



MINUTES

LONDON FIRE & EMERGENCY PLANNING AUTHORITY

DATE	Wednesday 2 December 2015	TIME	2.00 pm
VENUE	Chamber, City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London, SE1 2AA		

Minutes of the proceedings of the meeting of London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority held in the Chamber, City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London, SE1 2AA, on Wednesday 2 December 2015

Present:

Gareth Bacon AM (Chairman)	Tom Copley AM	Darren Johnson AM
Dr Fiona Twycross AM (Vice-Chair)	Andrew Dismore AM	Councillor Stephen Knight AM
Councillor Liaquat Ali MBE, JP	Councillor Susan Hall	Councillor Oonagh Moulton
Councillor Tony Arbour JP, AM	Councillor Sarah Hayward	Councillor Pauline Morrison
Andrew Boff AM	Councillor Maurice Heaster OBE	Councillor Martin Whelton
Councillor David Cartwright QFSM	Councillor Jack Hopkins	

1. Statement of Members Appointed

Resolved – That the appointments by the Mayor of London of the Members of the Authority be noted.

2. Apologies for Absence

No apologies for absence were received.

3. Appointment of the Vice-Chairman of the Authority

The Authority, pursuant to Schedule 28, paragraph 3 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999 (as amended), proceeded to the appointment of a Vice-Chairman.

Dr Fiona Twycross AM was nominated by Andrew Dismore AM; the nomination was seconded by Councillor Liaquat Ali.

There being no other nominations, Dr Fiona Twycross AM was duly appointed as Vice-Chair of the Authority for the period up until 16 June 2015.

Resolved – accordingly.

4. Minutes

The motion was moved by the Chairman – that the minutes of the Authority meeting held on 1 October 2015 be signed as a correct record.

The motion was seconded by Councillor David Cartwright QFSM, put and agreed.

Resolved – accordingly.

The minutes were thereupon signed by the Chairman.

5. Minutes of Appointments and Urgency Committee

The motion was made by the Chairman – that the minutes of the Appointments and Urgency Committee meeting held on 15 October 2015 be signed as a correct record.

The motion was seconded by Councillor David Cartwright QFSM, put and agreed.

Resolved – accordingly.

The minutes were thereupon signed by the Chairman.

6. Special Announcements by the Chairman and reports by the Chairman or the Clerk to the Authority of any Communications

The Chairman welcomed Councillor Liaquat Ali to the meeting and conveyed the Authority's best wishes for a speedy recovery following his recent illness.

The Chairman announced that Deputy Assistant Commissioner Sabrina Cohen-Hatton had been presented with a Chief Fire Officers Association award in recognition of her research into risk-critical decision-making by Incident Commanders. In addition, Matthew Hogan, from the Brigade's Special Operations Group, had been awarded a Public Order & Resources Operational Command Unit Commanders Commendation for his involvement in handling the Holborn fire earlier in the year.

The Chairman stated that on Saturday 31 October 2015 crews had been mobilised to an intense fire in a third floor flat in North Kensington where a large number of people were calling for help from their balconies. Crew had assisted people from their flats and used a turntable ladder and the internal staircase to rescue fifty people.

The Chairman stated that, on Friday 6 November 2015, the Brigade had received the first of 104 calls to a fire in a Warehouse in Tottenham. On arrival, the crews had been faced with a fully developed fire in a large single storey warehouse and had done extremely well to prevent the fire from spreading beyond an adjoining warehouse. This became a 20 pump fire, which the Commissioner had also attended.

The Chairman noted that, on Wednesday 25 November, the Brigade had won a design award for a method to search buildings at incidents. Following an inquest into the 2009 Lakanal House fire in South London, the Brigade had undertaken a number of actions to improve its

procedures and policies. One part of this had been to introduce an acrylic tag that fitted into a firefighter's pocket and could be hung from a door to denote that a building had been searched.

Finally, the Chairman confirmed that, on Tuesday 17 November, the Brigade's new mobilising system – called Vision – had gone live. The system allowed appliances closest to incidents to be mobilised using GPS technology, and it was noted that it should lead to a faster response to emergencies and quicker call handling when people called the 999 emergency telephone number. There had been a few early glitches, which had been quickly identified and addressed, and which had had no impact on the Brigade's ability to respond to emergencies. The Chairman explained that he had arranged a briefing for lead Members on the initial issues and that he was now confident the system was running effectively.

7. Disclosures of Interests and Dispensations

Resolved – That the details of membership of the GLA, other functional bodies and London Boroughs, as attached as an appendix to the agenda, be noted. No further disclosures were made.

8. Reconstitution of Committees, Standing Orders, Allowances, Delegations and Related Matters - FEP 2541

Report by the Clerk to the Authority.

A document that set out the Chairman's motion and appended details of the proposed membership and Chairs and Vice-Chairs of all committees was tabled at the meeting.

The Chairman moved the motion:

That the Authority -

- (1) Notes the appointment by the Mayor of London of the Chairman and Members of the Authority;
- (2) Agrees that the committee structure proposed in Appendix 1 of the report be adopted for the remainder of the 2015-16 year with the orders of reference for each such body as set out in that Appendix, including revised orders of reference for the Equalities Working Group;
- (3) Agrees to dis-apply strict proportionality rules in the allocation of seats on committees;
- (4) Agrees to appoint Members and alternate Members to seats on committees in accordance with the document as tabled (and attached as Appendix 1 to these minutes);
- (5) Agrees to appoint the chairmen and vice-chairmen of committees in accordance with the document as tabled (and attached as Appendix 1 to these minutes);
- (6) Re-confirms the establishment of the Joint Council on the basis of the previously-approved constitution, attached at Appendix 2 to the report, and appoints Authority

Members to the Joint Council as set out in the tabled document (and attached at Appendix 1 to these minutes);

- (7) Confirms the establishment of the Local Pension Board on the basis previously approved, as set out at paragraphs 18-22 of the report, appoints Authority Members to the Board as set out in the tabled document (and attached at Appendix 1 to these minutes) and notes that the Board will in future be treated as a formal body in terms of publication of papers for Board meetings and the inclusion of legal, finance, equalities and sustainable development implications within reports to the Board;
- (8) Approves the programme of Authority and committee meeting dates for the remainder of 2015-16 year (as set out at Appendix 4 to the report);
- (9) Notes the Standing Orders for the Authority (as set out at Appendix 5 to the report) and approves the updated Scheme of Delegation of Functions to Officers, as set out at Appendix 6 to the report;
- (10) Adopts the Allowances Scheme set out at Appendix 7 of the report as the Members' Allowances Scheme for the remainder of the 2015-16 year;
- (11) Approves the updated Financial Regulations, as set out at Appendix 8 to the report; and
- (12) Agrees that the Clerk to the Authority be instructed to implement the decisions on these matters and to discharge the associated statutory requirements as regards publicity and the keeping of records.

