

Public Document Pack

FIRE AUTHORITY

Minutes of the meeting of the FIRE AUTHORITY held at Council Chamber, County Hall, East Sussex County Council, St Anne's Crescent, Lewes at 10.00 am on Friday, 25 October 2019.

Present: Councillors Galley (Chairman), Lambert (Vice-Chair), Barnes, Boorman, Bowdler, Dowling, Ebel, Evans, Fox, Hamilton, Osborne, Peltzer Dunn, Powell, Scott, Taylor, Theobald and Tutt

Also present:

D Whittaker (Chief Fire Officer), M O'Brien (Deputy Chief Fire Officer), M Andrews (Assistant Chief Fire Officer), L Woodley (Deputy Monitoring Officer), D Savage (Assistant Director Resources/Treasurer), L Ridley (Assistant Director Planning & Improvement), H Scott-Youlton (Assistant Director HR, OD, Training & Assurance), R Fowler (Assistant Director Operational Support & Resilience), K Pearce (ITG Manager), S Milner (Planning & Intelligence Manager), E Curtis (Communications & Marketing Manager), A Rowland (Head of Commercial Law, BHCC), C Sharp (Project Manager), S Neill (SM), E Simpkin (Democratic Services Officer), A Blanshard (Senior Democratic Services Officer)

Press & Public:

H Oxburgh (Local Democracy Reporter), H Shapcott (Mott MacDonald), P Sutherland (Mott MacDonald), T McCord (Fire Officers Association)

37 Declarations of Interest

Cllr Galley declared a non-prejudicial interest in agenda item 22 as he was a member of the Cabinet of Wealden District Council.

38 Apologies for Absence

Apologies had been received from Cllrs Earl-Williams, Pragnell, Sheppard and Smith.

The Chairman welcomed Cllrs Boorman, Bowdler and Fox who were attending as substitutes.

39 Notification of items which the Chairman considers urgent and proposes to take at the end of the agenda/Chairman's business items

The Chairman informed the Authority that he had agreed to accept agenda item 21(a) as a late item. In his view, it was important for the Authority to respond to the Technical Consultation. The consultation period closed before the next scheduled meeting of the full Fire Authority.

The Chairman informed the Authority that he had attended the excellent Annual Awards Ceremony in Hastings. He explained that Staff had enjoyed

Unconfirmed minutes – to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Fire Authority

and appreciated the event and thanked those other Members who had been able attend.

The Chairman informed the Authority that, along with the Chief Fire Officer and the Vice-Chair he had attended the recent Combined Fire Authorities Conference in Milton Keynes. There had been many useful updates including information on Pensions and wider sector funding issues which he would circulate to Members if they wished him to.

40 To consider any public questions

The following questions were received from Members of the Public. As the questioners were not able to attend the meeting to receive their responses in person the Chairman would send a written response to their question.

The questions and responses are included in these minutes as a matter of public record.

Public Question from Dawn Tindall of Sussex Control Centre:

“Why do you think it will be good working practice to go to Surrey to work alongside two Services with poor records, one of which has already divorced our Service? Better cross border working will not be a good answer as we currently do not use Surrey”

Response:

Cross border working is not just about sending appliances from one area to another when there is an incident. We believe that this partnership offers all the services involved an opportunity to share operational learning and experiences, as well as to provide greater resilience. In time, this will have the potential to deliver further operational improvements for all three services. In the short-term, this arrangement would allow the introduction of borderless mobilising between Surrey, East and West Sussex; the latter of which was always an identified benefit from the original SCC project.

We understand that the improvement plan to address concerns raised in the Surrey HMICFRS report has now been delivered. The Surrey HMICFRS report made a number of references to Surrey Control and the majority of them were positive; for example “confident approach to intelligent call handling” and “good systems to pass on risk information to crews”.

Public Question from Sue Ivatt of Sussex Control Centre:

“Our Chief, Dawn Whittaker, categorically stated that we would never enter into partnership with another Service who are County Council led, so why have we?”

Response:

Unconfirmed minutes – to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Fire Authority

The CFO did indeed say that we would not enter into another Control room arrangement with a single County Council led service after West Sussex took the decision to give us notice and the reason for that was the financial risk associated with that being repeated. In fact that is a matter of record in the principles established in the Phase 1 of the Mott MacDonald work

However what is now being proposed is not a partnership with a single County service - it is a partnership with two other services, so the financial cost and risk is spread and also we would seek to put in place a much more robust contract agreement with full schedules, unlike that previously in place.

