#### LANCASHIRE COMBINED FIRE AUTHORITY

### PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 16 September 2020, at 10.00 am - Virtual Meeting accessible via MS Teams and YouTube (as a live webcast).

#### **MINUTES**

#### PRESENT:

### Councillors

S Holgate (Chairman)

L Beavers

P Britcliffe

S Clarke

N Hennessy (for M Khan OBE)

H Khan

Z Khan

A Riggott

D Smith

D Stansfield

### Officers

B Norman, Assistant Chief Fire Officer (LFRS)

T Crook, Area Manager, Head of Service Delivery (LFRS)

S Morgan, Area Manager, Head of Service Delivery (LFRS)

J Ashton, Community Protection Manager (LFRS)

D Brooks, Principal Member Services Officer (LFRS)

N Bashall, Member Services Officer (LFRS)

#### 26/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Mohammed Khan.

### 27/19 <u>DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY AND NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS</u>

None received.

### 28/19 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

In relation to resolution 25/19 on page 16, Councillor Smith was aware of a petition to parliament to ban the sale of disposable barbecues. He felt this was an important issue and asked whether any progress had been made. In response, the Assistant Chief Fire Officer advised that the sector had fed back concerns to the National Fire Chiefs Council who were lobbying the Home Office to consider making changes to legislation to ban barbecues. In the interim a number of leading manufacturers and supermarkets had chosen to stop stocking them, not just those used on the

moorlands but also those that were used on balconies. Members would be updated at future meetings as clarity emerged.

<u>RESOLVED</u>: - That the Minutes of the last meeting held on <u>24 June 2020</u> be confirmed as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

#### 29/19 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT INFORMATION

The Chairman introduced, Assistant Chief Fire Officer Ben Norman who presented the report.

The Assistant Chief Fire Officer advised Members that this was the 1st quarterly report for 2020/21 as detailed in the Risk Management Plan 2017-2022.

Members examined each indicator in turn as follows:-

# KPI 1 – Preventing, fires and other emergencies from happening and Protecting, people and property when fires happen

#### 1.1 Risk Map

This indicator measured the fire risk in each Super Output Area. Risk was determined using fire activity over the previous 3 fiscal years along with a range of demographic data, such as population and deprivation.

The standard was to reduce the risk in Lancashire – an annual reduction in the County risk map score.

The current score 32,448, previous year score 31,816.

This was a negative exception report due to the overall risk score increasing over the previous year.

Analysis showed the reason was due to two factors:

- i) an update in 2019 to the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) score which was compiled by the Ministry of Housing and Local Government; (with the previous update being 2015). The IMD score was the official measure of relative deprivation for Lower Level Super Output Areas (SOA's) and was taken from the English Indices of Deprivation. Each SOA was assigned a score; the higher the score the more deprived the area. The 2019 update showed an increased score for 565 of the 941 SOA's within Lancashire. Our risk map calculation applied a multiplier of two to the score; hence an increased likelihood of SOA's being moved to a higher risk banding; and
- ii) the number of dwelling fire casualties recorded over the three-year period had increased. Details of casualties were reported quarterly within KPI 1.4. It was noted that although there were decreases in the number of dwelling and building fires, they were insufficient to offset the combined increases in IMD and casualties.

It was also noted that as the increase in the risk map score appeared to be related to the updated IMD, it was felt that this increase would be a single occurrence and that the current trajectory of dwelling and building fires would lead to a reduction in the next risk map update. The updated risk would be considered in future planning actions and performance would continue to be monitored at both a local and county level.

#### 1.2 Overall Activity

This indicator measured the number of incidents that the Service attended with one or more pumping appliances.

Quarter 1 activity 4,916, previous year quarter 1 activity 4,532 an increase of 8.47% over the same quarter.

| Year<br>to Date | 2020/21<br>Quarter 1 | Previous<br>year<br>to Date | 2019/20<br>Quarter 1 |
|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 4,916           | 4,916                | 4,532                       | 4,532                |

Incidents attended consisted of a myriad of different types. The report presented a chart which represented the count and percentage that each activity had contributed to the overall quarter's activity; most notably was that 45% were false alarms which was comparable with previous periods. The Assistant Chief Fire Officer advised that the Home Office had commissioned an academic institution to undertake a national study on how Fire and Rescue Services were dealing with false alarms and a report was awaited. This would feed into National Fire Chief Council practices and identify best practice for consideration.

In response to a request from the Chairman that a detailed report be provided to the Committee on the issue of false alarms, the Assistant Chief Fire Officer suggested and it was agreed that a report would be presented once the national report had been received.

### 1.3 <u>Accidental Dwelling Fires</u>

This indicator reported the number of primary fires where a dwelling had been affected and the cause of the fire had been recorded as 'Accidental' or 'Not known'.

It was noted that quarter 1 activity was 224, the previous year quarter 1 activity was 209, which represented an increase of 7.18% over the same quarter.