The motion was seconded by Dr Fiona Twycross AM, put and agreed unanimously.

Resolved – accordingly.

9. Representation on Outside Bodies 2015-16 - FEP 2542

Report by the Clerk to the Authority.

A document setting out the Chairman's motion and appending proposed nominations to outside bodies was tabled at the meeting.

The motion was moved by the Chairman:

That the Authority–

- (1) Appoints representatives to the relevant bodies for the remainder of the 2015-16 as set out in the tabled document (and attached as Appendix 2 to these minutes);
- (2) Agrees that, upon ceasing to be a Member of the Authority, a Member's appointment as an LFEPA representative to an outside body automatically ends; and
- (3) Agrees that, should there be any change to the Authority's political balance during the municipal year, a report be submitted to the next meeting of the Authority to ensure that LFEPA's representation on outside bodies remains consistent with the rules of proportionality.

The motion was seconded by Councillor David Cartwright QFSM, put and agreed.

Resolved – accordingly.

10. **Budget Update - FEP2520/A/B**

Report and supplementary report of the Commissioner and Director of Finance and Contractual Services and second supplementary report of the Director of Finance and Contractual Services.

The Commissioner and the Director of Finance and Contractual Services introduced the report and answered questions from Members.

Mr John Turner made representations to the Authority on behalf of the Fire Officers' Association. Mr Gordon Fielden made representations to the Authority on behalf of the Fire Brigades Union.

The Chairman, noting that Mr Fielden was retiring from the London Fire Brigade shortly, referred to his long service to the Fire Brigades Union and placed on record the Authority's best wishes for the future.

The Chairman moved the motion: That –

- (1) The Authority notes the report and supplementary reports;
- (2) As recommended by the Resources Committee, the Authority approves the budget submission to the Mayor that includes:
 - a. savings proposals of £5.1m in 2016/17 as set out in Appendix 3;
 - b. further change proposals totalling £8.1m; and
 - c. a draft 2 year capital plan, prudential indicators and borrowing limits for 2016/17 to 2017/18, with a draft capital budget in 2016/17 of £58.8m as set out in table 13;
- (3) As recommended by the Resources Committee, and proposed in paragraphs 49-51, the Authority agrees an extension to the Fifth London Safety Plan until such time as the Sixth London Safety Plan is approved by the Authority, noting that revisions to commitments and agreement of targets for 2016/2017 will be dealt with as set out in paragraph 51;
- (4) That the Authority agrees to start public consultation on the option proposed by the Chair of the Resources Committee from paragraph 31, to be referred to as 'Option A' in all consultation documentation, and Option 2 from paragraph 32, to be referred to as 'Option B', on Monday 7 December 2015;
- (5) That the Authority agrees to temporarily stand down the current contingency arrangements in line with the assurances given by the General Secretary of the FBU in his letter dated 1 December 2015.

The motion was seconded by Councillor David Cartwright QFSM.

Andrew Dismore AM moved an amendment as follows –

To amend the Chairman's motion as follows:

"To:

- Insert new paragraph 2 (given below);
- Delete paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Chairman's motion ;and
- Insert new paragraphs 5, 6, 7 and 8 (given below)

so that the motion would read as follows -

1. The Authority notes the report and supplementary reports;
2. That the Authority notes the Chair of Resources' following additional comments on the Supplementary Report:
 - 1 Introduction
 - 1.1 Nobody wants to make cuts in fire cover, but these are imposed as a result of the Mayor's budget envelope. We need to do the best we can to minimise the impact; and to ensure so far as possible that any changes are not irreversible, as no-one can foresee what demands we may face in the future.
 - 2 Pensions dispute suspension
 - 2.1 The FBU Executive Committee nationally has resolved that there will be no more strikes in support of the pensions dispute until at least June 2017. We can therefore stand down the Securitas crews, and now have a reduced budget pressure of £1.7 million as a consequence.
 - 2.2 In relation to my proposals, I would apply this to reducing the number of FRUs to be alternately crewed from 3 to 2; and would suggest that the officers' recommendations should now see a reduction in their proposed cut in fire appliances by 2 for each option, enabling 2 pumps to be returned to stations, in accord with paragraph 10 of the supplementary report, if the Mayor consents.
 - 2.3 I would apply the remainder of the £1.7 million to reducing the draw on reserves my proposals would otherwise require, in accordance with paragraph 11 of the supplementary report.
 - 3 Alternate crewing impact
 - 3.1 The alternate crewing proposal is an alternative to cutting 10 or 13 pumps, under the officers' proposal. If accepted, it would mean the return to the stations of those pumps and would improve attendance times for 1st and 2nd pumps generally as the 10/13 pumps would go back.
 - 3.2 There is nothing new in alternative crewing. This is what LSP5 said about extending alternate crewing: (from the final LSP5 document that went to the Authority in September 2013, page 33.)

