

LANCASHIRE COMBINED FIRE AUTHORITY

PERFORMANCE COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 17 March 2021, at 10.00 am - Virtual Meeting accessible via MS Teams and YouTube (as a live webcast).

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Councillors

S Holgate (Chairman)
M Khan CBE (Vice-Chair)
L Beavers
P Britcliffe
S Clarke
H Khan
Z Khan
P Rigby
A Riggott
D Smith

Officers

S Healey, Deputy Chief Fire Officer (LFRS)
B Norman, Assistant Chief Fire Officer (LFRS)
J Charters, Area Manager, Head of Service Development (LFRS)
T Crook, Area Manager, Head of Service Delivery (LFRS)
M Hutton, Area Manager, Head of Prevention and Protection (LFRS)
S Morgan, Area Manager, Head of Service Delivery for South, East and Pennine (LFRS)
D Brooks, Principal Member Services Officer (LFRS)
N Bashall, Member Services Officer (LFRS)

40/19 CHAIRMAN'S WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

The Chairman, County Councillor Holgate welcomed Authority Members and members of the press and public to the virtual committee meeting of the Lancashire Combined Fire Authority. He advised that in response to the Covid-19 Pandemic the Government had made regulations that enabled virtual meetings. This meeting was accessible for Committee Members via Microsoft Teams and for members of the press and public via a live webcast on YouTube.

A roll call was undertaken and Members individually confirmed their attendance.

41/19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None received.

42/19 DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY AND NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS

None received.

43/19 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED: - That the Minutes of the last meeting held on the 16 December 2020 be confirmed as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

44/19 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT INFORMATION

The Deputy Chief Fire Officer was pleased to present a positive report. This was the 3rd quarterly report for 2020/21 as detailed in the Risk Management Plan 2017-2022. He proposed that at the end of the performance year a report be brought to the next Committee meeting to look at making small changes to the key performance indicators (delivering value for money and valuing people) to better align with data returns submitted to Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services.

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.

1.2 Overall Activity

This indicator measured the number of incidents that the Service attended with one or more pumping appliances. The Deputy Chief Fire Officer advised that the number of incidents attended included work undertaken with other emergency services particularly the Police and North West Ambulance Service. An increase in number of incidents attended was not therefore negative if the Service was supporting other blue light colleagues.

Quarter 3 activity 4,109, previous year quarter 3 activity 4,281 a decrease of 4.02% over the same quarter.

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 51% were false alarms.

As agreed at the last meeting, proposals for changes to the Unwanted Fire Signals Policy would be considered as a separate item later on the agenda.

1.3 Accidental Dwelling Fires

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 3 activity was 231, the previous year quarter 3 activity was 206, which represented an increase of 12.1% over the same quarter. Year to date performance was 654 compared with 615 the previous year.

The Deputy Chief Fire Officer advised that there had been an increase in Accidental Dwelling Fire incident numbers in the last quarter which could be due to lockdown. Circa 50% of activity was kitchen fires and corporate communications colleagues were increasing safety messaging to raise awareness.

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

The Deputy Chief Fire Officer advised this indicator set out the damage which had occurred from Accidental Dwelling Fire incidents. He was pleased to report that whilst incident numbers remained fairly static the level of damage sustained was reducing due to proactive work including community safety and smoke alarm ownership.

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' 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 95.7% which was an increase of 0.6% against the 95.1% recorded in the same quarter of the previous year.

Severity (Direction against the same quarter of previous year)	Previous Rolling 4 Quarters				Quarter 3	
	Quarter 3	Quarter 4	Quarter 1	Quarter 2		
High	↓	4.9%	8.2%	7.1%	3.5%	4.3%
Medium	↓	57.8%	51.0%	52.4%	43.9%	47.6%
Low	↑	37.4%	40.8%	40.4%	52.55%	48.1%

1.3.2 Accidental Dwelling Fires – Number of Incidents where occupants have received a Home Fire Safety Check

This indicator reported the number of primary fires where a dwelling had been affected and 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	
	ADF's with previous HFSC	% of ADF's with previous HFSC	ADF's with previous HFSC	% of ADF's with previous HFSC
Q1	26	12%	23	11%
Q2	21	11%	26	13%
Q3	31	13%	31	15%
Q4			27	14%

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 and 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.