It is important to remind ourselves that the list of options agreed by Senior Leadership Team to be evaluated as part of the Project 21 detailed due diligence process has always contained two options involving Surrey FRS, a fact that everyone in the Service and on the Fire Authority were fully aware of.

The other fact is that in other areas of work we do collaborate with other County Council led FRS, for example in our Occupational Health contract, which involves Surrey FRS and the Police.

Public Question from Neal Martin of Sussex Control Centre

“Why did the option to work from Lewes Police HQ and buddy with Warrington (North West Fire Control) get pulled?”

Response:

This is the “NWFC hybrid option”. It has never has been “pulled” – it was one of the options under active consideration throughout the due diligence process. This option has not been recommended as the preferred option primarily because it was the most expensive and involved working with a partner 250 miles away.

Public Question from Claire Andrews of Sussex Control Centre

“If we stayed in the County and work from Lewes Police HQ, we would have more support from ESFRS staff and officers. Being at Haywards Heath over the last few years has seen less support than we had when we were based at Eastbourne HQ.”

Response:

We recognise that the move from Eastbourne HQ to Haywards Heath meant a big change for staff and we take on board the comments about support. We will look at how we can address this in the immediate future and going forwards through Project 21. Any future mobilising strategy will look carefully at how we ensure a strong and positive working relationship between all colleagues.

Public Question from Paula Jones of Sussex Control Centre

Unconfirmed minutes – to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Fire Authority

“Why is it costing over 11 million pound?”

Response:

Our current joint control room with WSFRS already costs just over £1m a year to run. The £11m figure is the anticipated “whole life” cost of the recommended solution over a 7 year period from now through to the end of the financial year 2025/26.

The £11m figure splits into two different types of cost, one being one-off “transition costs” to build, configure, test and implement the new solution and the other being year on year “revenue costs”. The transition costs are currently estimated at £4.6m and the annual revenue costs £1.2m per year, equivalent to £6m over the 5 year lifespan modelled as part of the due diligence. The transition costs include not only the cost of on-boarding to Surrey, but significant investment in our MDTs, Pagers and Alerters and integration to other ESFRS systems.

The remaining £0.5m is an assessed contingency sum bringing the total to £11.1m over 7 years.

Public Question from Sue Norton of Sussex Control Centre

“East Sussex implemented a new pre-determined attendance (PDA) for ambulance calls WEF 21/10/19. This involves various configurations of what will be mobilised, we manually mobilise as the system cannot do this for us. This is just an example of a new attendance, we have many attendances that are completely different to Surrey & West Sussex. Does Vision have the capability to work out different attendances for different Brigades or will we conform and send whatever Surrey or the system say? Is this just the start of ESFRS losing control of its own resources?”

Response:

At no point will we lose control of our own resources.

Capita Vision as a system does have the capability of applying different PDAs to differing geographic areas.

Our aim is to work with Surrey FRS and West Sussex FRS in partnership to develop common and best practice Ways of Working across all three services over time.

Public Question from C Watch of Sussex Control Centre

“What will happen to local knowledge?”

Response:

Any ESFRS Control staff whose roles will be affected by this decision will be protected under the TUPE transfer regulations. They have the right to move

Unconfirmed minutes – to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Fire Authority

to Surrey FRS when responsibilities transfer in future. If they choose to do this, the new control function will benefit from much of the ESFRS local knowledge.

We also recognise that local knowledge comes from experience, and anticipate that this will grow over time. In addition, it is also worth reflecting that a large amount of local knowledge is also held by local operational crews.

41 To receive any petitions

There were none.

42 Non-confidential Minutes of the Previous Meeting

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 5 September 2019 be approved and signed by the Chairman. *(Copy in Minute Book)*

43 Callover

Members reserved the following agenda items for debate:

23 Project 21 Future Mobilising – Final Options Appraisal

26 Sussex Control Centre – Exit of WSFRS – Deed of Variations to Section 16 Agreement

Members debated whether or not to bring the exempt appendices to Project 21 Future Mobilising – Final Options Appraisal in to the public Domain. There was a lengthy discussion regarding the reasons why these two appendices had been deemed to be confidential including for business and contractual reasons. It was explained that as much as possible had been included in the public report and that there was the potential that ESFRS might be put at a financial disadvantage if all the papers were to be presented in the public domain. Members took on board the recommendation of the legal officers with regard to exemptions and would be guided by them. The Deputy Monitoring Officer (DMO) confirmed that the appendix papers contained exempt information and accordingly met the requirement for being in closed session. The DMO reminded Members that their duty was to protect the interests of the Fire Authority and that with the papers presented as they were the majority, if not all, the debate could and should be held in open session with the debate only being closed if Members needed to.