'We currently use a system called alternate crewing at some of our fire stations. As well as fire engines, these stations also have one or more specialist vehicles to

provide resources such as additional fire hoses or foam. These specialist vehicles are not required as frequently as normal fire engines and so are crewed by firefighters from that station's fire engine. We have found this to be an efficient use of our resources and will extend the arrangements to the following types of special appliance that are infrequently used:

- Urban search and rescue modules (USAR) that attend collapsed structures.
- Scientific support units (SSU) which aid and support our scientific advisors in identifying hazardous materials.
- The remaining two incident response vehicles. Seven of the nine vehicles are already alternately crewed.

We will also consider the introduction of alternate crewing of either our fire and rescue units or the fire engine with which it is located.'

3.3 Para 18 states there are 17 wards affected by +10 seconds pump attendance times as a result of alternative crewing. The actual impact is minimal (app 3 annex B) and far less than the impact on other wards of removing the 10/13 pumps. Under the officer proposals across London, 1st response increases by +4 seconds and 2nd response by +18 seconds. As all the 10/13 pumps are from 2 pump stations, the second appliance times are most impacted by their removal. On page 277 of the Authority main agenda papers it states that there are 61 wards which are affected by a change in the average attendance time of greater than 60 seconds for the 2nd response: far worse than the alternative crewing proposal.

3.4 There are no significant increases in attendance times for FRUs, but 5 boroughs do see some increases in times for aerals: 2 boroughs less than 6 minutes more ; 2 less than 7 minutes; and 1, 8.24 minutes. However, at ward level, the data is not available as the sample is so small. This may well demonstrate little impact in practice, in that all but 6 wards in these boroughs have numbers of attendances in a whole year in single figures, and only 7 others have 5 or more attendances. I have obtained the following information about the type of calls involved in those wards:

How many calls are in response to a PDA?

A third (31%) of aerial mobilisations in the wards provided were potentially as part of an initial attendance. We can assume that most of these were on the PDA (but the old mobilising system did not automatically collect this data), but as control officers have the ability to add to the PDA, we can't be sure if all of them are part of it. The remaining two thirds of the incidents were either upgrades or relief attendances to the incident that would have been requested by the Incident Commander.

How many as a response to an AFA?

12 of the 119 mobilisations (10%) were to AFAs, plus 14 to other false alarms (good intent or malicious) – a total of 26 false alarms (22%).

Can you tell me, for the wards with 5 or more attendances, is this because they are, or are mainly, attendances at the same premises?

Out of the wards with more than five mobilisations, the following were to the same premises, although the majority are not multiple attendance to different incidents at the same address. This is 60 mobilisations (50% of the total):

Enfield, Edmonton Green
VA Laundry, one Primary Fire with five aerial mobilisations (including three reliefs)

Enfield, Ponders End
Vadi Restaurant, one Primary Fire with five aerial mobilisations (including reliefs).

Haringey, Bruce Grove
Nationwide Building Society, two Good Intent False alarms, one Aerial mobilisation each.

Haringey, Northumberland Park
Archway Sheet Metal Works Ltd, one Primary Fire with two Aerial mobilisations.
Tottenham Hotspur Football Club, six AFAs with one aerial mobilisation each.

Havering, Rainham and Wennington
A C Structures, one Primary Fire with seven aerial mobilisations.

Havering, South Hornchurch
Euro Shopfitters Ltd, one Primary Fire with two aerial mobilisations.
Shanks, protracted fire incident (12PF) with 27 aerial mobilisations.

Redbridge, Clementswood
Advanced Insurance Centres Ltd, two Good Intent False alarms with one aerial mobilisation each.
Santander UK Plc, one Good Intent False alarm and one AFA with one aerial mobilisation each.

Taking into account the above data, it can be seen that the actual impact of the attendance times variations is not considerable as the wards with the larger numbers of calls can be explained by the above facts, such as multiple reliefs where time is not critical.

- 3.5 Moreover, some of the projected borough increases are not too dissimilar to the increases in some ward areas as a consequence of LSP5. Wards contain fewer people than whole boroughs, but the Commissioner clearly felt that the increases in some wards under LSP5 was acceptable, so it would be wrong to argue that increases of a similar nature are of more concern.
- 3.6 In any event, aerials are not classed as frontline. Aerials are never mobilised alone. They are always mobilised either immediately alongside other appliances or later upon request. They will rarely be the first appliance to reach the scene of an incident and are generally used as back-up. So, in this respect, a delay in an aerial arriving will not be as problematic as a delay in a pump arriving.
- 3.7 Aerials have never been included in the target attendance time figures. Obviously it is beneficial to have them arrive as soon as possible, but it does not stop firefighting operations before they arrive. The brigade even wanted for some time to mobilise them 'upon request' only, rather than as part of a pre-determined attendance. It is generally accepted that they are a tool for support and back-up rather than attack firefighting in the first 20 minutes of an incident.

- 3.8 Although the modelling forecasts some increase in aerial response times in small pockets of London, the pan-London increase is only between 29 seconds and one minute and ten seconds, depending upon what is prioritised. As the Commissioner has argued that we should look at response times on a pan-London basis it would be to move the goalposts to abandon the 'pan-London' method to focus on particular localities when looking at aerials.
- 3.9 So as aerials are generally not considered part of first attendance, and for the other reasons given above, it is suggested that these increases are a reasonable trade off, against the London wide improvement in first and second attendances of front line pumps, through the restoration of the 13 appliances to their stations.
- 4 Optimising the correct selection of specials for alternate crewing
- 4.1 The proposal is initially to select some of those specials which would achieve the best saving; with a review of that selection as part of the LSP 6 process. This is no different in principle to what the officers propose for the removal of the pumps. Indeed the officers' proposals accept that the 10/13 they propose to go are not the optimum list and that this would be reviewed as part of LSP6.
- 4.2 The Resources Committee proposal is to alternate crew not the whole specials fleet but just 3 FRUs: my recommendation now would be just 2 (as the FBU strike has been called off until at least June 2017) out of the total fleet of 14, and all from 2 pump stations - if anything, this could be seen as a pilot for what may become more widely needed as part of LSP6; 5 out of 11 aerials; and 2 out of 4 OSUs (which are only marginally and rarely time critical and all of which will almost certainly be alternate crewed anyway, as the wider review of their role is concluded).
- 5 Response to terrorism
- 5.1 The terrorist threat level in the UK and in London has not changed as a result of Paris and has been at its present level, 'severe', since August 2014. This was not referred to in the officers' original paper as a reason not to alternate crew FRUs; indeed the paper accepted the likely need to do this anyway, as part of LSP6, and was under consideration for LSP5.
- 5.2 As the officers' report states, FBU members do not participate in 'warm zone' activity, so the alternate crewing proposal for a small number of FRUs would not affect the response anyway. There is no agreement nationally between employers and the FBU on what the capability will be for multi-agency response to a terrorist attack.
- 5.3 There is no reason why the work needs to be restricted only to FRU personnel. The role envisaged for firefighters does not need the FRU vehicle itself nor the special equipment it carries. The role could be carried out by crews on all frontline pumping appliances, Usar personnel, CBRN RRT (a small specialist team) personnel, all personnel at particular designated stations (e.g. in Essex fire service they have identified Leigh-on-Sea fire station to do this work) or, in fact, any operational personnel provided they were given the specialist training.
- 5.4 It may be the officers' preference to earmark FRU personnel for the role, but there is absolutely no reason to be rigid about this. At a national level, the

