

Minutes of the meeting of the BUCKINGHAMSHIRE AND MILTON KEYNES FIRE AUTHORITY held on WEDNESDAY 10 FEBRUARY 2016 at 11.00 am, held at MILTON KEYNES COUNCIL CHAMBER, MILTON KEYNES COUNCIL OFFICES

Present Councillors Bendyshe-Brown, Busby (Chairman), Clarke OBE, Dransfield, Exon, Glover, Gomm, Huxley, Lambert, Mallen, Marland, Morris, Reed, Schofield, Vigor-Hedderly, Watson, and Wilson

Officers: J Thelwell (Chief Fire Officer), M Osborne (Deputy Chief Fire Officer), G Britten (Director of Legal and Governance), L Swift (Director of People and Organisational Development) D Sutherland (Director of Finance and Assets), J Parsons (Head of Service Development), P Holland (Head of Projects and Transformation), N Boustred (Head of Service Delivery), S Gowanlock (Corporate Planning Manager), M Hemming (Head of Finance [Deputy Director]), K Nellist (Democratic Services Officer), F Pearson (Communication and Consultation Manager), A McCallum (Executive Assistant to Chief Fire Officer), G Wylie (Property Manager) D Norris (Fire and Rescue Advisor DCLG)

Also Present: Approximately 80 members of the public.

Apologies: None.

FA37 MINUTES

RESOLVED -

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Fire Authority held on 16 December 2015, be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

FA38 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

The Head of Service Development declared an interest in Item 10 Milton Keynes Safety Centre, review of funding agreement, as he was a trustee director of the Safety Centre.

FA39 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman's announcements had been circulated in advance of the meeting. [Appended to these minutes].

The Chairman advised that Agenda Item 7 (Recommendations from Committees) would be taken after Agenda Item 9.

FA40 PETITIONS

The Chairman advised that a request to present a petition had been received from Councillor Nolan, Loughton and Shenley Ward, Milton Keynes Council and would be taken under Item 9; and that five Milton Keynes Councillors had requested to make statements relating to Agenda Item 9. The Chairman consented

to their statements being heard once Councillor Nolan had presented her Petition.

FA41

QUESTIONS

The Chairman announced that four Questions had been received by the Monitoring Officer: three Questions from Councillor Zoe Nolan Loughton and Shenley Ward Labour, and one Question from Councillor Matthew Clifton Loughton and Shenley Ward Labour; and that printed copies were in front of Members and in the Public Gallery. The Chairman proposed, that as all four Questions related to Agenda Item 9, that the Questions be addressed after the presentation of the Petition and Milton Keynes Councillors' statements.

FA42

ENABLING CLOSER WORKING BETWEEN THE EMERGENCY SERVICES: CONSULTATION OUTCOMES AND NEXT STEPS

The Chairman advised Members that as they were aware, from the 1 April 2016, the responsibility for fire policy was moving from the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) to the Home Office and clearly greater collaboration between police and fire was a key item on the Home Office agenda.

The Chairman introduced the Fire and Rescue Advisor who was an employee of Buckinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service but had been seconded to the Fire Resilience and Emergencies Department at DCLG for over two years.

The Fire and Rescue Advisor introduced the report and advised Members that his role was to provide professional advice to ministers and officials across all government departments on a range of matters affecting the fire and rescue service, and the services' contribution to national capabilities and civil contingencies.

The Fire and Rescue Advisor deputises and represents the Chief Fire and Rescue Adviser on a range of current initiatives including; the integration of fire policy into the Home Office; policy development on collaboration including the newly formed Ministerial Board; policy development around assurance and transparency including the outcomes of the PAC on inspection and audit in the fire service; development of the revised Emergency Operations Centre from DCLG to the Home Office and provide support as assistant private secretary to the Minister for Policing, Fire, Criminal Justice and Victims.

The Fire and Rescue Advisor informed Members that the consultation paper was launched on 11 October 2015 and posed 16 questions covering a range of matters seeking to realise the manifesto commitment to '*enable the fire and police services to work more closely together and develop the role of our elected and accountable Police and Crime Commissioners*'. A total of 318 responses were received (fully or partially completed) from a range of organisations and individuals.

The Fire and Rescue Advisor reminded Members that a full and detailed response was considered by the Authority at its meeting on the 14 October last year, and was subsequently submitted. The consultation closed six weeks later and the Government's response to the consultation was released on 26 January 2016. The Government now intends to legislate to introduce a suite of reform measures.