Cllr Scott proposed and Cllr Powell seconded a motion to move Agenda Item 25 – Project 21 Future Mobilising – Final Options Appraisal – Exempt Appendices into the public domain.

Votes: For – 8 Against – 9

Therefore the appendices at Agenda Item 25 would remain exempt.

Unconfirmed minutes – to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Fire Authority

RESOLVED: That all other reports be resolved in accordance with the recommendations as detailed below.

44 Local Government Finance Settlement Technical Consultation

The Fire Authority considered the report of the Assistant Director Resources / Treasurer which sought approval for the Authority's response to the Government's Local Government Finance Settlement (LGFS) Technical Consultation.

RESOLVED: That the Fire Authority agreed to:

- i. approved the response to the LGFS Technical Consultation; and
- ii. delegated authority to the Treasurer to finalise the responses in the light of any relevant changes to the NFCC response.

45 Business Rates Pooling

The Fire Authority considered the report of the Assistant Director Resources / Treasurer seeking approval to participate in a re-established East Sussex Business Rates Pool.

RESOLVED: That the Fire Authority agreed to:

- i. approve the authority's membership of a re-established East Sussex Business Rates Pool;
- ii. delegate the final decision on whether to participate in the Pool to the Assistant Director Resources / Treasurer after consultation with the Chairman and the Chief Fire Officer; and
- iii. authorise the Assistant Director Resources / Treasurer to take any steps necessary to give effect to the decision in (ii) above.

46 Project 21 Future Mobilising - Final Options Appraisal

The Fire Authority considered the report of the Deputy Chief Fire Officer (DCFO) which presented Members with the outcomes of the final due diligence stage of Project 21 – Future Mobilising Project and sought their approval to implement the preferred option as recommended by the Senior Leadership Team (SLT).

The Vice-Chair addressed the Authority explaining that the Members all accepted that any decision that involved substantial change and a potential financial risk was difficult. She informed the meeting that Members had received a letter from a member of staff raising personal thoughts on the proposed option, perceived financial difficulties of the county authorities and concerns that the respective Fire Services were not in control of their own finances. The letter also stated that staff did not feel they had been fully

Unconfirmed minutes – to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Fire Authority

engaged in the process which raised concerns with Members. The Vice-Chair understood there was an operational balance and the project was very technical but felt the report demonstrated that the Surrey option was potentially a risk and had concerns about their ability to meet the timeline. It was a large amount of money and in these times of financial difficulty it needed to be a carefully considered decision. The Vice-Chair proposed a pause in the process requesting officers provide a further report detailing the costings and requirements of a standalone control centre and additionally the possibility of sharing accommodation with Sussex Police on the shared HQ site. This proposal was seconded by Cllr Powell. The Chairman asked that this proposal be held aside in order to allow the DCFO to introduce the report and for Members to fully debate the contents.

The DCFO provided the Fire Authority with a brief introduction to the report ensuring that all relevant points were covered. The DCFO thanked the Sussex Control Centre (SCC) staff and other colleagues for their work on the project. The DCFO also thanked Mott MacDonald for their support and challenge during the evaluation process. The due diligence work showed that all four shortlisted options were possible but were not without risk. It had been clear from the start of the process that each option would impact on staff, not just with regard to IT, but operationally too. There had been regular staff engagement throughout the process. SCC staff, members of the SCC technical team and the SCC Group and Station-Managers had been included on the analysis team.

The DCFO explained that the due diligence process had led to the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) being clear on a preferred option which was to partner with Surrey as a member of a tri-service collaboration. Whilst the North-West (NW) Outsource solution was technologically preferable it was essential that Members considered the operational risk, impact on staff and potentially challenging industrial relations that may result from it.

The NW Hybrid option was not currently operational and the most expensive. The SLT were concerned that option would not in SLTs opinion offer the same inter-operability and operational benefits of co-location with a neighbouring service and therefore officers advice was that this would only ever be considered as a temporary option rather than a permanent solution.