employers have various ideas about which personnel might do the work; they certainly have not said it should be FRU crews only.

- 5.5 I understand that it is a matter of record that the FBU have specifically told officers in previous discussions that they would rather the work wasn't restricted only to FRU personnel.
 - 5.6 In these circumstances, it is no wiser to remove permanently the 10/ 13 pumps than it would be to introduce alternate crewing on FRUs, as it might well be that we reach a future agreement with the FBU under which the terrorist response work is carried out by crews on ordinary pumping appliances (after they would have received specialist training).
 - 5.7 Even if we did reach a future agreement with the FBU to the effect that it would be FRU crews doing this work, if necessary it would be easy to change the status of an FRU from alternate crewing to permanent crewing, (after alternate crewing had been introduced), apart from possibly needing to train a few extra FRU crew members. As just 2 FRUs are proposed for alternate crewing, it would not require a change of status for every FRU in the brigade.
 - 5.8 However, if we decommission 10/13 pumps, they will be gone permanently.
- 6 Appendix 2: Additional comments on officer additional comments on App 4 Main Report

Paragraph 8:

These savings would be in the final quarter and would involve 2 FRS posts. It should be achievable to bring forward this project by 3 months. The officers accept it is low risk.

Paragraph 9:

These savings would involve 1 or 2 FRS posts and the officers accept it is low risk.

Paragraph 12:

The Commissioner told me this scheme has not been particularly successful in its objectives; and he stated it could be subsumed into Departmental establishments.

Paragraph 15:

The current year's budget assumes a fee income of £7.8 million plus £20 million for the MFB fund. The officers' budget assumes an increase of £1.175m in the MFB income only; and no increase in other fee income.

The MOPAC review of full cost recovery of the Authority's charging regime is due to conclude in the New Year, and it can be anticipated that it will recommend further increases and sources of charging income.

Whilst the balance between income and service is important, and we should not kill the golden goose, there are already a number of income streams that could and are likely to generate more.

Some possible examples:

The Fire Safety Department is actively looking at potential future options for generating income. Some of these services may be delivered via LFB Enterprises, and some by officers on a cost recovery basis. Currently however the Department undertakes a range of activities and the table below sets out the position in relation to charging for these services.

Type of work	Potential to charge
Inspection and Advice	No. Statutory duty
Building control consultations	No. Statutory consultee
Planning and other consultations	No. Statutory consultee
Enforcement work	No. Need law change like HSE
Pre consultation meetings	Yes. Not currently
Expert witness	Yes. Not currently
Third party approval of computer modelling	Yes. Not currently
Fire investigating services to other FRS	Yes. Charging regime needs to be reviewed to reflect expertise.
FI attendance at coroners court	Yes. Not currently

It can be seen therefore, that we do not charge developers sufficiently (and often not at all) for advice on fire engineering solutions for their developments, for example.

The trading company made £4k profit last year. In next year's budget the profit is conservatively estimated at only £20k, despite proposed contracts with e.g. Qatar.

We could generate further income from services provided to the Fire Services College at Moreton in Marsh, beyond the £100k budgeted.

LSP 5 showed that the full cost recovery for a special services charge could be as high as £4k per hour. We currently charge only £298. Whilst I would not suggest a leap as far as £4k, a modest increase is justified on the almost 3000 attendances in a year.

Primary Authority Schemes (we operate 20 across the country at present) also have the capacity to be expanded. They currently bring in £96k.

We charge £93 for a fire report summary; contrast this with the basic police RTA accident book fee of £144.90. Police expert witness fees are £90 per hour and ordinary officer attendance is £74 per hour in civil cases. We make no charge for these activities at present.

Legal advice could be obtained relatively quickly on what other services we do that we could charge, or charge more, for, too.

Paragraph 19:

Use of reserves can be significantly reduced as the FBU strike has been called off. As the main report indicates, this means that the reserves would not fall below the recommended threshold.

7 Appendix 4: consultation

7.1 The consultation plan is broadly acceptable, but member participation is required in the Borough Commander briefing meeting. The press release and email notifications should be approved by members. The proposal for four public meetings is acceptable. Members should be involved on the platform if they wish.

7.2 The proposed consultation questions are unacceptable and are not in conformity with the Mayor's letter, which requires that the consultation be conducted in a 'fair and neutral manner'. The questions are biased towards officer recommendations.

7.3 The questions and consultation materials should be approved by members. Both should be presented as options before the Authority and not 'branded' as the Commissioner's or the Chair of Resources Committee's proposals, but indicating which is the preferred option.

7.4 Both options should be presented as packages of the operational cuts involved, rather than broken down into constituent parts, each with a one paragraph explanation of the proposals, with a choice as to which of the two packages is preferred by the consultee.