The Assistant Chief Fire Officer advised that although this indicator was not in exception there had been an increase when compared to quarter 1 from the previous year; the reasons for this had therefore been investigated.

Area Manager Morgan advised that a moderate spike had been seen in May with incident numbers moving from the very low 60s (which was comparable with previous months) up to 100 accidental dwelling fires. This was during the lockdown period which reflected that more people were spending time at home. The data

showed that those primarily involved were single occupant males or older persons and the incident types were cooking and distraction related, with the fires contained to items first ignited.

#### 1.3.1 Accidental Dwelling Fires – Extent of Damage (Fire Severity)

This indicator reported the number of primary fires where a dwelling had been affected <u>and</u> the cause of the fire had been recorded as 'Accidental or Not known' presented as a percentage extent of fire and heat damage.

The extent of fire and heat damage was recorded at the time the 'stop' message was sent and included all damage types. The report charted a rolling quarterly severity of accidental dwelling fire over the previous two years with each quarter broken down into high, medium and low severity. Each quarter included the percentage (out of 100%) that each severity type represented of the total, with an indicator to illustrate the direction against the same quarter of the previous year.

The latest quarter recorded a combined 'low' and 'medium' severity of 92.9% which was a decreased of 3.3% against the 96.2% recorded in the same quarter of the previous year.

| Severit                                   | :У     | Previous Rolling 4 Quarters |           |           |           |           |
|---|--------|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| (Direction a<br>the same q<br>of previous | uarter | Quarter 1                   | Quarter 2 | Quarter 3 | Quarter 4 | Quarter 1 |
| High                                      | •      | 3.8%                        | 6.5%      | 4.9%      | 8.1%      | 7.1%      |
| Medium                                    | •      | 49.8%                       | 51.5%     | 57.8%     | 50.8%     | 52.7%     |
| Low                                       | Û      | 46.4%                       | 42.0%     | 37.4%     | 41.1%     | 40.2%     |

## 1.3.2 <u>Accidental Dwelling Fires – Number of Incidents where occupants have</u> received a Home Fire Safety Check

This indicator reported the number of primary fires where a dwelling had been affected <u>and</u> the cause of fire had been recorded as 'Accidental or Not known' by the extent of the fire and heat damage. The HFSC must be a completed job (i.e. not a refusal) carried out by LFRS personnel or partner agency. The HFSC must have been carried out within 12 months prior to the fire occurring.

|    | 2020/21 |                               | 2019/20 |                               |  |
|----|---------|-------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|--|
|    |         | % of ADF's with previous HFSC |         | % of ADF's with previous HFSC |  |
| Q1 | 26      | 12%                           | 23      | 11%                           |  |
| Q2 |         |                               | 26      | 13%                           |  |
| Q3 |         |                               | 31      | 15%                           |  |
| Q4 |         |                               | 27      | 14%                           |  |

County Councillor Riggott queried whether it was possible to provide an update concerning those who had refused a Home Fire Safety Check (as detailed on page 3 in the third paragraph of the previous minutes). In response, Area Manager Crook advised that within quarter 1 there that been 4 people who had refused a HFSC. The reasons for the refusal were: 1 x change of occupier; 2 x unable to contact (after trying for up to 3 times) and 1 x person declined following a small fire. The Assistant Chief Fire Officer added that for some homeowners, particularly those living in troubled conditions or with chaotic lifestyles, it was common for a Home Fire Safety Check to be declined. The Service did install smoke alarms wherever possible at the scene of a fire, given the probability that if someone had already had a fire a further fire was more likely.

CC Riggott thanked Officers for the information and asked that this be provided at future meetings. As he had a number of questions regarding Home Fire Safety Checks he wondered whether at some point it would be appropriate to consider what was reported rather than ask Officers to keep doing extra work. In response, the Assistant Chief Fire Officer confirmed the headings in the report were set by the Integrated Risk Management Plan but the detail of what was provided in the reports could be changed and systems set to extract the required data.

CC Riggott queried (on page 33) of the report the statement that an improvement indicated "that the correct households were being targeted with prevention activities". He wondered whether the data showed an increase in accidental dwelling fires in premises that had had a HFSC due to better targeting and people were taking advice on board, or had the number of accidental dwelling fires just increased. In response, the Assistant Chief Fire Officer advised the aim was to demonstrate that individuals who were highly vulnerable and who had received an intervention didn't have a fire although, this was difficult to evidence. He suggested a case study presentation for the next meeting to provide qualitative evidence of why high risk individuals that didn't have a fire was a measure of success. He also reassured Members that there remained a targeted approach taken for those having fires and low risk households to influence behaviour however; the approach was through other means including social media.

In response to a question from County Councillor Hennessy on the action taken to inform residents of the risks, the Assistant Chief Fire Officer confirmed it was possible to see if there was more the Service could do via social media and this would be included in the presentation agreed for the next meeting. He advised that those who were most vulnerable to fire were those in domiciliary care which was where efforts were focussed and while the Service was very successful in accessing those dwellings it was very difficult to change deep seated behaviours.