The Authority would be mindful of the progressive work carried out by officers of this service over a number of years which include a refurbished fire station at Broughton with a dedicated and shared space for Thames Valley Police; a long standing arrangement for South Central Ambulance Service (SCAS) to use the Authority's fire stations as mobilisation hubs and to share resources with station staff; officers seconded to roles outside of the service and becoming embedded in areas such as the South East Counter Terrorism unit; the developing role of co-responding across areas within Buckinghamshire; Memorandums of Understanding (MOU's) with Thames Valley fire services and the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC), as well as this Authority amending its constitution to give the PCC a seat on the Authority and joint procurement of operational equipment with neighbouring services.

The Fire and Rescue Advisor informed Members that the intention of the Government was to introduce radical reform and colleagues from the Home Office were using police reform as a blueprint for fire service reform. There was, however, recognition that the fire service needed to be better understood.

During recent visits to fire services, including a recent, and very successful visit to this Authority, both the Permanent Secretary and the Fire Minister had been focussed and resolute that reform of the fire service and the delivery of benefits for local taxpayers was a Government priority.

RESOLVED:

That the outcomes of the consultation and next steps proposed by HM Government be noted.

FA43

STATION MERGER CONSULTATION: FEEDBACK AND RECOMMENDATION

The Chairman proposed to adjourn the meeting to allow members of the public to speak, it was seconded by Councillor Morris and put to the vote with all in favour.

The meeting adjourned at 11.21am. [10 members of the public and the Bucks FBU Acting Brigade Secretary spoke against Recommendation 1]

The meeting resumed at 11.51am.

Petition

Councillor Nolan presented a petition 'Stop the Closure of Great Holm Fire Station' which she stated had 3,616 signatures. Councillor Nolan gave a statement to Members against the closure of Great Holm Fire Station.

Rights to Speak

Milton Keynes Councillors Nolan, Clifton, Gifford, Bradburn and Long made statements on behalf of their wards against Recommendation 1.

Questions

DCFO Osborne provided answers. [The Questions and responses are appended to these minutes.]

The Head of Projects and Transformation advised Members that the Public Safety Plan (PSP) 2015-20, which the Authority approved unanimously in December 2014, set out the strategic approach to managing risk in its communities over the coming years; that the key risk management strategy proposal in the Public Safety Plan was 'the right number and location of fire stations which may involve moving, merging, closing or co-locating with other blue light services'; and that the Authority already had an example of sharing a site with Thames Valley Police in Milton Keynes at Broughton Fire Station. The PSP also included a number of reviews based upon five geographical risk areas adopting an integrated model in respect of managing risk via a blend of prevention, protection and response elements.

The Head of Projects and Transformation reminded Members that the Authority was required to have due regard to the Fire and Rescue Service National Framework which sets out the need for the Authority's PSP to cover at least three years and to be reviewed regularly and to all foreseeable fire and rescue related risks had been identified. The PSP analysis identified that within Milton Keynes there was a reduction in demand by 54%, and that there was no link between population growth and demand.

The Head of Projects and Transformation made further points in his presentation including that:

- the Authority's vision to make Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes the safest place in England to live, work and travel was best achieved with a blended approach of prevention, protection and response. Where risk levels remained high, despite the best efforts to engineer and eliminate them, the Authority would provide appropriate high quality response services;
- across Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes the Authority had 30 traditional pumping fire engines and specialist appliances to support its activity. Flexible resources to cover the whole area of Milton Keynes and Buckinghamshire did not mean it

would only respond in one area, resources could and did get deployed anywhere across the geographical area of Milton Keynes and Buckinghamshire;

- the consultation to merge Bletchley and Great Holm Fire Stations with Thames Valley police into a blue light hub at West Ashland ran for 8 weeks. A range of approaches were used to gather the information for the consultation; public forums of which 46 members of the public from Bletchley, Great Holm and the wider area of Milton Keynes, were questioned over 3 sessions. An independent research company 'Opinion Research Services' facilitated the sessions and provided a feedback report. This gave a diverse group of people from Milton Keynes the opportunity to participate independently by random selection, in line with best practice;
- regular meetings with staff had been held since July 2015. At these meetings a representative from each fire station in Milton Keynes as well as the Fire Brigades Union attended. The meetings had received excellent feedback which had been shared in the consultation;
- there was also an online questionnaire in which there had been 782 completed responses. The results and analysis were included within the report. The results needed to be interpreted carefully as the feedback demonstrated the strength of feeling in certain areas of the community;
- one of the key points was response standards to the north west of Milton Keynes. Since it was introduced in 2008, the service had one of the best response standards in the country and this would continue. The Authority's response standard was to get a fire engine to an incident within 10 minutes and this was achieved on 80% of occasions;
- in addition to community safety activity during the day, identified points across the city would be used to ensure that the Authority consistently provide the best response to those most at risk. Using dynamic management of resources, the nearest fire engine would be sent to an incident, providing flexibility to the response;
- there had been a 24% increase in population in Milton Keynes over the past 15 years, but a 54% reduction in incidents over the same period. This was partly due to the excellent prevention and protection work by the Authority's staff and its partners;
- with regard to the traffic around Milton Keynes on match days, under the Safety of Sports Grounds Act 1975, the service was already involved in planning (including traffic and access issues) for match days and other events;
- the Great Holm site, if it was vacated, would be subject to a planning consultation as part of any planning application.