8 Appendix 6: Equality analysis

8.1 Paragraph 17 infers a major impact on FRS staffing budgets. Most of the non-operational savings recommended by the Resources Committee do not involve job losses. The total number of FRS posts affected will be less than 5.

8.2 This can be contrasted with the much higher number of operational job losses proposed by the officers, compared with the Resources Committee recommendations. After adjustment for the posts that can be saved as result of the FBU's suspension of the strike decision, the Resources Committee proposals would result in 124 posts lost; the officer option 1, 160 posts; and option 2 148 posts if 2 pumps are rerieved; or 200 and 188 respectively, if not.

3. As recommended by the Resources Committee, the Authority approves the budget submission to the Mayor that includes:
 - a) savings proposals of £5.1m in 2016/17 as set out in Appendix 3;
 - b) further change proposals totalling £8.1m; and
 - c) a draft 2 year capital plan, prudential indicators and borrowing limits for 2016/17 to 2017/18, with a draft capital budget in 2016/17 of £58.8m as set out in table 13.
4. As recommended by the Resources Committee, and proposed in paragraphs 49-51, the Authority agrees an extension to the Fifth London Safety Plan until such time as the Sixth London Safety Plan is approved by the Authority, noting that revisions to commitments and agreement of targets for 2016/2017 will be dealt with as set out in paragraph 51.
5. That in light of the FBU's decision to suspend strike action until at least June 2017, the Securitas crews providing cover be stood down, at a saving of £1.7 million pa, with immediate effect;
6. That the Chair of Resources' proposals be adopted as the Authority's preferred proposals for the budget and the Mayor so informed;
7. That officers write to the Mayor, seeking amendments to the Mayoral Directions
 - a) to permit the return to stations of 2 of the 13 pumps currently off the run due to the pension dispute in light of the suspension of the FBU's strike action; and
 - b) to enable the consultation on the budget to refer to a reduction of 11 or 8 pumps instead of 13 or 10 in the officer options;
8. That
 - a) the consultation be on the basis of two options: namely -
 - i) that of the Chair of the Resources Committee (amended in accordance with his proposals in paragraph 2.2 and 2.3 of recommendation 1 above) as the Authority's preferred option; and
 - ii) the officers' proposal 2, as amended to reflect the reduction in pumps to be removed if the Mayor so agrees;and
 - b) that details and text of all materials to be distributed or otherwise used in the consultation be approved by members, if necessary at an A and U Committee, to include text written by the Chair of the Resources Committee and/or Deputy Chair of the Authority, so as to ensure the 'level playing field' instructed by the Mayor."

The amendment was seconded by Dr Fiona Twycross AM.

Following discussion and upon being put to a vote, the amendment was agreed with 10 votes for and 7 votes against. The amendment was declared to be carried.

The Chairman then put recommendations 1,3 and 4 of the substantive motion, as amended, to the vote. These were agreed unanimously.

The Chairman then put recommendations 2,5,6,7 and 8 of the substantive motion, as amended, to the vote. These were agreed, with 10 votes in favour and 7 votes against.

The motion, as amended, was therefore declared to be carried.

Resolved – accordingly.

11. Treasury Management Mid Year Report as at 30 September 2015 - FEP 2522

Report of the Director of Finance and Contractual Services.

The Director of Finance and Contractual Services introduced the report and answered questions from Members.

Following the discussion, the Chairman moved the motion – That the report be noted.

The motion was seconded by Councillor David Cartwright QFSM, put and agreed.

Resolved – accordingly.

12. Disciplinary Procedures for Senior Officers - FEP 2543

Report of the Head of Human Resource Management.

The Acting Director of Operational Resilience and Training introduced the report and answered questions from Members.

The Chairman, noting that this would be the Acting Director's final Authority meeting prior to retirement, thanked him for his service to the Authority and placed on record the Authority's best wishes to him for the future.

The Chairman moved the motion: That the amendments to Policy Number (PN) 392b, the Disciplinary Procedure for Senior Officers, as set out in Appendix A, and specifically referred to in paragraph 7 of the report, be approved.

The motion was seconded by Councillor David Cartwright QFSM, put and agreed.

Resolved – accordingly.

13. Assessment of Risk in London - FEP 2544

Report of the Commissioner.

The Commissioner introduced the report and answered questions from Members.

The Chairman moved the motion – That:

- (1) The Assessment of Risk 2015 (AOR 2015) attached as Appendix 1 to the report be noted; and
- (2) The intention to publish a more interactive online version of the AOR 2015, and to engage with stakeholders during the preparation of the Sixth London Safety Plan (LSP6), to adapt and finalise an AOR for 2016, be noted.

The motion was seconded by Councillor David Cartwright QFSM, put and agreed.

Resolved – accordingly.

14. Honours, Awards and Long Service - FEP 2545

Report of the Head of Legal and Democratic Services.

The Chairman moved the motion:

That the Authority places on record its:

Congratulations to:

- (a) The officers, police officers and members of the public mentioned in paragraphs 2 – 4 of the report who received Commissioner's Certificates of Commendation, Assistant Commissioner's Certificates of Commendation and Borough Commander's Letters of Congratulations;

and
- (b) Those officers who received the Long Service and Good Conduct Medal or Long Service Certificate (as referred to in paragraph 5 of the report).

The motion was seconded by Councillor David Cartwright QFSM, put and agreed.

Resolved- accordingly.

15. Authority - Summary List of Actions - FEP 2546

Report by the Clerk to the Authority.

The Chairman moved that the report be noted.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Maurice Heaster OBE, put and agreed.

Resolved – accordingly.

16. Questions from Members (in accordance with Standing Order 20) – 2 December 2015 – FEP 2547

Questions from Members for the meeting on 2 December 2015, received in accordance with Standing Order 20, are set out below with supplementary questions and the Chairman and Commissioner's replies.

The Chairman explained that he would take question 437 from Councillor David Cartwright QFSM regarding preparedness for terrorist attacks at the end of the question and answer session, in case it proved necessary to exclude the press and public in order to receive an answer which contained exempt information.