## 1.4 Accidental Dwelling Fire Casualties

This indicator reported the number of fire related fatalities, slight and serious injuries at primary fires where a dwelling had been affected <u>and</u> the cause of fire had been recorded as 'Accidental or Not known'. A slight injury was defined as; a person attending hospital as an outpatient (not precautionary check). A serious injury was defined as; at least an overnight stay in hospital as an in-patient.

There were no fatalities during the latest quarterly period. One casualty was recorded as serious and 10 slight. The same quarter of the previous year recorded 2 fatalities, 6 serious and 5 slight.

| Casualty Status  | 2020/21   | 2019/20   |
|--|-----------|-----------|
|  | Quarter 1 | Quarter 1 |
| Fatal  | 0         | 2         |
| Victim went to hospital visit, injuries appeared Serious | 1         | 6         |
| Victim went to hospital visit, injuries appeared Slight  | 10        | 5         |
| TOTAL  | 11        | 13        |

### 1.5 <u>Accidental Building Fires (Non-Dwellings)</u>

This indicator reported number of primary fires where the property type was 'Building' and the property sub type did not equal 'Dwelling' and the cause of fire had been recorded as 'Accidental' or 'Not known'.

Quarterly activity increased 29.89% over the same quarter of the previous year.

| Total number of incidents | 2020/21   | 2019/20   |
|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|
|                           | Quarter 1 | Quarter 1 |
|                           | 113       | 87        |

This was a negative exception report due to the number of accidental building fires (non-dwelling) recorded during the month of May, within quarter 1, being above the upper control limit.

Analysis had identified that there had been 113 recorded accidental building fires, with a peak in May of 50. This month was just above the upper control limit of 48.8. A similar increase was seen during quarter 1 of 2018 with activity possibly being exaggerated during the period by the national lockdown which started late March.

Area Manager Crook advised that private garden shed fires accounted for a third of the fires during the quarter, with a further 14% being within a private garage. Combined, there were 53 fires, which accounted for almost 50% of the accidental building fires within the quarter. This would be consistent with the public being mainly confined to their home address for several months.

As a comparison, during the same quarter of the previous year, there had been 21 private garage and private garden shed fires.

It was expected that performance would return to within standard over the coming months which had already started to occur with June activity being very low in comparison to previous years. During lockdown, appropriate local targeting had taken place which included where an accidental garden rubbish fire that without intervention might have led to a primary property being affected. He assured Members that the campaign calendar would be reviewed to ensure that risks associated with the home were highlighted, including: the use of sheds, gardening, electrical and barbeque safety.

#### 1.5.1 Accidental Building Fires (Non-Dwellings) – Extent of Damage (Fire Severity)

This indicator reported the number of primary fires where the property type was a building and the property sub-type was not a dwelling <u>and</u> the cause of fire had been recorded as 'Accidental or Not known' presented as a percentage extent of fire and heat damage.

The extent of fire and heat damage was recorded at the time the 'stop' message was sent and included all damage types. The report charted a rolling quarterly severity of accidental building fires over the previous two years with each quarter broken down into high, medium and low severity. Each quarter included the percentage (out of 100%) that each severity type represented of the total, with an indicator to illustrate the direction against the same quarter of the previous year.

The latest quarter recorded a combined 'low' and 'medium' severity of 56.6%. This was a decrease of 6.6% against a combined severity of 63.2% in the same quarter of the previous year. Area Manager Crook advised that analysis of the accidental building fires showed that although the fires were not major they had led to a near or complete loss of a shed or outbuilding structure.

| Severit                                   | ,      | Previous Rolling 4 Quarters |           |           |           |           |
|---|--------|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| (Direction a<br>the same q<br>of previous | uarter | Quarter 1                   | Quarter 2 | Quarter 3 | Quarter 4 | Quarter 1 |
| High                                      | •      | 12.6%                       | 22.4%     | 29.2%     | 17.8%     | 43.4%     |
| Medium                                    | Û      | 50.6%                       | 57.9%     | 58.3%     | 65.8%     | 47.8%     |
| Low                                       | Û      | 36.8%                       | 19.7%     | 12.5%     | 16.4%     | 8.8%      |

#### 1.6 Deliberate Fires

This indicator reported the number of primary and secondary fires where the cause of fire had been recorded as 'Deliberate'. Secondary fires were the majority of outdoor fires including grassland and refuse fires unless they involved casualties or rescues, property loss or 5 or more appliances attended. They included fires in single derelict buildings.

