be implemented. Whilst there might be a small number of options that Members would wish to implement regardless of the financial situation, it was envisaged that the majority of options would only be implemented when the financial situation dictated that they needed to be. Therefore engagement on a wide range of options would enable Members to determine what might need to be implemented sometime in the future, dependent on finances, which will support effective planning. Although there will be a need to make decisions during 2013/14 as to what options would be implemented, in order to achieve a balanced budget, it was not envisaged that any implementation would need to take place before 2014/15.

The options set out in the report had previously been presented to Members in detail with particular focus on providing information regarding the effect of implementing the options on the following:

- First engine response standard performance.
- Second engine response standard performance.
- Risk of dwelling fire fatalities
- Risk of fire fatalities in other buildings
- Risk of special service fatalities
- Finances

Further information on each option was also provided which included;

- General service wide information
- Station specific information
- The effect on the workload of other stations
- The peak times that fires occur in station areas
- Mapping of where the most fires occur
- Mapping of the fire engine travel times from stations

If, as was anticipated, most options would only ever be implemented if there was a financial need to do so then it was likely that consideration will need to be given to the balance of key pieces of information in respect to:

- Predicted effect on community risk
- Predicted effect on response standards
- Financial impact
- Views of stakeholders

The Strategic Plan (SP) and Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP) clearly laid out the importance of balancing the service delivery resources in Prevention, Protection and Response, and also developing service delivery arrangements around Preparedness and Recovery in line with the Service Vision. Risk to communities had been progressively reduced during the past ten years by highly effective fire prevention work. That had seen an almost halving of emergency calls but very little reduction in the number of fire engines deployed. Whilst many of the options were predicted to increase risk those predicted increases would still mean that the risk would be below the level considered acceptable ten years ago. That downward trend in incidents continued and Appendix 2 to the report showed the resulting risk reductions from 2004 onwards and the predicted effect on risk of two of the

options with the most negative impact. If the trend of incidents continued downwards then risk would also continue to reduce as a result and could in time be reduced to a level less than the current level even if options are implemented. The Service will continue to support fire prevention work which should give Members confidence in the potential for further incident reductions and Members may also wish to reinvest some savings from implementing options in increasing prevention resources in areas where changes have been made.

At the Member Day on 15 March 2013 Members had requested that Officers should express their professional opinion as to which, if any, of the options were not considered to be suitable for implementation regardless of the fact that they could be implemented within the existing response standards. The report set out in paragraphs 15 and 16 the options which Officers considered in their professional opinion were not suitable for implementation.

Members discussed the content of the report and sought clarification, where necessary regarding specific options.

**Moved by Councillor Waltham and Seconded by Councillor Ibson:**

“That Members agree to go out to engagement on each option where the estimated saving is above £250,000 except those options listed in paragraphs 15 and 16 of the report which Officers had expressed their professional opinion that they were not considered to be suitable for implementation.”

**Moved by the Councillor Briggs and seconded by Councillor Engall as an amendment:**

“That Members ratify their previous decision at the meeting on 23 April 2013 and approve the 24 options in the report (excluding the 8 options set out in paragraphs 15 and 16 to go out to engagement whilst stopping short, at this stage, of formally consulting on implementing any of those options (Minute 4119 (a) refers)”

**Resolved** – That the voting on this item shall be by a recorded vote.

Upon being to put to the vote the voting on the Amendment was:

For: 13 (Councillors Briggs, Engall, Gemmell, Hodgson, Mathieson, Mole, Moore, Shipley, Suggit, Sutton, S Walker, T Walker and Wallace)

Against: 3 (Councillors Ibson, Vickers and Waltham)

**Amendment Carried**

**Substantive Motion Carried**

**Resolved** – (a) That Members approve the 24 options in the report (excluding the 8 options set out in paragraphs 15 and 16 to go out to engagement whilst stopping short, at this stage, of formally consulting on implementing any of those options and (b) that a Special Meeting of the Authority be convened to consider the outcome of the engagement exercise to determine which options should be consulted upon.

**4126 ‘HFR SOLUTIONS’** – The Deputy Chief Officer/Director of HFR Solutions reported orally that he had just heard that the company had been successful in another bid and that he would submit further information to the June 2013 meeting.

*Meeting closed at 11.55am*