The Deputy Chief Fire Officer reported that sadly there was 1 dwelling fire fatality in the quarter. One casualty was recorded as serious and 12 slight. The same quarter of the previous year recorded no fatalities, 8 serious and 10 slight.

Casualty Status	2020/21 Quarter 3	2019/20 Quarter 3
Fatal	1	0
Victim went to hospital visit, injuries appeared Serious	1	8
Victim went to hospital visit, injuries appeared Slight	12	10
TOTAL	14	18

1.5 Accidental Building Fires (Non-Dwellings)

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 8.33% over the same quarter of the previous year.

Total number of incidents	2020/21 Quarter 3	2019/20 Quarter 3
	78	72

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

The Deputy Chief Fire Officer advised that whilst the level of damage from accidental dwelling fires was reducing; in commercial buildings it was increasing. On investigation there had been a significant increase in fires in private sheds and outbuildings which could be quickly lost to fire prior to the arrival of the Fire and Rescue Service.

This indicator reported the number of primary fires where the property type was a building and the property sub-type was not a dwelling and 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 75.6%. This was a decrease of 11.9% against a combined severity of 87.5% in the same quarter of the previous year.

Severity (Direction against the same quarter of previous year)		Previous Rolling 4 Quarters				Quarter 3
		Quarter 3	Quarter 4	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	
High	↑	12.5%	16.4%	43.4%	39.7%	24.4%
Medium	↑	58.3%	64.4%	47.8%	43.8%	64.1%
Low	↓	29.2%	19.2%	8.8%	16.4%	11.5%

1.6 Deliberate Fires

The Deputy Chief Fire Officer was really pleased to report that through the proactive work undertaken by the Service and work with Police colleagues the Service had seen the lowest level of deliberate fires over the last decade (particularly secondary fires throughout November and December). At the end of the report a presentation would be given by Area Manager Hutton on the community safety work undertaken during the "BrightSparx" period.

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.

Deliberate Fire Type	2020/21 Quarter 3	2019/20 Quarter 3
1.6.1 Deliberate Fires – Anti-Social Behaviour	290	345
1.6.2 Deliberate Fires – Dwellings	31	29
1.6.3 Deliberate Fires – Non-Dwellings	27	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 number of completed HFSC's had decreased 29% over the same quarter as the previous year; due to the challenges presented by the Covid 19 pandemic. However, through a modified HFSC engagement with the most vulnerable had resulted in a 9% increase of those with a high-risk outcome.

	2020/21	2019/20
	% of High HFSC outcomes	% of High HFSC outcomes
Q1	71%	65%
Q2	72%	61%
Q3	69%	60%
Q4		61%

To help illustrate the importance of the Home Fire Safety Check service; properties that had refused a HFSC, but subsequently, suffered an Accidental Dwelling Fire were monitored. During this quarter 7 properties recorded an ADF after refusing a HFSC during the previous rolling 12-month period.

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 (cumulative)		2019/20 (cumulative)	
	Total participants	% positive influence on participants' behaviour	Total participants	% positive influence on participants' behaviour
Q1	The covid-19 pandemic led to the closure of educational facilities which meant it was not		4,354	85%
Q2			8,158	85%
Q3			16,417	85%

Q4	possible to deliver road safety activities in the normal way.	21,516	85%
----	---	--------	-----

It was noted that 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, the Service had undertaken Wasted Lives sessions via an online video chat service. During quarter 3 there had been 5 Wasted Lives sessions, involving 40 attendees. The Service also continued to engage with people via social media platforms (which included coverage of the Road Safety week during November) and information was shared via the Biker Down webpage. Later on the agenda, was a presentation on the work of the Road Safety Partnership.

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	
	*No. of Inspections	Requiring		Satisfactory Audit	% requiring Formal Activity	% requiring Formal Activity
		Formal Activity	Informal Activity			
Q1	18	5	7	4	28%	9%
Q2	48	7	29	9	15%	9%
Q3	83	12	59	4	14%	10%
Q4						13%

The Deputy Chief Fire Officer advised that the Service continued to inspect based on risk. The percentages shown which required formal activity were higher than the previous year; this demonstrated the successful targeting of buildings most at risk.

KPI 2 – Responding, to fire and other emergencies quickly and competently

The Deputy Chief Fire Officer advised that in the main the Service was reaching very stretching response standards ie: setting a 90%, 6-minute attendance standard to very high-risk areas was probably amongst the quickest response arrangements

across the country with many other Services having response standards of 10 – 15 minutes.