The Assistant Chief Fire officer advised that it was seen as a real positive that this indicator was not in exception (as it had been in previous years) given a number of social factors at that time (such as young people were not in school and people were not engaged in holidays and social activity). Efforts from wholetime, prevention and unusually on-call staff (because of their first class availability during the period) were focussed on reducing deliberate fires.

| Deliberate Fire Type                           |           | 2019/20   |
|--|-----------|-----------|
|  | Quarter 1 | Quarter 1 |
| 1.6.1 Deliberate Fires – Anti-Social Behaviour | 552       | 681       |
| 1.6.2 Deliberate Fires – Dwellings             | 18        | 29        |
| 1.6.3 Deliberate Fires – Non-Dwellings         | 29        | 35        |

### 1.7 Home Fire Safety Checks

This indicator reported the percentage of completed Home Fire Safety Checks (HFSC), excluding refusals, carried out where the risk score had been determined to be high.

An improvement was shown if: i) the total number of HFSC's completed was greater than the comparable quarter of the previous year; and ii) the percentage of high HFSC outcomes was greater than the comparable quarter of the previous year.

The Assistant Chief Fire Officer advised that during the lockdown the Service had carried out 2,300 Home Fire Safety Checks on a risk basis (where the risk of harm from fire to individuals was greater than the risk to staff of wearing PPE and entering the home). This was in addition to the 3,500 visits that mainly prevention colleagues delivered on behalf of local authorities with a focus on those shielding, checking on people's welfare, ensuring food parcels and medicines were delivered etc.

Members noted that although the number of HFSCs undertaken during the quarter had decreased by 52% over the same quarter of the previous year, it was pleasing that the percentage of those with a high risk outcome had increased by 6%.

In response to a question raised by County Councillor Riggott the Assistant Chief Fire Officer advised that quarter 2 would be very similar figures to those seen in quarter 1. The Service was currently still in the emergency phase of the response to Covid however, a recovery group had been set up to look at services that had been ceased or amended and, in a prioritised order, risk assessments had been undertaken to look at those recommencing. The risk assessments were currently being reviewed in line with Public Health England, Public Health Directors and the National Fire Chief's guidance. Currently there was more freedom to consider entering into homes to carry out safe and wellbeing visits and work was ongoing to determine an appropriate time for this to be re-established.

In addition, the Assistant Chief Fire Officer reassured Members that where services could recommence they had done so including: i) for young people playing with fire the restorative justice work had been adapted to a digital based delivery; and ii) education work continued particularly the Prince's Trust programme with 9 teams due to commence this month. Therefore the Service was looking to influence circa 150 young people in a Covid secure way.

|    | 2020/21                 | 2019/20                 |
|----|-------------------------|-------------------------|
|    | % of High HFSC outcomes | % of High HFSC outcomes |
| Q1 | 71%                     | 65%                     |
| Q2 |                         | 61%                     |
| Q3 |                         | 60%                     |
| Q4 |                         | 61%                     |

## 1.8 Road Safety Education Evaluation

This indicator reported the percentage of participants of the Wasted Lives and Road Sense education packages that showed a positive change to less risky behaviour following the programme; based on comparing the overall responses to an evaluation question before and after the course.

Total participants were a combination of those engaged with at Wasted Lives and Road Sense events.

|       | 2020/21 (cumul  | ative)         | 2019/20 (cumul | ative)  |
|-------|---|----------------|----------------|---|
|       | Total<br>participants   |                | participants   | % positive influence on participants' behaviour |
| Q1    | The covid-19 pa   | andemic led to | 4,354          | 85%   |
| ~-    | the closure of educational  |                | 8,158          | 85%   |
|       | facilities which meant it was not possible to deliver road safety activities in the normal way. |                | 16,417         | 85%   |
| N J — |   |                | 21,516         | 85%   |

It was noted that during the quarter 1 period the pandemic had led to the closure of educational facilities and the Service had been unable to deliver road safety activities in the normal way. However, to ensure road safety messages continued to be available people were engaged via social media platforms; with 30,000 people recorded as being engaged via social media platforms during the period.

The Assistant Chief Fire Officer introduced Area Manager Crook who was the national fire chief's lead for the sector on road safety.

Area Manager Crook advised that the Service was part of the Road Safety Partnership which was also very active on social media in relation to road safety messages across the county. He advised that the Service recovery group was writing out to all educational establishments requesting they complete a survey to determine whether they wanted education packages to be delivered either in school, remotely or by more digital handouts for pupils.

In response to a question asked by CC Hennessy at the last meeting, Area Manager Crook advised that between the years 2014 – 2018 there had been a consistent year-on-year decrease in the number of people who had been killed and seriously injured on Lancashire's roads from 859 in 2014 to 734 in 2018. Of all those killed or seriously injured in Lancashire over the 5 years, two-thirds were male.

Area Manager Crook advised that: i) there was an increasing trend for motorcyclists (who represented 1% of all traffic on the roads) yet they were much more prominent on the casualty data (and the Service provided education through its Biker Down campaign); ii) there was a higher rate of collision in the hours of daylight in line with increased traffic at rush our periods and education was needed for commuters to drive responsibly and safer; iii) in summer cyclists were more prevalent to have accidents; iv) there was a spike in collisions involving 11 and 12 year olds as they moved to high school which introduced new risks to them (this was a key message covered in RoadSense delivered by the Service at year 6); v) there was also a spike in serious collisions at ages 16-20 when most people learned to drive (which was covered in education packages such as Wasted Lives and SafeDrive StayAlive).