There would be a need to demonstrate value for money to the public and the money would be re-invested back into the new facility;

- there had been very little feedback regarding Bletchley which indicated support for the need to replace this ageing facility and for the new location at West Ashland;
- there were many examples of fire authorities taking decisions to remove fire engines and reduce fire-fighters whereas the Authority's response was to invest £3m of central Government money into a blue light hub to improve the service to our communities for many years to come; and
- this proposal gave the Authority a tremendous opportunity to develop not just a new site, but much more importantly a new concept in operations and ways of working, alongside other blue light partners in delivering safety services to the communities of Milton Keynes and Buckinghamshire for many years to come.

A Member asked where operational savings were coming from. The meeting was advised that the financial proposal put to the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) was a public document and showed a good business case and that DCLG would not have given the project £2.8M funding if the business case was not feasible. The investment however, does enable revenue savings to be made.

A Member asked why analysis on future traffic growth projections had not been carried out as response times would increase as the level of congestion on the roads in Milton Keynes would grow. The meeting was advised that the Authority consistently monitored its response times and part of that was to move away from station based mobilising to automatic vehicle locating technology (AVLT), which was technology that mobilises the nearest available vehicle.

A Member asked for reassurance regarding the statement 'the intention of this project was to merge the resources across two fire stations in West Milton Keynes into a single facility in a location that has the minimum impact on current response times', taking into consideration the new builds in the area over the coming years and noting that the number of house fires had gone down but the number of road traffic accidents had gone up. The meeting was advised that it was not about the location of fire stations, but the use of fire engines. It was also about trying to prevent the incident from occurring in the first place through prevention and protection activity, but if that should fail, there were excellent response standards in place.

A Member asked why there was a huge peak in the statistics when Great Holm Fire Station opened in 1989, and then dropped by 54% between 2003 and 2015. The meeting was advised that this was before the Authority started undertaking integrated risk

management planning, but from 2004 onwards the Authority had actively been out in the community reducing the risk to members of the public within their homes and businesses and part of the impact of the reduction of incidents was due to that.

A Member asked that within the public safety plan it states that 62% agreed with fire stations merging, and if that was across the whole of Buckinghamshire or just Milton Keynes. The meeting was advised that the Public Safety Plan covered both Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes and the responses came from a range of areas.

A Member stated that the locations of Great Holm and Bletchley fire stations were based on the original standards of fire cover created in 1947 (69 years ago) and asked if it had been reviewed since then. The meeting was advised that the original standards of fire cover were all based on property risk, not life risk. This was recognised in 2002 when an independent review of the fire service was published and integrated risk management planning was introduced which was based upon life risk and not just property risk.

A Member asked when councils and parish councils had been notified about the consultation. The meeting was advised that letters had been sent out prior to the consultation to all parish councils in the affected area and local councillors for Milton Keynes, advising them about the consultation.

A Member asked a question regarding houses of multiple occupancy (HMOs). The meeting was advised that the Authority had an agreement set up with Milton Keynes Council and carried out joint inspections but the responsibility lay with the local authority.

A Member asked if standby points would be tested before the opening of the new facility and if assurance could be given that average response times would not deteriorate in the area normally served by Great Holm Fire Station. The meeting was advised that standby points would be used and reassurance was given that response standards would be maintained across Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes, including Great Holm and the western flank.

A Member asked for more information on the consultation forums. The meeting was advised that people had been selected at random for the forums. The people were given additional information on how the Authority functioned and how it was funded. This gave them a broader outline of how a fire and rescue service operated. At the forums a number of people came in with fixed views that they were anti the closure of both fire stations, but when presented with the facts, could understand how the conclusion was reached. Responses included; it made more sense; it saved money; it was a better way of operating across the area the Authority covers.

A Member asked what it would cost to maintain the two existing fire stations at Bletchley and Great Holm. The meeting was advised that essential maintenance work needed to be done to both within the next 12 months, at a cost of £350K for Bletchley and £215K for Great Holm. A full refurbishment for both stations would cost £2-£3M. This was an informed view as a professional assessment had been undertaken.