The Deputy Chief Fire Officer was pleased to advise that North West Fire Control had reported call handling times had reduced to fire incidents across the last quarter to an average of 76 seconds against a target of 90 seconds.

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 3 – 1st pump response increased 1.52% of total first fire engine attendances over the same quarter of the previous year.

Year to Date	2020/21 Quarter 3	Previous year to Date	2019/20 Quarter 3
88.80%	89.58%	88.31%	88.06%

2.1.2 Emergency Response Standards - Critical Fires – 2nd Fire Engine 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 3 – 2nd pump response increased 3.56% of total second pump attendances over the same quarter of the previous year.

Year to Date	2020/21 Quarter 3	Previous year to Date	2019/20 Quarter 3
86.40%	87.77%	86.67%	84.21%

2.2.1 Emergency Response Standards - Critical Special Service – 1st Fire Engine 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 decreased 2.96% over the same quarter of the previous year.

Year to Date	2020/21 Quarter 3	Previous year to Date	2019/20 Quarter 3
86.76%	87.83%	89.30%	90.51%

2.3 Fire Engine Availability – Wholetime, Day Crewing and Day Crewing Plus

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 99.29% was a decrease of 0.21% over the same period of the previous year.

Year to Date	2020/21 Quarter 3	Previous year to Date	2019/20 Quarter 3
99.29%	99.16%	99.50%	99.51%

2.4 Fire Engine Availability – On-Call Duty System

This indicator measured the availability of fire engines that were crewed by the on-call 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 61%
- Crew deficient 63%
- Not enough BA wearers 51%
- No driver 36%

Standard: above 95%

Year to date availability 90.46%, a 4.46% increase against the previous year to date total availability of 86.60%.

Year to Date	2020/21 Quarter 3	Previous year to Date	2019/20 Quarter 3
90.46%	87.90%	86.60%	87.47%

The Deputy Chief Fire Officer advised the on-call availability was amongst the very best in the country which had been impacted (positively) through employers furloughing staff which had enabled on-call staff to provide more cover. It was noted that many other Services had around 60-70% availability.

2.4.1 Fire Engine Availability – On-Call Duty System (without wholetime detachments)

Subset of KP1 2.4 and provided for information only

This indicator measured the availability of fire engines that were crewed by the on-call 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 3 was 86.15%. 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 28.57% against the same quarter of the previous year.

Year to Date	2020/21 Quarter 3	Previous year to Date	2019/20 Quarter 3
50	15	62	21

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

3.1 Progress against Savings Programme

The annual budget for 2020/21 was set at £57.3m with a budget to 31 December of £40.8m. The spend for the same period was £39.9m which gave an underspend of £0.9m; a variance of -1.57%. This was a result of the pandemic continuing to affect 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 2,553 people surveyed since April 2012 and the number satisfied with the service was 2,525; % satisfied was 98.90% against a standard of 97.50%; a variance of 1.44%.

During the latest quarter, 27 people were surveyed and 27 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

An engagement index was calculated based on five questions measuring pride, advocacy, attachment, inspiration and motivation; factors that were understood to be important features shared by staff engaged with the organisation.

For each respondent an engagement score was calculated as the average score across the five questions where strongly disagree is equivalent to 0, disagree is equivalent to 25, neither agree nor disagree is equivalent to 50, agree is equivalent to 75 and strongly agree is equivalent to 100. The engagement index was then calculated as the average engagement score in the organisation. This approach meant that a score of 100 was equivalent to all respondents saying strongly agree to all five engagement questions, while a score of 0 was equivalent to all respondents saying strongly disagree to all five engagement questions. An improvement was shown if the percentage engagement index was greater than the previous survey. The engagement index was previously measured in the last full staff survey undertaken in May 2018.

Staff were surveyed from October to December 2020 on topics including working at LFRS; equality, diversity and inclusion; health and wellbeing; training and development; leadership and management; and internal communication.

The engagement index was 79%, an increase of 9% on the 2018 survey. The number of responses was 458, a decrease of 6% on the 2018 survey.

This equated to a decrease of 31 people however the Service was unable to undertake focus groups and engage with crews at stations due to the coronavirus pandemic. These were carried out extensively during the last survey to encourage participation.

4.2.1 Staff Absence – Excluding on-Call Duty System

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 5.300

This was a negative exception report due to the number of shifts lost through absence per employee being above the Service target for each month during quarter 3.