To date there had been 20 fatalities across Lancashire. This included 6 drivers, 3 pedal cyclists, 8 motorcyclists and 3 pedestrians (none of whom were children). All of these investigations were complex and would take some time to determine the causation factors. The number of fatalities in 2020 was far lower than the 51 fatalities in 2019 which reflected the dramatic (around 50%) reduction in road traffic primarily as a result of lockdown since March.

The next Lancashire Road Safety Partner Executive Board was due to meet in early October and at the meeting the Partnership analyst would update the Board on the current data to determine the targeting of demographic and geographic risk. Area Manager Crook reassured Members that the road safety data and the education prevention provided was carefully considered.

In response to Member comments concerning an update on the partnership work, it was agreed that Area Manager Crook would invite the Lancashire Road Safety Partnership Co-ordinator, Rhiannon Leeds to attend a future meeting.

### 1.9 Fire Safety Enforcement

This indicator reported the number of Fire Safety Enforcement inspections carried out within the period resulting in supporting businesses to improve and become compliant with fire safety regulations or to take formal action of enforcement and prosecution of those that failed to comply.

Formal activity was defined as one or more of the following: enforcement notice or an action plan, alterations notice or prohibition notice.

An improvement was shown if the percentage of adults 'requiring formal activity' was greater than the comparable quarter of the previous year. This helped inform that the correct businesses were being identified.

\*The 'number of inspections' count included business safety advice and advice to other enforcement authorities not captured within the formal/informal or satisfactory counts.

|    | 2020/21                | 2019/20            |                      |              |        |                                   |
|----|------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------|-----------------------------------|
|    |                        | Requiring          |                      |              | 0/     |                                   |
|    | *No. of<br>Inspections | Formal<br>Activity | Informal<br>Activity | Satisfactory | Formal | % requiring<br>Formal<br>Activity |
| Q1 | 18                     | 5                  | 7                    | 4            | 28%    | 9%                                |
| Q2 |                        |                    |                      |              |        | 9%                                |
| Q3 |                        |                    |                      |              |        | 10%                               |
| Q4 |                        |                    |                      |              |        | 13%                               |

## KPI 2 - Responding, to fire and other emergencies quickly and competently

## 2.1.1 Emergency Response Standards - Critical Fires – 1st Fire Engine Attendance

This indicator reported the 'Time of Call' (TOC) and 'Time in Attendance' (TIA) of the first fire engine arriving at the incident in less than the relevant response standard.

The response standards included call handling and fire engine response time for the first fire engine attending a critical fire, these were as follows:-

- Very high risk area = 6 minutes
- High risk area = 8 minutes
- Medium risk area = 10 minutes
- Low risk area = 12 minutes

The response standards were determined by the risk map score and subsequent risk grade for the location of the fire.

Standard: to be in attendance within response standard target on 90% of occasions.

Quarter 1 - 1st pump response decreased 0.74% of total first fire engine attendances over the same quarter of the previous year.

| Year<br>to Date |        | Previous year to Date | 2019/20<br>Quarter 1 |
|-----------------|--------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| 88.50%          | 88.50% | 89.24%                | 89.24%               |

## 2.1.2 <u>Emergency Response Standards - Critical Fires – 2nd Fire Engine</u> Attendance

This indicator reported the time taken for the second fire engine to attend a critical fire incident measured from the time between the second fire engine arriving and the time of call. The target is determined by the risk map score and subsequent risk grade for the location of the fire.

Standard: to be in attendance within response standard target on 85% of occasions.

Quarter 1 – 2nd pump response decreased 5.76% of total second pump attendances over the same quarter of the previous year.

| Year<br>to Date |        | Previous year to Date | 2019/20<br>Quarter 1 |
|-----------------|--------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| 83.71%          | 83.71% | 89.47%                | 89.47%               |

## 2.2.1 <u>Emergency Response Standards - Critical Special Service – 1st Fire Engine</u> Attendance

This indicator measured how long it took the first fire engine to respond to critical non-fire incidents such as road traffic collisions, rescues and hazardous materials incidents. For those incidents there was a single response standard which measured call handling time and fire engine response time. The response standard for the first fire engine attending a critical special call was 13 minutes.

Standard: to be in attendance within response standard target on 90% of occasions.

The latest quarter 1st pump response increased 2.32% over the same quarter of the previous year.

| Year<br>to Date | _      | Previous year to Date | 2019/20<br>Quarter 1 |
|-----------------|--------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| 92.07%          | 92.07% | 89.98%                | 89.98%               |

## 2.3 <u>Fire Engine Availability – Wholetime, Day Crewing and Day Crewing Plus</u>

This indicator measured the availability of fire engines that were crewed by wholetime, day crewing and day crewing plus shifts. It was measured as the percentage of time a fire engine was available to respond compared to the total time in the period.