The DCFO explained that the Surrey Hybrid option was the least robust and well understood. Whilst ESFRS would be able to retain more staff, the technical solution was the least well developed. As a result there was no certainty as to the cost of this option; during the due diligence process it was made clear that Surrey and Capita did not have the capacity to consider the hybrid solution and would not be able to do so until the start of 2020. It would then take approximately 8-12 weeks to review this option. In reality, the detail for this solution would not be presented to the Fire Authority for a decision until April 2020, meaning the March 2021 go-live date would be impossible to meet. This would result in ESFRS being required to renegotiate with Remsdaq for continued provision and support to the existing system in order to continue to be able to mobilise during the intervening period.

Unconfirmed minutes – to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Fire Authority

The DCFO told the Authority that the Surrey Outsource option was not without risk and that there was no intention to play this down, but it was deemed that the risks were outweighed by the potential future benefits. The Authority were told that whilst no guarantees could be made to SCC staff, this option meant the prospect of compulsory redundancies would be reduced. It was confirmed that there would be no loss of accountability to ESFRS, under the Fire & Rescue Services Act the statutory duty of provision remained with ESFRS, although through a “Section 16 agreement” this could be delivered by working with a partner. The DCFO accepted that perhaps the choice of terminology was not helpful, the preferred option was not a straightforward commercial “outsource” but could be better described as being a tri-service partnership.

The DCFO confirmed that the Information Technology Governance (ITG) Manager agreed that the proposed Surrey solution was deliverable. The DCFO closed by telling the Authority that putting all concerns aside, the operational benefits of the proposed solution were immediate, the detail of these were included on pages 21 - 22 of the report. The responsibility of the Fire Authority and ESFRS was to provide a functional mobilising system and this proposed solution would achieve this and enable the Service to keep the communities of East Sussex safe.

Members welcomed the change of process that had allowed the acceptance of Public questions on this agenda item. There was some discussion on the long history of upheaval and change within Control provision, not just in East Sussex but nationwide. Some Members explained that they ideologically opposed outsourcing as they believed it removed local accountability and that they believed residents of East Sussex would also oppose this. Members commented that ESFRS had expert staff who were valued but that years of uncertainty had been a challenge which was reflected by many staff moving on to new employment.

The Authority felt the cost of the proposed options was also a concern and were disappointed that there appeared to have been no real consideration given to a standalone provision on the shared HQ site. Cllr Scott proposed, seconded by Cllr Evans, an amendment to the recommendations to defer any decision until Members had been presented with a fully costed option for a standalone control centre at the shared HQ in Lewes – this amendment was later withdrawn.

Some Members reminded their colleagues that any delay would not prevent them from having to make a difficult decision. They reminded the Authority that the standalone option had been considered by them previously and deemed not practical or affordable, but that this had regrettably not been included in detail in the report before them today. There were other problems with a standalone option including foregoing any economies of scale and the importance of collaboration. The DCFO replied that it was not accurate to say that an option which included maintaining a control room in East Sussex had not been referenced in the report. The NW Hybrid option included reasonably robust costings. This was the most expensive option with limited operational advantage, and as previously stated, it could only ever be considered as a temporary solution. The national picture across the fire sector was that

Unconfirmed minutes – to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Fire Authority

services were moving towards local shared services and collaborations. The DCFO explained to the Authority that the costs of a standalone control provision would be considerably higher and the service less resilient than any of the four options considered in this process. There was a reasonably strong assumption that the cost of re-tendering for a standalone system would add an additional c. £2.5m to the costs outlined in the report. Whilst a standalone control option might technically be achievable it would be more expensive and against the national direction.

The debate continued with a discussion on the issues that would be presented by a delay, including the supplier potentially no longer providing or supporting the current software; if this was the case then ESFRS would have to re-provision fast. Remaining with the current situation was not possible in the long term. Some Members explained they would not be seeking a pause in the process but felt there should be a preference expressed by the Authority which should be progressed but a final decision deferred.

Everyone at the meeting agreed that SCC staff had remained remarkably resilient and loyal to the Service and should be credited for this. Members recognised that there was one hybrid model presented in the report that had the benefit of providing some staff retention. The DCFO responded to queries regarding the staffing levels at Surrey by confirming that this had been identified during their HMICFRS inspection and they had already begun to respond to the findings, including a current recruitment process. A TUPE process would also be carried out, should it be agreed to partner with them.

Members had strong concerns regarding the financial risk that could be faced if sharing provision with County Authorities. They were aware of pressures on both Fire Services, however, some Members recognised that there were substantial advantages to a partnership with Surrey. There was a request that a mechanism must be in place to ensure robust, secure ring-fencing and safeguarding of funds in order to ensure there was no impact on control centre provision from outside pressures at either County Authority. The DCFO explained that a Section 16 Agreement was the mechanism through which the Governance arrangements would be agreed and that ESFRS would have the chance to influence and contribute to the creation of robust governance arrangements and ways of working.