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

During October 2020 – December 2020, absence statistics showed above target for all three months for both Whole-time personnel and Non-uniformed personnel. There were 10 cases of long-term absence which spanned over the total of the 3 months and there were 21 other cases of long term absence which were also recorded within the 3 months; reasons for these absences were set out in the report. It was noted that during the quarter 16 employees had returned to duty.

At the end of December 2020, the cumulative totals showed that non-uniformed staff absence was above target at 6.73 shifts lost per employee, for whole-time uniformed staff absence was also above target at 4.84 shifts lost per employee.

Overall absence for all staff (except On Call staff) was 5.3 shifts lost which was above the Service target of 3.75 shifts lost for this quarter.

The cumulative figures in the period included employees absent due to coronavirus and those required to self-isolate as a result of coronavirus since 1st September 2020.

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.

4.2.2 Staff Absence – On-Call Duty System

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, 0.92%.

The Chairman commented that a number of years ago the Committee had serious concerns in relation to the performance of the call handling centre and had limited conversation with North West Fire Control. Representatives were invited to attend quarter 2 and quarter 4 meetings. As a consequence, the Committee had a better knowledge and understanding of the challenges faced by North West Fire Control and the Service and there had been a significant improvement in performance which was commendable. He asked that this be noted in the minutes and that the Committee be given credit for embarking on that engagement.

In response to a question from Councillor Smith regarding how the Service captured the exceptional performance of staff supporting the vaccination programme the Deputy Chief Fire Officer advised that this was captured in the community fire safety reports presented to the Authority meetings. To date over 300 staff had volunteered with over 100,000 vaccinations given of which 10,000 had been delivered by Lancashire Fire and Rescue Service (LFRS) staff. LFRS was the first Service to support the vaccination programme. Colleagues in corporate communications were sending messages out using social media, Teams meetings were being held with volunteers to thank them for their support and members of the senior team were visible at vaccination centres to thank staff.

BrightSparx

Area Manager Mark Hutton summarised BrightSparx, which was a major winter safety campaign that included work undertaken across the Service which had contributed to some of the positive performance reported earlier in relation to antisocial behaviour fires, deliberate fires and accidental fires and casualties during the bonfire period (October/November) which for the Service started much earlier in May/June. It was noted that covid restrictions this year had meant that normal diversionary activities in the districts were not available (such as public bonfires). The presentation focussed on how the Service had used resources as effectively as possible to deliver this performance.

The BrightSparx campaign aimed to: i) maximise public and responder safety; ii) target resources at the areas and demographic groups most at risk based on data and incident intelligence; iii) increase target audience awareness of Bonfire and Firework Safety; iv) ensure legal compliance regarding safe storage and the sale of fireworks; v) identify and work closely with appropriate partners and vi) to reassure members of the public who may be concerned that the Service was pro-active in managing the risks associated with Firework and Bonfire related activity, whilst also recognising that for many the period was one of celebration.

Area Manager Hutton outlined the details of the media campaign which was viewed

as being more essential than ever due to the limited opportunity for face to face engagement / education. The Service worked with Lancashire Resilience Forum partners with clear target groups to take a co-ordinated approach across multiple platforms.

In addition, prevention and education included a Virtual Library which was refreshed with current and relevant material aligned to target groups and the ongoing Covid compliance campaign. This was used by the Fire Cadets and the Prince's Trust programme to assist youth engagement. Environmental Visual Audits were undertaken by crews to support district council street cleaning and cleansing teams waste removal work. Where covid rules allowed, innovative engagement methods were used which included radio interview and videos playing in entrances to schools / Mosques.

The Protection Team monitored lists of firework storage and retail sites from Trading Standards which were updated regularly as these changed throughout the period and risk information was added to Fire Appliance Mobile Data Terminals. Protection Fire Safety Inspectors undertook targeted audits of premises which presented the greatest risk.

Annual plans were well rehearsed in conjunction with Lancashire Constabulary and the North West Ambulance Service. Multiagency cars were deployed in each area (based on historical data and current intelligence) over the 4 nights predicted to have the highest activity. The Command Support Room was staffed at Service Headquarters with multi-agency co-ordination from Greenbank Police Station. In addition, LFRS Managers, co-located in North West Fire Control were deployed to small fires in lieu of appliances to triage response and maintain fire appliance availability for genuine emergencies. In total these vehicles responded to 67 incidents.