Fire engines were designated as unavailable for the following reasons:

Mechanical

Crew deficient

- Engineer working on station
- Appliance change over
- Debrief

- Lack of equipment
- Miscellaneous
- Unavailable
- Welfare

Standard: 99.5%

Year to date availability of 99.27% was a decrease of 0.31% over the same period of the previous year.

| Year<br>to Date |        | Previous year to Date | 2019/20<br>Quarter 1 |
|-----------------|--------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| 99.27%          | 99.27% | 99.58%                | 99.58%               |

### 2.4 Fire Engine Availability – On-Call Duty System

This indicator measured the availability of fire engines that were crewed by the oncall duty system. It was measured as the percentage of time a fire engine was available to respond compared to the total time in the period.

Fire engines were designated as unavailable (off the run) for the following reasons which include the percentage of off the run hours that each reason contributed to the total. Members noted that fire engines can be off the run for more than one reason; hence the percentages were interpreted individually (rather than as a proportion of the total):

| • | Manager deficient     | 50% |
|---|-----------------------|-----|
| • | Crew deficient        | 30% |
| • | Not enough BA wearers | 29% |
| • | No driver             | 33% |

Standard: above 95%

Year to date availability 96.11%, a 9.28% increase against the previous year to date total availability of 86.83%.

| Year    | 2020/21   | Previous year | 2019/20   |
|---------|-----------|---------------|-----------|
| to Date | Quarter 1 | to Date       | Quarter 1 |
| 96.11%  | 96.11%    | 86.83%        | 86.83%    |

This was a positive exception report due to On-Call availability being within standard and greater than the lower control limit, during all three months of quarter 1.

Area Manager Morgan advised that from analysis, on-call availability had increased during the start of the lockdown period due to: staff being furloughed from their primary employment, those who were self-employed who were not able to carry out their roles, and those who were homeworking. An overall increase in availability was also due to furloughed and self-employed staff choosing contract variations to increase availability, with staff on some units working over their contracted hours, particularly at weekends. As the job retention scheme was coming to an end it was felt likely that the need for wholetime staff to cover (which had decreased during quarter 1) would begin to increase to the pre-April position. Wholetime staff would be used to help manage the reduction in hours that on call staff would be able to cover when they returned to their primary employment.

The number of on-call staff who had left the Service during quarter 1 was lower than previously recorded at this time of year which might suggest that the Service had assisted staff to be able to maintain their financial position to support any furlough payments they received from their primary employers.

As we moved out of the initial restrictions, additional work on local risks, hydrants and additional training, where possible, would continue to drive Service Delivery at a local level. Additionally, an increase in the use of flexible contracts, used to cover

gaps in availability, would continue to be appraised.

## 2.4.1 <u>Fire Engine Availability – On-Call Duty System (without wholetime detachments)</u>

### Subset of KP1 2.4 and provided for information only

This indicator measured the availability of fire engines that were crewed by the oncall duty system (OC) when wholetime detachments were not used to support availability. It was measured by calculating the percentage of time a fire engine was available to respond compared to the total time in the period.

Fire engines were designated as unavailable (off-the-run) for the following reasons:

- Manager deficient
- Crew deficient
- Not enough BA wearers
- No driver

Standard: As a subset of KPI 2.4 there was no standard attributable to this KPI.

The percentage of time that OC crewed engines were available for quarter 1 was 94.57%. This excluded the wholetime detachments shown in KPI 2.4.

### 2.5 Staff Accidents

This indicator measured the number of staff accidents.

The number of staff accidents during the latest quarter decreased by 19.05% against the same quarter of the previous year.

| Year<br>to Date | 2020/21<br>Quarter 1 | Previous year to Date | 2019/20<br>Quarter 1 |
|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| 10 Date         | Quarter              | to Date               | Quarter i            |
| 17              | 17                   | 21                    | 21                   |

#### KPI 3 – Delivering, value for money in how we use our resources

## 3.1 <u>Progress against Savings Programme</u>

The annual budget for 2020/21 was set at £57.3m with a budget to 30 June of £13.8m. The spend for the same period was £13.5m which gave an underspend of £0.3m; a variance of -0.52%. This was a result of the pandemic affecting planned spend activity during the period. This position would continue to be monitored in the forthcoming months.

### 3.2 Overall User Satisfaction

There had been 2,472 people surveyed since April 2012 and the number satisfied with the service was 2,447; % satisfied 98.99% against a standard of 97.50%; a variance 1.53%.

During the latest quarter, 71 people were surveyed and 69 responded that they were 'very satisfied' or 'fairly satisfied' with the service they received.