Questions received:

Question 436	From Darren Johnson AM								
<p>How many flood incidents has the London Fire Brigade dealt with over the last decade? Can you provide annual figures broken down by a) borough b) type of flood incident (surface water, river, sewage etc)?</p>									
<p>Commissioner's written response</p>									
<p>The types of flooding incidents attended by the Brigade include surface water flooding and fluvial flooding of rivers after heavy rain, and burst water mains. However, most flooding incidents attended are to buildings as a result of leaky plumbing, burst pipes or simply leaving sinks/baths to overflow.</p>									
<p>The data for flooding incidents attended by the Brigade by borough for the ten years to 2005/06 to 2014/15 is attached. Data from January 2009 is available on the London Datastore.</p>									
<p>Unfortunately, the type of flood incident is not required by the government's national Incident Recording System (IRS). However, since July 2014, the Brigade has recorded in more detail the high level categories for (a) burst water main, (b) water leaks within building, and (c) weather related, were added. Based on the data collected between 1 July 2014 to 30 October 2015 (16 months), the breakdown of flooding incidents by type was as follows:</p>									
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="403 1498 780 1574"></th> <th data-bbox="780 1498 987 1574">Type of flooding</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="403 1574 780 1624">Burst water main</td> <td data-bbox="780 1574 987 1624">5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="403 1624 780 1673">Water leak within building</td> <td data-bbox="780 1624 987 1673">86%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="403 1673 780 1720">Weather related</td> <td data-bbox="780 1673 987 1720">9%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Type of flooding	Burst water main	5%	Water leak within building	86%	Weather related	9%
	Type of flooding								
Burst water main	5%								
Water leak within building	86%								
Weather related	9%								
<p>In terms of the action taken by the Brigade, action to 'make safe/isolate supply' for water leaks within buildings accounted for 61 per cent of all incidents attended during the 16 month period.</p>									
<p>Data for type of flooding and action taken is attached [to the published written answers].</p>									
<p>Darren Johnson AM: Thanks for the response. Following the helpful exchange with my colleague, Jenny Jones AM, this morning [at the London Assembly Plenary</p>									

meeting] on flood preparedness and the issue about the possibility of flood advice and prevention work being included in future fire safety visits, as part of preparations for LSP6, would that be consulted on and the relevant engagement with unions and other stakeholders undertaken to allow that to happen? Could that take place as part of the LSP6 process?

Commissioner: It could be part of that. At the moment we're considering our whole approach towards the information that firefighters pass over to members of the public during home fire safety visits, because there's a range of other things in there which other organisations have also spoken to us about. Other organisations also give out fire safety advice on our behalf. It's got to be as collaborative as we can make it. If we were to come to some conclusions about that and want to consult the fire brigades unions earlier, I wouldn't want to have to wait until LSP6. I think LSP6 could be the backdrop but we could get to it sooner.

Darren Johnson AM: Thank you. That's helpful.

Question 438	From Dr Fiona Twycross AM
<p>There were reports that Wallington Fire Station was closed on Thursday 29 October due to a staff shortage, and cover was expected to be provided by neighbouring Sutton and Croydon firefighters. Why did this staff shortage take place and what impact would this have on attendance times?</p>	
<p>Commissioner's written response</p>	
<p>Wallington Fire Station was not closed on Thursday 29 October 2015. The fact is that due to long term sickness of the crew and watch manager, standby officers were required, however on this particular night there were insufficient spare officers elsewhere in the Brigade to keep the appliance at Wallington on the run. Therefore in line with normal protocols, the dynamic modelling tool was used to determine whether standby cover was required and on this occasion an appliance was sent from Sutton and later replaced with an appliance from Croydon. The average first appliance attendance times for Croydon and Sutton boroughs both remained within 6 minutes throughout 29 October.</p>	
<p>Dr Fiona Twycross AM: Obviously this is about public perception as well. I just wondered if you could comment on how often fire stations are effectively out of commission, if not closed? How often would it be the case that fire stations are effectively out of commission for some reason?</p> <p>Commissioner: Not very often. I would have to collate and provide you with some figures; but I will provide the information to you afterwards. It's not very often. It's generally during those periods in the year when you might expect it to be, so school holidays and so on, when people are trying to get lots of leave. Unfortunately we do get sickness increased during those periods as well, so it impacts on our ability to staff everything. However, no fire station is ever closed and that station ground is always covered by others in any case. However, I will provide more information in terms of the detail.</p>	

Question 439	From Andrew Dismore AM
Please explain the process of how appliances are allocated as standbys at other stations to provide cover when those stations' appliances are out on a call or otherwise unavailable?	
Commissioner's written response	
Appliance standby moves are made at the discretion of the Control Room Supervisor based on a combination of their professional judgement and guidance offered by the Dynamic Cover Tool (DCT). The DCT uses live resource information and operational modelling to suggest and evaluate standby moves. It enables Supervisors to quickly and easily see the size and location of gaps in cover, the relative contribution of individual appliances and the impact associated with each unavailable appliance. The level of coverage is calculated against the known pattern of serious incidents in London and the visual display indicates where appliance unavailability has the greatest impact on coverage.	
Andrew Dismore AM: Presumably, if we had more fire engines we could have more standbys if we needed to? What prompted me to ask this question was that in the Camden Road fire, the attendance would normally have come from Kentish Town but there was no standby at Kentish Town because they had gone somewhere else. Following on from Fiona's point, in fact there were, I think, ten fire stations off the run that particular day. It feeds into our previous debate; if you've got more fire engines presumably you can provide more standbys and we'd have less risk of fire stations being off the run?	
Commissioner: You could do it that way. It does depend, though, on what policy decision we want to make. With the call rates as they are, when we have a large incident, every time we send an appliance to be on standby somewhere else we disrupt them from doing something else. They might be doing important training; they might be doing community safety work which actually prevents the fires in the first place. We therefore have to make a judgement about whether we seek to cover every fire station every time it's empty for any reason and the impact that has on the work firefighters and stations are doing elsewhere during that period, and what the balance is.	
Control officers are very professional and experienced in making those judgements. They're got an IT based system which helps them in terms of minimising attendance times across the Brigade during these periods and doing standbys into stations, but there is always a balance to be found if firefighters are out doing important fire safety work and we disrupt them to send them to another fire station and they don't get any calls anyway. There's a balance to be found.	