Members discussed whether there were further reasons for progressing two options rather than settling on one at this meeting. It was suggested that the preferred option would be Surrey Outsource, but there was some desire to keep the NW Hybrid option open. The Authority were reminded that Project 21 had already been a 12 month process, including long-listing of potential options, refining and short-listing. In line with the time limitations and the option requirements set out before the process started there were no other options that could have been tabled for Members.

Members asked for clarity on the operational benefits that had been referred to and whether, if a different option were chosen, these operational benefits would be possible by other means. The DCFO referred Members to the details of the operational assessment shown at pages 21-22 of the report.

Unconfirmed minutes – to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Fire Authority

There was an expectation through the National Framework for England on fire and rescue services with regard to operational standards. The framework described expectations of intraoperability and interoperability across emergency services and fire and rescue services were expected to work with each other to deliver the intraoperability element, including compatible communications systems, control rooms and equipment and cross border working. The view of officers was that it was easier and more effective to deliver this through a local control room rather than one located in a different part of the UK, it was also noted that this was one of the reasons that the majority of control room collaborations and partnerships were based on defined and logical, coterminous geographical groupings. Operational benefits that might be achieved included truly borderless mobilising for two adjacent counties, convergence of operational procedures including standardisation of Predetermined Attendances (PDAs – the number and type of resources mobilised to certain incidents on the initial call) and making a local incident control room available for large scale and major incidents, there would also be increased tie-in with the local Resilience Forums for Sussex and Surrey and their arrangements.

The Chief Fire Officer (CFO) added that by having a shared local control centre the staff had access to live visuals of the availability of all appliances across all borders; if there were no borders then the response to an incident could be far quicker. A standalone control solution would not provide this. The benefits would be particularly apparent when dealing with large operations involving multiple partners. Members were informed of how valuable it was to be able to place officers at the control centre to support control staff and to add their knowledge to an incident response. A further risk to ESFRS of moving to a standalone provision would be the loss of collaboration, shared knowledge cross county, organisational benefits and alignment to others with regards to policy change. ESFRS would also be closing itself off to future potential opportunities including multi-service control rooms, unlocking more collaborations, sharing wider resources, joint PDAs, shared purchasing and improvements in service delivery.

The DCFO reiterated the impacts a pause in the process might have. Financially this was presented at paragraph 4.6, page 40 of the report. Whilst it might be contractually possible it would pose the service with a technical risk. The ADR/T added that the assessed additional cost of an extension would be £500k per annum, with the additional requirement to maintain project resources at a minimum cost of c. £100k, but likely greater. He added that it was already proving challenging to manage operationally with the current SCC, including maintaining cover which presented its own operational risk.

The ITG Manager informed Members that the equipment at SCC had been purchased in 2013 with maintenance agreements in place. There had been some prudent investment during that time to make improvements to ensure that the system would continue to function. If a delay were agreed then assessment would have to be undertaken to evaluate the fitness for purpose of the servers and other equipment at SCC.

Unconfirmed minutes – to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Fire Authority

The Authority discussed the complexity of the papers and admitted to being surprised at the preferred option, as it did not appear to be the number one suggestion from the due diligence process. They accepted that operational benefits were stacked against some serious financial and technical issues. These were not easy issues to resolve and there was some concern regarding the capacity of Surrey to be able to on-board West and then East. Some Members were keen to be clear that this was not a political issue and there were cross party concerns that they did not perceive that all the options had been fully tested and not enough information had been provided. There was a lack of confidence in both authorities and concerns that Surrey and West Sussex might begin to lean financially on ESFA. The DCFO reminded Members of the earlier discussion regarding the Section 16 Agreement and reassured them that all these matters would be covered fully within this partnership agreement. He confirmed that the SLT was able to support the Surrey option because of the significant operational benefit that it would bring to ESFRS. The capacity of Surrey had been covered in the report where it was explained that they would not be able to on-board until the New Year but that they had committed their own costs to provide resources in order to do so. The resources of ESFRS had been fully costed and were included in the report. The DCFO confirmed that he did not disagree with the evaluation of the timeline made by Members and accepted that there was a possibility that the deadline of March 2021 may be missed and that the process was not risk free.

