

ACTION NOTES

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 20 AUGUST 2013



COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Councillor Paul Cosham
Councillor David Higgs
Councillor Reginald Howard (Chairman)
Councillor Vic Kerr
Councillor Michael King

Councillor David Nalson
Councillor Bob Russell
Councillor Bob Sampson
Councillor Ian Selby
Councillor Frank Turner

OFFICERS

Community Engagement and Policy
Development Officer (Carol Drury)
Principal Democracy Officer (Jo Toomey)
Community Safety and Licensing Service
Manager (Mark Jones)
Economic Development and
Regeneration Lead (Corrine Garbett)
Economic Development and Investment
Service Manager (David Mather)

Superintendent Phil Vickers (Lincolnshire
County Council – Safer Communities
Team)

2 members of the public

11. COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Two members of the public were present at the meeting.

Comment from Michael Worth

Mr Worth spoke about the issuing of parking penalty notices in Market Place, Grantham by parking wardens. He gave an example of a penalty notice issued in that area which had been cancelled on the grounds of insufficient marking and signposting. He stated that the issue of signage had been reported to Lincolnshire County Council's Highways Team but no action had been taken in 6-months. Mr Worth said he believed penalty notices were still being issued in this area, which people were paying. He suggested this was a reason why members of the public might feel aggrieved and car parking wardens might feel threatened carrying out their duties. Mr Worth left photographs of the areas to which his comment related.

Comment from Sue Verel

Following experiences with a number of different Councillors dating back to 2012, Ms Verel asked whether the general public could have confidence in Councillors. She left copies of a file she had compiled for the information of Committee members.

The Chairman gave Mr Worth permission to speak during the meeting following the Annual Report 2012/13 item. Mr Worth thanked the Committee for extending the opportunity for members of the public to speak at its meetings.

12. MEMBERSHIP

The Committee was notified that Councillor Higgs would be substituting for Councillor Mrs Smith and that Councillor Vic Kerr would be substituting for Councillor Powell for this meeting only.

13. APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Mrs Kaberry-Brown.

14. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

No interests were disclosed.

15. ACTION NOTES FROM THE MEETING HELD ON 11 JUNE 2013

The action notes from the meeting held on 11 June 2013 were noted.

16. CCTV

The Chairman welcomed Superintendent Phil Vickers to the meeting. Superintendent Vickers was a Lincolnshire Police officer on secondment to the Safer Communities Team at Lincolnshire County Council.

He explained that Lincolnshire Police and Lincolnshire Police Authority received regular requests from district councils for funding contributions to their CCTV services. This issue had also been raised with the Police and Crime Commissioner following his election November 2012.

Members were informed that CCTV arrangements differed greatly across the county. There were six CCTV control rooms that operated a different number of hours a day, using different technologies, platforms and ways of recording and providing evidence. The issue of CCTV was raised at a meeting of the Lincolnshire Community Safety Partnership when the Police and Crime Commissioner said he would not fund the different CCTV arrangements across the county and challenged members of the Community Safety Partnership to develop a more financially efficient, co-ordinated solution.

Lincolnshire County Council commissioned an independent technical feasibility study of possibilities for CCTV in Lincolnshire. As part of the report, consideration was given to different operating models potential income streams and technical issues. The draft report was made available to community safety partners in July 2013, when a number of technical corrections were made prior to the preparation of the final report. The final report would be presented to the Police and Crime Commissioner who would consider whether he was prepared to commit any funding to CCTV.

Superintendent Vickers summarised the findings in the technical study including the required investment and potential savings of moving to a countywide CCTV model with one or two control rooms. The level of support for these proposals had varied between districts, which meant that changing the operating model would not be possible in the short-term.

To provide a more integrated approach in the medium term, Procurement Lincolnshire was working with the Safer Communities team and community safety partners. When districts needed to replace and update their equipment, Procurement Lincolnshire would co-ordinate contracts so that the platform on which all districts were working was compatible. Potential advantages which were highlighted included remote monitoring during an emergency where local monitoring might not be possible and opportunities to change the county CCTV model in the medium to long term.

Committee members thoroughly considered the presentation and asked a range of questions.

The costs associated with new operating models which were provided in the feasibility study were based on bespoke new equipment and bolt-ons to make current hardware compatible. It was not anticipated that there would be an opportunity to generate income from the sale of old equipment because of the rate at which it would become obsolete.

Members were informed that the feasibility study provided a technical analysis of different models only and did not make any recommendations. Using Procurement Lincolnshire to develop a combined platform was not considered in the report.

Some concern was expressed that aligning the platforms used by the six control rooms would prove more expensive than changing the operating model. It was suggested that cost-benefit analysis of this might be useful. Members were informed that providing a platform from which all authorities could work would not increase costs as equipment would be only be replaced in-line with each district's renewal schedule. A common platform would not mean all authorities had to use the same supplier, but that the requirement for compatibility would form part of the technical specification for the contract.

Some Councillors were concerned about whether, with the speed at which technology advanced, it would be possible to establish a common platform when equipment had life cycles of five and ten years. The Community Safety and Licensing Service Manager informed Members that, if necessary, bolt-ons could be purchased to enable the transmission of images to other control rooms in an emergency.

The Committee asked how it could be kept abreast of the work that was being undertaken with Procurement Lincolnshire. They were informed that there would be ongoing liaison between Procurement Lincolnshire and the relevant officers from each district council.

Councillors were informed that the costs quoted in the technical report did not include all potential expenses of changing the operating model. Additional costs could be incurred as part of any release of staff.

There was some discussion about the beneficiaries of CCTV and how footage had contributed to the prosecution of offenders. Superintendent Vickers explained that the police force and police authority had not made contributions to CCTV, citing national guidance which stated a police force should not make financial contribution to CCTV systems or control public space CCTV systems. While members noted the provision of CCTV was a discretionary service, they argued its availability was of particular benefit to police officers. The Superintendent argued in favour of the wider benefits for local communities, businesses and visitors.