Question 440	From Councillor Martin Whelton
Can the Chairman update the Authority on the implementation of the new mobilising system?	
Chairman's written response	
<p>Since the introduction of the new mobilising system on 17 November there has, as expected, been an initial bedding in period during which the Brigade has worked closely with Control staff and representatives from Capita to resolve issues around paging, address matching and status changes on mobile data terminals. Nevertheless, the system is proving to be a success; during the first nine days after go-live, the staff in Control have performed extremely well in successfully handling 4,000 calls within the same average call handling times as before including attendances at an eight pump fire, two six pump fires and 12 four pump fires.</p>	
<p>Councillor Martin Whelton: In relation to the mobilising system, I visited, along with Tom Copley AM, last week. There were concerns in relation to data matching of addresses and I understand that further software updates were to be undertaken. Have these updates now been undertaken and has there been improvement in performance since then?</p>	
<p>Chairman: I'm going to ask the Commissioner to answer that as it's an operational question rather than a policy one.</p>	
<p>Commissioner: We briefed some Members last week in terms of the current situation with the new mobilising system and we gave an indication that there were certain fixes which were going into place. In fact I was asked about them this morning at the London Assembly Plenary meeting by Mr Copley. I can confirm that most of those updates have gone into place; the remaining ones will be in place by Friday of this week. Attendance times remain in line with where they were prior to implementation of the new system, as do call handling times. So we don't have all the fixes in place yet but the intention is to get them in by Friday.</p>	
<p>Councillor Martin Whelton: In terms of those fixes, were you satisfied that this was the right time to launch it given that there are penalty charges in terms of the contract. Would it have been better to have delayed it until all of those were fully resolved, before going live with the mobilising system?</p>	
<p>Commissioner: I don't believe so. We reached the point with the contractual negotiations with the supplier that the contract had been fulfilled in full, therefore we accepted the system. I believe that some of the issues which have arisen since we have gone live with the mobilising system could only have been identified once it had gone live; so it wouldn't have mattered how long we had waited - we would still have faced some of those issues anyway. I think we made the right decision going live when we did. We've had a number of large incidents since the mobilising system went live and they have been dealt with entirely in line with our expectations. As we know, there have been some issues with over-paging of officers and in some cases some over-mobilising, but there certainly haven't been any issues of under-mobilising, which is very good. I think the fixes which will be in place by Friday of this week should resolve most of those issues.</p>	

Question 441**From Councillor Jack Hopkins**

Can the Commissioner provide details of the security and protection measures were in place with regard to 8 Albert Embankment prior to the rave on the weekend of 31st October, to cover such issues as: where were decisions made to not provide for adequate protections?; what has been the cost of the failure of such protections?; what protective measures are in place with regard to other sites in the Estate which are currently vacant?; and whether any more detailed protections been put in place at those sites since the incidents at 8 Albert Embankment?

Commissioner's written response

Security for the 8AE rear block site is provided by a company called 'Vigilance Properties' on a Specialist Caretaking basis. This is a system of caretaking protection by ex-military professionals. In the case of 8AE rear block Vigilance embedded 3 licensed operatives in a residential context to protect the property 24/7. They have also been contracted to provide security for all of the Authority's vacant LSP5 properties from the date of fire station closure to disposal of the sites.

On the night in question the normal 24/7 security caretaker presence of 3 live in staff were within the building at the time of the illegal forced entry. The trespassers broke into the building by cropping the padlocked front and rear gates and entered the site rapidly in a highly organised vehicle convoy and in significant numbers. On breaking in the trespassers' convoy progressed immediately to the rear main workshop shutter door and broke the securing padlocks gaining access into the main former workshop area.

At the time of the break-in, the security staff had just completed one of their regular perimeter checks which had ensured that the front and rear gates were locked and that the building was secure. On hearing the break-in the security caretakers (all retired Gurkha soldiers who have oiled other break in attempts and do not easily take a backwards step) responded directly to the workshop area but were confronted by significant numbers of determined trespassers who considerably outnumbered them (by at least ten to one). The caretakers followed their training and protocols and confronted the group assertively, professionally and courteously and demanded they leave, informing them that they were bona fide resident caretakers in the property and the group were trespassing contrary to the law. However the trespassers refused to leave and, after defiant confrontation from the illegal rave organisers, being seriously outnumbered and with the occupiers numbers growing, the caretakers were forced to withdraw and phoned the Police via 999 to request assistance and to report the criminal act which had taken place. As you will be aware from the extensive media coverage of the events, a significant Police presence was required to resolve this situation and it is our view that our retained premises security could in no way have been expected to have taken any other course of action in the circumstances and that they more than honoured all contractual requirements.

Officers have been and continue to be very satisfied with the level of service provided by Vigilance 'Caretaker' operatives. Indeed there have been several incidents where Vigilance operatives have actively challenged and prevented illegal activity at vacant LSP5 sites, e.g. Clerkenwell, Kingsland, previously at rear block and Westminster. As discussed at the Resources Committee on the 12 November, I think we need to be clear that this was an highly planned and well-resourced criminal act to take over the former rear block workshops and to stop it would have required a considerable 24/7 security presence with ongoing costs that would not be commensurate with the risk.

In the immediate aftermath of this incident officers decided to up the security presence at rear block by an additional 2 x 24/7 patrolling security guards to provide a more overt security presence at the site. This has been at an additional cost of £576 per day (circa £17,000 per month). Security has also been enhanced by the addition of 4 x concrete vehicle access barriers across the main vehicle access points at a one off cost of £1415. These extra precautions were taken due to the high risk trespassers would return to reclaim their belongings left on site. As indeed occurred on the night of Sunday 8 November when 15-20 individuals arrived at the site and using threatening language and behaviour, again sought to gain access to the site. This was professionally and robustly challenged by our on site security who were able to deny access to this group who we suspect wanted to collect belongings, vehicles and sound equipment from the illegal rave the previous weekend. An agreed operational plan was quickly put in place with LFB duty officers and the Police being informed and quickly attending the site.