LFRS employed a debrief and analysis process deemed essential to maintain effectiveness which was used to inform the following years plan. This included: objective data and subjective feedback which would contribute to the usual performance reporting cycle and meet an improvement area cited by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services.

Performance Outcomes

Overall, 230 media articles reached 9.23 million people and had 83% positive sentiment which equated to an advertising value equivalent of £132,000. The virtual Bonfire Night hosted live on the Service's Facebook and YouTube page reached over 270,000 people from the UK and abroad. Almost 4,000 comments and messages were received from people thanking everyone involved and saying how much they enjoyed it and over £1,800 was raised for the Firefighters' Charity.

Digital School Education Sessions were delivered to:

KS2 - 52 schools (12 sessions) - 4,390 pupils
KS3 - 18 schools (26 sessions) - 6,425 pupils
Total - 70 schools (38 sessions) - 10,815 pupils

50% of schools provided feedback with 90% of respondents grading the sessions as good or outstanding

It was noted that: i) the number of fires from antisocial behaviour during the period was 192 which was the lowest in 5 years; ii) there was an increase in accidental secondary fires (from 120 in 2019/20) to 179 in 2020/21 (which was thought to be due to more bonfires held at home); iii) casualties (incidents which the Service attended) remained at low levels (with 1 casualty during the period); and iv) there was a slight increase (from 3 in 2019/20) to 4 in 2020/21 of attacks on firefighters predominantly in the eastern part of the county.

RESOLVED: - That the Committee endorsed the Measuring Progress report for Quarter 3 (including noting the contents of the 1 negative exception report and the BrightSparx presentation).

45/19 UNWANTED FIRE SIGNAL POLICY (UWFS) - PROPOSALS FOR CHANGE

The Deputy Chief Fire Officer introduced the report. He drew Members attention to the overall activity breakdown detailed earlier on the agenda which showed that 51% of incidents were due to automatic fire alarm activations. He advised that if attendance was discounted for support given to Police and North West Ambulance Service colleagues (for gaining entry, support to missing persons searches and other activities) the overall activity breakdown to automatic fire alarm activations would increase to around 54% and it was known from statistical analysis that around 99% of those activations would be false alarm calls. He also took the opportunity to re-emphasize the inspectorate scrutiny in this area.

Members received a presentation from Area Manager Jon Charters and Area Manager Mark Hutton that provided an overview of the current policy pertaining to Automatic Fire Alarm (AFA) actuations (in particular, those categorised as Unwanted Fire Signals) and proposals for policy change.

The presentation focussed on system-based actuations and attendances made where the Service could work with premises owners to eradicate and reduce actuations as opposed to well-intended actuations from people who reasonably believed there was a fire and activated the fire alarm system or malicious calls (which represented a small proportion of calls and were dealt with very differently).

The current AFA policy had been in place since April 2016. It i) set out the impact and risks associated with Unwanted Fire Signals (UWFS); ii) defined what constituted an UWFS; iii) defined the role of Alarm Receiving Centres (ARCs); iv) defined the call handling role within North West Fire Control; v) confirmed the information gathering role of Operational Crews; vi) correctly categorised the incident and populated the Incident Recording System; vii) confirmed that Lancashire Fire and Rescue Service (LFRS) did not reset Fire Alarms; viii) set trigger points for Fire Protection staff intervention; and ix) set out a proportionate enforcement route which started with the provision of business support and escalated to formal enforcement action to resolve unsatisfactory premises.

It was noted that LFRS continued to attend much higher volumes of AFA actuations than many other fire and rescue services, as noted by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services during its first inspection. In 2020, LFRS attended 4,851 AFA's of which 63% were in sleeping risk premises and 37% in non-sleeping risk premises.

At the present time, LFRS was distinctly out of step with the approaches currently

being employed by the other Services operating within North West Fire Control, who had taken a risk-based approach to reducing mobilisations to AFA's, typically framed around building types and/or time of day or night.

LFRS' current approach posed a number of challenges to the Service:

- Diverted essential resources from actual emergencies;
- Created risk to crew and public whilst responding;
- Disrupted Community and Business Safety activities;
- Created disruption for businesses employing on-call firefighters;
- Reduced operational training time and impacted upon planned exercises;
- Created environmental impact;
- Constituted a draw upon public finances; and
- Caused call handling delays in NWFC impacting Service performance levels.