#### KPI 4 – Valuing, our people so that they can focus on making Lancashire safer

#### 4.1 Overall Staff Engagement

Staff surveys were undertaken on matters which required a broader range of input. In the past, these had related to health and wellbeing, naming of the new intranet or more targeted surveys on challenges faced by blue light drivers. Due to surveys being undertaken on an ad hoc basis they were reported on an 'as required' basis. As such, the measure of success would be the levels of engagement in a survey and in contributing to decisions and improvements.

Members noted that 2 surveys for operational and support staff ran online only for two weeks from 15th to 21st June 2020. These were designed to gain insight into the health and wellbeing of staff during the pandemic along with their views on ways of working, safety measures and communications. There was additional focus on support service staff in relation to remote working and plans to gradually re-occupy offices. In total, 374 responses to the surveys were received (32% of staff). In total 79% of respondents were very satisfied or satisfied with safety measures taken by work to-date; 96% strongly agreed or agreed that they knew what to do to keep safe and healthy during the pandemic; 81% strongly agreed or agreed that they were receiving timely communications; 93% of people were able to access the systems and technology they needed to do their job remotely; and 76% strongly agreed or agreed that the Service was supporting employees during the pandemic.

## 4.2.1 <u>Staff Absence – Excluding on-Call Duty System</u>

This indicator measured the cumulative number of shifts (days) lost due to sickness for all wholetime, day crewing plus, day crewing and support staff divided by the total number of staff.

Annual Standard: Not more than 5 shifts lost Cumulative total number of monthly shifts lost 1.549

This was a negative exception report due to the number of shifts lost through absence per employee being above the Service target for the months of April and May.

The Assistant Chief Fire Officer presented Members with the analysis, that:-

During quarter 1 (April 2020 to June 2020), absence statistics showed wholetime personnel and non-uniformed personnel were above target for April and May and below target for June. The target for April was 0.41 and the total shifts lost was 0.71. Cumulatively, the target for May was 0.83 and the total of shifts lost was 1.18 and the target for June was 1.25 and the total number of shifts lost was 1.55.

There were 10 cases of long-term absence which spanned over the 3 months and there were 24 other cases of long-term absence which were recorded within the 3

months with the reasons detailed in the report.

Members also considered the actions undertaken to improve performance which included that the Service aimed to continue with:

- Early intervention by Occupational Health Unit (OHU) doctor / nurse / physiotherapist;
- Human Resources supported managers in following the Absence Management Policy managing individual long-term cases, addressing review periods / triggers in a timely manner and dealing with capability of staff due to health issues;
- To be included again within the leadership conference to assist future managers understanding and interpretation of the policy;
- Encouraging employees to make use of our Employee Assistance Programme provider Health Assured and The Firefighters Charity;
- HR to be in attendance at Stress Risk Assessment meetings, to support managers and to offer appropriate support to the employee along with signposting;
- OHU to organise health checks for individuals on a voluntary basis;
- Support from Service Fitness Advisor / Personal Training Instructors;
- Promotion of health, fitness and wellbeing via the routine bulletin and Employee Assistance programme.

As staff were key workers, County Councillor Hennessy queried the level of engagement staff received and whether consideration was given to family concerns around child care, supporting elderly family members etc. In response, the Assistant Chief Fire Officer confirmed that staff briefings were held via Teams with the Executive Board members and departmental and sectional managers. There was in the region of 50 staff members who worked flexibly to support childcare, caring for family members or they were shielding themselves and this in a limited fashion remained ongoing. He advised that in the long term the Chief Fire Officer was clear that any improvements to practices be continued after Covid and that the Service emerged better stronger and more effective.

## 4.2.2 <u>Staff Absence – On-Call Duty System</u>

This indicator measured the percentage of contracted hours lost due to sickness for all on-call contracted staff.

Annual Standard: Not more than 2.5% lost as % of available hours of cover.

Cumulative on-call absence (as % of available hours cover) at the end of the quarter, 0.91%.

<u>RESOLVED</u>: - That the Committee endorsed the Measuring Progress report for Quarter 1 (including noting the contents of the 3 negative and 1 positive KPI exception reports).

#### 30/19 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Committee would be held on <u>Wednesday</u>, <u>16 December 2020</u> at 1000 hours – venue to be confirmed.

Further meeting dates were agreed for 17 March 2021, 30 June 2021 and 15 September 2021.

#### 31/19 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

<u>RESOLVED</u>: - That the press and members of the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following items of business on the grounds that there would be a likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the appropriate paragraph of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, indicated under the heading to the item.

## 32/19 COMPARATIVE PERFORMANCE

#### (Paragraph 3)

It was noted that arrangements were in place within the old Best Value (BV) Family Group 4 to compile an annual comparative data in respect of the two (now withdrawn) National Fire Indicators that related specifically to fire authorities.