Security has also been raised at Clerkenwell and Westminster. This is at an additional cost of £5,000 per station/month. Officers have agreed to this additional security being in place until the New Year to provide an enhanced security presence during the Christmas and New Year festive period. These enhancements will then be reviewed in the New Year.

There were no supplementary questions.

Question 442	From Tom Copley AM
What conversations has the Chairman had with the Mayor or his Office regarding any forthcoming Mayoral Directions?	
Chairman's written response	
I have had no recent conversations with the Mayor regarding forthcoming Mayoral Directions.	
Tom Copley AM: I was interested to see that you haven't had any conversations with the Mayor regarding forthcoming Mayoral Directions given that he has been ruling by royal decree for some time now. Given that, why haven't you had any discussions with him and do you anticipate any forthcoming Mayoral Directions?	
Chairman: I haven't had any discussions about forthcoming Mayoral Directions because there were no Mayoral Directions to discuss. Never say never is my answer to part two of your question.	

Question 443	From Councillor Sarah Hayward
What conversations has the Chairman had with the Department for Communities and Local Government about the forthcoming budget cuts?	
Chairman's written response	
Since becoming Chairman I have had discussions with DCLG officials regarding a range of subjects including budgets. It was made clear that detail over LFEPA's future funding settlements would not be available until after the government's Comprehensive Spending Review. I have not had the opportunity to have such discussions since the Autumn Statement last week, but recently sent a joint letter from both myself and the Commissioner to the Secretary of State, requesting a meeting to discuss this issue.	
There were no supplementary questions.	

Question 444	From Councillor Liaquat Ali
Can the Commissioner update the Authority on what recent conversations he has had with all Government departments, including but not limited to DCLG?	
Commissioner's written response	
In addition to my role as the London Fire Commissioner, I am also the Chief Fire Officers' Association strategic lead for CBRN(E) & counter terrorism matters. Recent discussions with Government departments have included the current threat from terrorism, the Government review of the CBRN(E) capability, the Governments' recent consultation on greater collaboration between emergency services and fire and rescue procurement matters. These discussions have taken place with DCLG, Home Office, Cabinet Office and the Office for Security and Counter Terrorism.	
There were no supplementary questions.	

Question 445	From Councillor Pauline Morrison
What conversations has the Chairman had with the Department for Communities and Local Government, the Mayor or his office about the future of LFEPA?	
Chairman's written response	
Since discussing with the Mayor the Authority's response to the Government's consultation 'Enabling closer working between the Emergency Services', I have not had any conversations with him, nor his office, regarding the future of the LFEPA. Neither have I had any discussions with DCLG on the matter, but did notice a suggestion in the Autumn Statement that should the changes be agreed by Parliament, implementation was likely in early 2017.	
There were no supplementary questions.	

Question 437	From Councillor David Cartwright QFSM
<p>In the light of the terrorist atrocity carried out in Paris on 13 November 2015, can you assure members that the London Fire Brigade is as well prepared as it can be to respond along with the other emergency services to such an attack in London? Could you also confirm that we would see London firefighters playing the full and professional role that we witnessed Paris firefighters doing in response to the attacks in Paris?</p>	
Commissioner's written response	
<p>I can assure Members that, while working within the current constraints, the Brigade is as well prepared as it can be to respond with our emergency service partners to such an attack should one take place in London. We have in fact had a Marauding Terrorism Fire-arms capability since before the Olympic Games and large exercises like Operation Strong Tower, which went ahead earlier this year, are a key part of our continued preparation.</p> <p>Our response to a Paris style attack is currently provided by a group of managers who have volunteered for this role and have taken part in enhanced training with our emergency service partners. I am extremely grateful to the managers who have volunteered to perform this role but, while their willingness to volunteer means that we would see London firefighters performing a similar role to that seen in Paris, I cannot confirm that the numbers and extent of their role would be the same.</p> <p>Officers will be liaising with our colleagues in Paris over the next few months to ensure that we learn any lessons following the Paris terrorist attack.</p>	
<p>Councillor David Cartwright QFSM: In your response you mentioned constraints and you also say that the Brigade is as well prepared as it can be. This terminology causes me some concern, I have to say. Can you identify those constraints you are working under and tell us what is the local and national fire brigade union position and how does that affect London's response to terrorist incidents? I understand that may take us into part 2.</p> <p>Commissioner: The first part certainly does. I am happy to answer that questions, so that Members can be aware of that, but it's not something I would want to say in public session.</p>	

The Chairman explained that he would deal with the remaining items on the agenda before formally moving that the public and press be excluded from the meeting, in order to enable the Authority to receive the full answer to this question.

17. Urgent Business

There was no urgent business.

18. Exclusion of Press and Public

Resolved – That, in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting in order to consider the following item of business, on the grounds that it would be likely to involve the disclosure of exempt

information as defined in paragraph 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act (namely information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime).

19. Urgent Exempt Business

Questions from Members (in accordance with Standing Order 20) – 2 December 2015 – FEP 2547

The Authority received the Commissioner's answer to question 437 from Councillor David Cartwright QFSM.

Given the nature of the issue, it was agreed to suspend in part the provisions of Standing Order 20 in order to allow all any Authority Member to ask a supplementary question on this item. The Commissioner answered questions from a number of Members, and his responses were noted.

The meeting ended at 3.51pm.

Signed By:
Chairman

Ed Williams, Ground Floor, 169 Union Street, London, SE1 0LL; telephone: 020 8555 1200 ext 30081; e-mail: Ed.Williams@london-fire.gov.uk
Clerk to LONDON FIRE & EMERGENCY PLANNING AUTHORITY