The National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) published guidance to assist fire and rescue services in reducing the risks created by Unwanted Fire Signals citing options such as: i) undertaking call challenge in control rooms (NWFC did this); ii) ensuring Fire Alarm Monitoring Organisations undertake call-back (NWFC also did this); and iii) sending reduced or no attendance under risk based and defined conditions (LFRS partially did this). The NFCC also endorsed: i) setting reasonable expectations for UWFS (LFRS applied these;); ii) providing Business Advice to continually nudge compliance (LFRS did this); iii) using Fire Safety Enforcement to secure compliance (LFRS did this); and iv) exercising capability to raise charges (LFRS did not do this).

The present approach to management of AFA's combined Business Safety advice and legal enforcement measures (under the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005. Business Safety Advisors delivered engagement / education and dealt with poor AFA performance using a series of triggers, which aimed to help premises owners and operators to comply. Where business safety advice was not followed the case was escalated and a full Fire Safety Audit undertaken and Fire Safety Order legal powers used. (Enforcement Notices issued to secure compliance, if for example, the Fire Alarm was deemed not suitable.) To withstand legal scrutiny / appeal, LFRS had to demonstrate the fire alarm system generating the AFA was poorly installed, defective or poorly managed against criteria in British Standard, BS5839:1.

These approaches to supporting premises owners to comply would continue. However, a number of improvement options existed which could fundamentally reduce fire appliance mobilisations, thereby alleviating Service wide impacts, providing increased operational efficiency and better value for money.

Subsequent to the detail on the AFA policy being provided at the last Performance Committee, work had been undertaken to explore policies of other Services both within the North West region and beyond, to examine the differing approaches, benefits, and risks, in order to shape LFRS' proposals for change.

Members considered the 3 options presented which sought to derive maximum Service benefit, optimise performance whilst encompassing a carefully risk-based approach:

IMPROVEMENT OPTION 1: REMOVE ATTENDANCE TO AFA AT NON-SLEEPING PREMISES

Performance Benefits:

- Would immediately realise c.40% reduction in attendances to AFA's;
- Aligned LFRS to other FRS in NW Fire Control;
- Improved NWFC call handling process and associated KPI;
- Improved availability and speed of response to real emergencies;
- Introduction could be staged i.e. during the day in year 1 and during the night from year 2.

Resource Implications:

- Public Consultation.

Risks:

- In 2019, there were 1,841 AFA in non-sleeping risks, 4 of which were found to be fires on arrival (0.2%).

A comparison of incidents over a 3-year period was provided which compared LFRS' current approach with the approach taken by Cheshire FRS who used this policy for apparatus incidents in non-sleeping premises. If LFRS had applied the same policy, there would have been faster call handling times and would have potentially seen an average reduction across the period of 38.7%.

IMPROVEMENT OPTION 2: IMPLEMENT A CHARGING POLICY

Performance Benefits:

- Likely to realise a small % reduction in attendances;
- Could generate up to £80k in cost recovery charges.

Resource Implications:

- Public Consultation;
- Inspecting Officer time / costs (gathering sufficient evidence to withstand potential appeal);
- Administration costs (raising charges and tracking payments / non-payments).

Risks:

- Potential reputational damage (£60k of charges would arise from NHS premises);
- Inspecting Officer time / costs (gathering sufficient evidence to withstand potential appeal);
- Administration costs (raising charges and tracking payments / non-payments).

The 46 Fire and Rescue Services nationally had been contacted in relation to their charging policies of which 17 had responded. All had non-attendance policies for non-sleeping risk premises, 5 had charging policies (which were used in the extreme and had been put on hold during the covid pandemic) and 1 had a non-attendance policy for non-sleeping risk and also reduced attendance to sleeping risk premises if charges were raised.

If LFRS had applied the London Fire Brigade policy of charging for the tenth and any additional AFA in non-sleeping risk properties, based upon the results of the latest 2020 count; this would have resulted in raising circa £9,000 in cost recovery charges

from 7 premises.

If LFRS had applied the London Fire Brigade policy of charging for the tenth and any additional AFA in sleeping risk properties, based upon the results of the latest 2020 count; this would have resulted in raising circa £70,000 in cost recovery charges from 9 premises (£60k of which would be from hospitals).