Data was provided for the six components which in turn made up the two explicit fire and rescue indicators in respect of: the position of each Fire and Rescue Service within the Family Group, 2018/19 – 2019/20 comparative progress/decline; percentage change in terms of actual numbers; the position of each F&RS within the comparative group for the respective indicator and a summary overview in graphical form.

Members examined each indicator in turn and noted Lancashire's position.

# National Indicator 33 – Number of deliberate (i) primary and (ii) secondary fires per 10,000 population.

#### NI 33 – Arson Incidents (deliberate fires) per 10,000 population

| Position in Family BV – 4th Quarter YTD |             | Actuals – 4th Quarter YTD |                   |            |                   |        |  |
|---|-------------|---------------------------|-------------------|------------|-------------------|--------|--|
| Group 4th Quarter                       |             | Comparison                |                   | Comparison |                   |        |  |
| YTD 2                                   | YTD 2019/20 |                           | 2018/19 - 2019/20 |            | 2018/19 - 2019/20 |        |  |
| Position                                | 2018/19     | 2019/20                   | % +/-             | 2018/19    | 2019/20           | % +/-  |  |
| 9                                       | 17.4        | 15.1                      | -13.33            | 2595       | 2249              | -13.33 |  |

## NI 33i Deliberate primary fires per 10,000 population

| Position    | in Family BV – 4th Quarter YTD Actuals – 4th |                   |            | <ul> <li>4th Quarte</li> </ul> | r YTD   |       |
|-------------|--|-------------------|------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------|
| Group 4t    | Quarter Comparison Comparison                |                   | Comparison |                                |         |       |
| YTD 2019/20 |  | 2018/19 - 2019/20 |            | 2018/19 - 2019/20              |         |       |
| Position    | 2018/19                                      | 2019/20           | % +/-      | 2018/19                        | 2019/20 | % +/- |
| 13          | 3.4  | 3.9               | 15.68      | 504                            | 583     | 15.68 |

## NI 33ii Deliberate secondary fires per 10,000 population

| Position    | in Family | BV – 4th Quarter YTD |        | D Actuals – 4th Quarter YTD |         |        |
|-------------|-----------|----------------------|--------|-----------------------------|---------|--------|
| Group 4t    | h Quarter | arter Comparison     |        | Comparison                  |         |        |
| YTD 2019/20 |           | 2018/19 - 2019/20    |        | 2018/19 - 2019/20           |         |        |
| Position    | 2018/19   | 2019/20              | % +/-  | 2018/19                     | 2019/20 | % +/-  |
| 8           | 14.0      | 11.2                 | -20.26 | 2090                        | 1666    | -20.26 |

# National Indicator 49 – Number of primary fires and related fatalities and non-fatal casualties per 100,000 population.

## NI 49i Number of primary fires per 100,000 population

| Position                     | in Family   | Family BV – 4th Quarter YTD |                   | Actuals – 4th Quarter YTD |                   |       |  |
|------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|-------|--|
| Group 4th Quarter Comparison |             | Comparison                  |                   |                           |                   |       |  |
| YTD 2                        | YTD 2019/20 |                             | 2018/19 - 2019/20 |                           | 2018/19 - 2019/20 |       |  |
| Position                     | 2018/19     | 2019/20                     | % +/-             | 2018/19                   | 2019/20           | % +/- |  |
| 11                           | 137.5       | 135.4                       | -1.56             | 2049                      | 2017              | -1.56 |  |

## NI49ii Number of fatalities in primary fires per 100,000 population

| Position               | Position in Family BV – 4th Quarter YTD |                   | Actuals – 4th Quarter YTD |                   |         |       |
|------------------------|---|-------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|---------|-------|
| Group 4th Quarter Comp |   | arison            | Comparison                |                   |         |       |
| YTD 2                  | 019/20                                  | 2018/19 - 2019/20 |                           | 2018/19 - 2019/20 |         |       |
| Position               | 2018/19                                 | 2019/20           | % +/-                     | 2018/19           | 2019/20 | % +/- |
| 6                      | 0.6                                     | 0.6               | 0.00                      | 9                 | 9       | 0.00  |

## NI49iii Number of non-fatal casualties in primary fires per 100,000 population

| Position                   | in Family BV – 4th C |            | BV – 4th Quarter YTD |            | <ul> <li>4th Quarte</li> </ul> | er YTD |
|----------------------------|----------------------|------------|----------------------|------------|--------------------------------|--------|
| Group 4t                   | h Quarter            | Comparison |                      | Comparison |                                |        |
| YTD 2019/20 2018/19 - 2019 |                      | - 2019/20  | 2018/19 - 2019/20    |            |                                |        |
| Position                   | 2018/19              | 2019/20    | % +/-                | 2018/19    | 2019/20                        | % +/-  |
| 8                          | 4.5                  | 4.9        | 7.27                 | 68         | 73                             | 7.27   |

<u>RESOLVED</u>:- That the Committee noted the content of the report and the comparative outcomes.

M NOLAN Clerk to CFA

LFRS HQ <u>Fulwood</u>