Members reiterated concerns regarding SCC staff and wanted some clarity on the TUPE process and what support was being provided. TUPE regulations were clear on what terms and conditions were protected, and that under these regulations the travelling distance to the proposed new location was deemed reasonable. The Authority accepted that this process was difficult for all involved but wanted further reassurance regarding the level of staff consultation. The ACFO provided clarity and reassurance, explaining that the technical team included the most experienced staff at SCC, they were control operators with a full understanding of the control room operation and requirements. The impact on staff of all the options was recognised and time had been spent with them discussing the potential impact of the decisions to be made. Their involvement was critical to the process and SCC managers had been crucial in sharing information with their teams. Additional communications with SCC staff had included FAQs and letters ensuring that the SCC staff, where possible, were always the first to be informed of any new or relevant information.

There were questions asked regarding the cost of the project. The ADR/T explained that this would not all be additional money. The existing cost of the control centre was circa £1m annually. The report set out the full costings on page 23-24, including £5.1m of transitional costs such as those for on-boarding, project management, and technology including Mobile Data Terminals (MDTs), station end equipment and pagers.

Members proposed that no decision be taken at the meeting, but that a motion should be considered that a meeting be held with Members and Officers to discuss the options further. Members stated that despite having

Unconfirmed minutes – to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Fire Authority

discussed the project at length they still felt unprepared for the decision that they had to take. The CFO confirmed that Officers would take whatever direction given by Members, but reminded the Authority that it would still not be an easy decision and the implications would remain the same. The CFO informed the Meeting that she was troubled by the suggestion that Members felt they did not have enough information or had not been given enough opportunities to discuss the project. Members were reminded that reports on the project had been made to both Scrutiny & Audit, Policy & Resources Panels, Fire Authority meetings, Members Seminars and a large amount of other correspondence. The Authority was also reminded that it had made the decision on the shortlist of which four options should be considered by Mott MacDonald. If Members felt that the information had been delivered in a convoluted or overly complicated manner, then the CFO took responsibility for this personally.

There were motions proposed and voted on as follows, the earlier proposals made by Cllr Lambert and Cllr Scott were withdrawn:

Motion for a deferral of the decision on this project being taken until a meeting of Members and Senior Officers can be held to discuss the options in a full and frank way ahead of asking officers to undertake further work – proposed by Cllr Osborne, seconded by Cllr Lambert

Votes: For – 8 Against – 9

Motion that the Authority would like to explore further the hybrid option of a local control room with NWFS Technology and also the Tri-Service Surrey Outsource model with a preference for the latter if satisfied with the governance, and financial and operational scrutiny of that option – proposed by Cllr Barnes, seconded by Cllr Fox

Votes: For – 2 Against – 7

Motion that the existing recommendations i), ii) and iv) remain as set out in the report with recommendation iii) being amended to state that the Authority agree to take forward the preferred option but with a direction to officers to return to the December meeting of the Fire Authority to provide further information on the operational benefits and governance arrangements of this option. Also to direct officers to provide the Authority with further detail on a standalone control option – proposed by Cllr Galley, seconded by Cllr Fox

Votes: For – 6 Against – 8

Motion to direct Officers to provide specific information about a stand-alone control option. Also to provide specific information about the recommended option to specifically outline the operational benefits and governance arrangements that would be in place, to be presented to the December meeting – proposed by Cllr Boorman, seconded by Cllr Lambert

Votes: For – 13 Against – 1

Unconfirmed minutes – to be confirmed at the next meeting of the Fire Authority

This motion was carried and replaced in full the original recommendations included in the report.

RESOLVED: That the Authority agreed:

- i. to direct Officers to provide specific information about a stand-alone control option; and
- ii. to also direct Officers to provide specific information about the recommended option to specifically outline the operational benefits and governance arrangements that would be in place. To be completed by the end of November 2019 and presented to the December meeting of the Fire Authority.

47 Exclusion of the Press & Public

RESOLVED: That agenda items no. 25 and 26 be exempt under paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006 and accordingly are not open for public inspection on the following grounds: they contain information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

48 Project 21 Future Mobilising - Final Options Appraisal - Exempt Appendices

The Authority considered the items contained within these Appendices during their open discussion on Agenda Item 23. There was no reference made to the specific confidential details and therefore it was not necessary to move into closed session.

49 Sussex Control Centre - Exit of WSFRS - Deed of Variations to Section 16 Agreement

The meeting concluded at 1.32 pm

Signed

Chairman

Dated this

day of

2019

This page is intentionally left blank