IMPROVEMENT OPTION 3: INTRODUCE A DOMESTIC FALSE ALARM POLICY

This would be a very different type of policy as AFA's from domestic dwellings were predominantly generated from Telecare systems incorporating smoke alarms. Numbers of actuations were increasing year on year and so the policy would focus on close collaboration with Lancashire's Social Care Providers.

The Objective:

To reduce UWFS and simultaneously reduce risk to vulnerable persons who relied on Telecare systems for their safety. Focus would be on poor installations and improvements that reduce UWFS but didn't increase risk to the occupier/s.

Should LFRS adopt this policy it would be one of the first Fire and Rescue Services in the country to take this approach and recognise this was an emerging issue.

The Chairman confirmed that the Committee recommendations would be brought to a future Authority meeting therefore there would be the option for further debate.

The Chairman PROPOSED that a recommendation be made to the Authority to adopt option 1; to remove attendance to Automatic Fire Alarms at Non-Sleeping premises staged over 2 years; to be introduced during the day in year 1 and during the night from year 2. He did not believe the Committee should recommend option 2 to be pursued because of the suggestion that it might affect other blue light services and he asked that further work be undertaken on option 3 to bring a report to a future meeting.

Councillor Smith SECONDED the motion.

The Chairman called a vote on this motion. It was noted that County Councillor Lorraine Beavers was not present in the meeting at this time. The remaining Councillors all voted in favour therefore the decision was CARRIED unanimously.

RESOLVED: That the Committee recommend to the Authority the adoption of option 1; to remove attendance to Automatic Fire Alarms at Non-Sleeping premises staged over 2 years; to be introduced during the day in year 1 and during the night from year 2; option 2 should not be pursued because this might affect other blue light services and that further work be undertaken on option 3 to bring a report to a future meeting.

46/19 LANCASHIRE ROAD SAFETY PARTNERSHIP

The Deputy Chief Fire Officer introduced Road Safety Coordinator, Rhiannon Leeds who presented the report and accompanying presentation to provide Members with an update on the work of the Lancashire Road Safety Partnership (LRSP).

The Road Safety Partnership for Lancashire was set up in 2001 initially as the co-

ordinating body for all the speed cameras. Very quickly an education and engagement division of the Partnership was established and there had been a lot of changes since then.

The partnership comprised of: Lancashire Fire & Rescue Service, Lancashire Constabulary, North West Ambulance Service, Lancashire County Council, Blackburn with Darwen Council, Blackpool Council, Highways England and the Police and Crime Commissioner. Working together to reduce duplication, the partnership aimed to reduce road casualties through the management of speed, enforcement, engineering, emergency response, driver education and training and through developing collaborative approaches to education, awareness, engagement and other measures. Everything the Partnership did was based on casualty, collision and police data in order to target some of the most vulnerable road user groups.

In 2010 the funding model for partnerships changed and local authorities did not receive government grant for road safety. Since 2010 there had been a small year on year rise in people killed or seriously injured on Lancashire's roads. In 2013/14, Lancashire County Council Scrutiny Panel told the Road Safety Partnership to make improvements to address the lack of a purposeful strategy, meaningful analysis, coordination and duplication of effort. The Partnership then identified: the right people for the right roles, a clear, long-term strategy alongside short-term tactical needs, issues with realistic and evidence-based options and tactics in order to be effective.

Rhiannon Leeds gave examples where processes had improved that resulted in clear, targeted messages and consistent responses to queries raised in different areas of Lancashire. Over the last 12-18 months an online tool for members of the public to report concerns had been implemented. This looked at speed, casualty and collision data to enable a fair and consistent policy to be applied across the county.

All the LRSP partners were committed to working together to reduce casualties on Lancashire's roads and make people feel safe. Some of the partnership activities were noted as:

- Child pedestrian training at reception, year 1 and year 2 at almost every primary school in the county;
- Cycle training at primary school age;
- Targeted social media campaigns based on the 'fatal 5';
- Activity in communities at key times of the year in line with the national road safety calendar;
- Managing and responding to community speed concerns county wide;
- Delivery of speed awareness courses (and other educational courses as an alternative to prosecution);
- Coordinated safety engineering and enforcement works such as the installation of average speed cameras;
- Delivery of RoadSense to Year 6;
- Delivery of Safe Drive Safe Alive.