The Chairman thanked Superintendent Vickers for his presentation and answering members' questions. The Committee showed their appreciation with a round of applause.

Following discussions, Members agreed how they wanted to follow-up after the meeting.

Recommendations:

That the Chairman writes to Superintendent Vickers

- 1. Thanking him for attending the meeting***
- 2. Asking for a copy of the draft and finalised technical reports***
- 3. Asking for a written copy of the brief that has been given to Procurement Lincolnshire***
- 4. Asking who will carry out cost-benefit analysis of any contract in which Procurement Lincolnshire is involved***

17. GRAVITY FIELDS FESTIVAL 2012

The Economic Development and Investment Service Manager and the Economic Development and Regeneration Lead presented a report which

summarised outcomes from the Gravity Fields Festival in 2012. They gave an overview of performance against each of the eight objectives:

- To deliver a science and arts festival celebrating Sir Isaac Newton attracting 12-15,000 participants. *There were an estimated 37,000 attendances plus an additional 50,000 people who listened to radio broadcasts of 'Giant Steps' on BBC Radio Lincolnshire.*
- To engage with 25 local schools. *27 schools and colleges from the local area participated.*
- To work with 200 volunteers. *150 volunteers were engaged from a variety of community groups.*
- Involve 20 community groups. *18 community groups were engaged.*
- To attract participation of over 100 businesses. *120 businesses participated.*
- To secure direct or in-kind funding and sponsorship of £100,000. *Excluding ticket sales, the project attracted £85,000 direct funding and £50,000 of in-kind support.*
- To generate revenue income equivalent to 65% of total available ticket sales and merchandising. *43% of possible ticket sales achieved.*
- To generate the equivalent of £50,000 worth coverage in local, regional and national media. *The estimated value of media generated was £80,000.*

Members' attention was also drawn to other outcomes:

- 25% of people who purchased tickets for events lived 45 minutes or more from Grantham. The normal percentage experienced by the Guildhall was 5%.
- The number of customers on the Guildhall's mailing list had increased.
- The twitter feed attracted 4,000 followers, which was a greater quantity than the long-running Cheltenham Science Festival.
- Work in association with Lincolnshire One venues showed an increase in engagement from 12% to 32.4%.
- In booking acts, Arts Centre staff had experienced greater awareness of Grantham.
- 36 compliments were recorded on the council's 'comments, compliments and complaints' system.
- New and stronger relationships were built with businesses, organisations and venues.

Members asked questions and made comments about the outcomes from 2012. In response to questions, officers explained the methodology for calculating the equivalent cost value of media and measuring footfall during the transformation of the town event.

Officers added that satisfaction surveys were conducted during the event, which were being used to inform the shape of the Festival for 2014. A brief

presentation was then made which summarised plans for 2014.

The five-day festival would run from 24 to 28 September 2014 (reduced from 8 days in 2012). Fringe events, including a possible business innovation conference, would take place outside this period. The organisational structure for 2014 was similar to 2012 however a patron, Dr Valerie Gibson, had been appointed. Membership of the steering group had also experienced some small changes.

Members were informed of key milestones for the project. Work was underway to secure funding. Heritage Lottery funding had been awarded while the announcement of whether Arts Council funding had been awarded was expected in September. A media announcement of the dates was planned for October 2013 with a public programme launch in January 2014. Tickets would go on sale in April 2014.

A number of objectives had been agreed, against which performance would be measured following the festival. A number of success criteria had also been put in place. It was hoped that objectives would still be deliverable despite the shorter duration of the festival.

In preparing the programme for 2014, the value for money of different elements was evaluated. The transformation of the town had the most impact but was also high cost. The evaluation considered that academic speakers and family programmes provided the best value for money, meaning they would feature prominently in 2014. The assessment identified that the dramatic pieces only had a low to medium impact.

The key risks to the project were highlighted. Members were assured that these were actively managed as part of the Council's risk arrangements.

During discussions, the timing of the festival was queried. Members were advised that the festival was scheduled for the end of September to maximise the participation of schools.

The officers were thanked for their presentation and Members wished them well for the 2014 festival.

18. DEFIBRILLATOR SCRUTINY REVIEW

The Committee's Defibrillator Scrutiny Review was considered by Cabinet at its meeting on 1 July 2013. Cabinet were supportive of the principle behind the report but had asked for additional work on finance and the liability of the organisation. Members tasked officers to research these areas and feedback to Cabinet.

The Chairman of the working group thanked those members who had been involved for their efforts.

Action Point

That the Community Engagement and Policy Development Officer and the Principal Democracy Officer respond to questions on the defibrillator Scrutiny Review posed by the Cabinet.

19. DRAFT ANNUAL REPORT 2012/13

The Committee agreed the draft annual report as circulated subject to one amendment on page 11.

The second paragraph of section 10.0 should be amended to read:

“Alan Thomas and Sharon Cuff (representing Procurement Lincolnshire) attended the meeting on 9 April 2013 and took note of the recommendations made within the Committee’s Scrutiny Review.”

The annual report would be submitted for the information of Council at its meeting on 12 September 2013.

20. WORK PROGRAMME

The Committee noted the work programme. It was agreed that the text on page 6 relating to Procurement Lincolnshire should be amended to reflect the wording of the Committee’s annual report.

21. REPRESENTATIVES ON OUTSIDE BODIES

Councillor Cosham informed the Committee that as a representative on the Welland and Deepings Internal Drainage Board, he had attended a demonstration of drainage equipment.

22. CLOSE OF MEETING

The meeting was closed at 12:33pm.