A reporting structure was presented which incorporated the 3 local authorities, 14 districts and policing divisions across the county. The Local Road Safety Partnership was governed by an Executive Board which was chaired by the

Assistant Chief Constable. Reporting to the Executive Board was a joint Operational Group supported by Casualty Reduction Partnerships in Pennine, South Lancashire and North Lancashire to determine local initiatives.

The vision set out in the strategic plan was that “people are safe and feel safe on Lancashire’s roads”. The plan set out a number of priorities and the work of the Road Safety Partnership fell under priority 1 “co-ordinated and evidence-based response to Road Safety”. Alongside the strategic plan sat the Action Plan and Areas of Focus documents which identified everything to be delivered by the partnership.

A graph was presented that demonstrated problem trends by mode of transport and age range which included spike charts to show the previous 5-years data and the number of incidents during the period. This assisted to identify emerging trends to inform future plans.

A chart was presented that showed the possible effects of the pandemic on road safety by comparing road traffic casualties during 2019 and 2020. Although the 2020 data had yet to be verified it showed that during March – April there was a huge decrease in the volume of casualties in Lancashire which was not the case in other areas of the country.

A further chart was presented that demonstrated road traffic collision casualties over the last 12 years which showed a steady continuous decline due in part to Firefighters now being trauma trained enabling injured parties to receive help much quicker and technological improvements had been made to vehicles. The chart also showed killed or seriously injured casualties to have peaked in 2019. It was noted that CRASH (Collision Reporting And Sharing Hub) was a national system that digitally supported consistent reporting of road traffic collisions across the country. In addition, the chart showed the number of fatalities across the county during the period; this had been fairly consistent until 2020 where there was a decline (which was in line with the volume of traffic). It was noted that the type of casualty had changed to an increased involvement of motor cyclists.

Based on speed, casualty and collision data the Partnerships top 8 issues had been identified as: i) young road users; ii) motorcyclists; iii) A584 between Cifton and Squires Gate; iv) A59 between Clitheroe and the Lancashire / North Yorkshire border; v) A59 between Nrothway and Tarleton; vi) A682 Colne Road between Burnley and J12; vii) M6 between J31a and J33; and viii) Careless Driving. Over the next few months work would be undertaken with partners and analysts to understand the detail to develop relevant initiatives including: education, engagement, engineering and enforcement.

An example was provided of a campaign that aimed to change driver behaviour which ran during the christmas period in 2019 depicting 59 pairs of shoes; each representing a person killed on Lancashire’s roads in one year.

It was noted that due to the covid-19 pandemic a lot of work had been undertaken online during the previous 12 months including: i) RoadSense which had been delivered to over 5,000 year 6 pupils since mid-January; ii) Speed Awareness Courses and iii) a TyreSafe campaign had been launched the previous day.

It was also noted that since 2010, the Partnership had been used on national

platforms as best practice.

County Councillor Clarke queried what could be done to enforce speeding restrictions in areas where the limit was 20 miles per hour (mph). The Chairman commented that, although a valid concern enforcement was out of our jurisdiction. In response, Rhiannon Leeds advised that 20 mph areas nationally fell into 2 categories: areas and zones. Areas were usually sign only (which applied to most roads in Lancashire) and 20 mph zones had extra street furniture such as speed bumps and chicanes. One of the reasons there had been no enforcement in 20 mph areas in Lancashire was that according to the national guidance, 20 mph areas should be self-enforcing and in locations where traffic was already low volume and low speed.

Any concerns about specific roads could be raised with the Partnership via: www.lancsroadsafety.co.uk/submit-concern. If there was an issue identified, something would be done ie: additional signage, additional community engagement and education.

County Councillor Britcliffe felt that the placing of additional cameras would slow traffic. In response, Rhiannon Leeds advised that action was based on data. Currently there were plans to introduce new average speed cameras on 5 roads in the county in addition to the 8 established routes (which would be funded from national government funding). Similarly, if data identified speeding on a particular road the Partnership had flexibility to change the location of speed camera vans. It was noted for information that the camera vans which looked for speeding offences also looked for other offences such as occupants not wearing seat belts and drivers not in proper control ie: while using a mobile phone.

RESOLVED: - That the report be noted and endorsed.

47/19 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Committee would be held on 30 June 2021 - venue to be agreed.

Further meeting dates were noted for 15 September 2021 and 15 December 2021 and agreed for 16 March 2022.

LFRS HQ
Fulwood

M NOLAN
Clerk to CFA