A Member asked if the co-location went ahead with Thames Valley Police, what discussions were taking place with the ambulance service. It was explained that South Central Ambulance Service was not formally 'on board' with the project, but there had been a considerable amount of work looking at possible site design and inclusions that would allow South Central Ambulance Service to share the site.

A Member asked if there would be any revenue savings or capital cost for Thames Valley Police, as the consultation showed that the Authority would make £600K in revenue savings. It was explained that Thames Valley Police would make revenue savings in the region of £150K per year, which over a ten year period would be £1.5M revenue savings for the public.

A Member asked if closing Great Holm Fire Station would increase response times to emergency calls in Milton Keynes. It was explained that as the service doesn't always respond from fixed locations it would manage the times it was out in the community in different ways and there would be no increase to response times.

A Member asked what had been done in terms of proposals for standby points, and what the definition of a standby point was. It was explained that a standby point was a geographical point that would be identified and would provide specific coverage of an area and would be utilised when crews were not out in the community providing prevention activity. A number of locations had been identified in conjunction with South Central Ambulance Service.

A Member raised concerns about the traffic congestion on the roads in Milton Keynes over the coming years with the increase in population and felt that officers had not addressed this in the consultation. Also, the increase in population and number of new houses being built would, he felt, make demand rise as the population increases. The meeting was advised that the issues raised regarding traffic congestion were of real concern to the Authority, but this strengthened the case of moving away from a fixed location fire station, to utilising fire appliances that are out in the community at peak times. There also needs to be better information links between Milton Keynes Council and the Authority to provide information when incidents occur (i.e. roads closed) so that resources can be moved to ensure response standards can be met and exceeded.

A Member asked what feasibility study had been done regarding sharing standby points with the ambulance service and why no

pre-application process had taken place and no applications for land acquisition on any sites had taken place. It was explained that some standby locations had been identified and should this proposal be approved, the Authority would start to look at proposals around the best locations to have fire appliances should it need to utilise standby points across Milton Keynes.

A Member asked if standard response times were maintained when crews are out in the community, what impact would this have on the community? It was advised that situations change very rapidly in the city and the fire and rescue service had to move to a more mobile adaptive response.

The Lead Member for Community Protection, thanked the members of the public for their input into the consultation and for attending the meeting today. She also advised Members that:

- some officers had been subjected to the most outrageous abuse and untruths for doing their jobs which was totally unacceptable and should have no place in this community.
- the Executive Summary of the report set out the background to the consultation. The decision to endorse mergers was made in the Public Safety Plan which was published and consulted on at the end of 2013, again in 2014 and approved unanimously in December 2014. This consultation looked at the specifics of delivering the plan to merge Bletchley and Great Holm Fire Stations at West Ashland.
- the independent research company advised that it had been a very good consultation, from the people that made the time to attend the independent focus groups, to the excellent input from staff and the larger response to the online questionnaire;
- two of the key issues that came out of the consultation were that the public didn't want the fire service to be seen working closely with the police and that there should be no community use of the new hub. The Authority had already made the decision to work with the police by signing an agreement in July 2015 for property sharing and co-location of the police and fire services in the Thames Valley. Also, as the fire service worked very closely within the community, why wouldn't it invite the community to be involved with the fire station. There would be community facilities, sports facilities and organisations would be able to hold meetings there;
- the new hub would have very good training facilities as unfortunately, at Great Holm training had been reduced after receiving many noise complaints from the nearby public about night time training. Night time is the best time for training as the number of emergency calls are reduced. The new facility would be on an industrial site with no residential neighbours so this would no longer be a problem;

- the two current buildings at Bletchley and Great Holm, were expensive to maintain, no longer entirely fit for purpose and don't meet some new regulations. As already mentioned, they need a significant amount of money spent on them simply to stand still; and
- the decision would not reduce the fire cover across Milton Keynes; it would not reduce the number of fire appliances on the streets of Milton Keynes and it would not reduce the number of firefighters working within the communities of Milton Keynes. The decision would enhance the community safety preventative work; it would ensure that firefighters enjoyed better training; it would support the service in building closer relationships with businesses within the community. The Authority's officers and firefighters were professionals they are passionate about serving the community and delivering the best possible service and outcomes.

The Chief Fire Officer advised Members that it was truly gratifying to know that so many people cared so much about the fire and rescue service in Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes. The main priority for the proposal was public safety. The Authority must consider how to provide the best possible service to the community with the money it had available. It must take difficult decisions, informed by excellent data, rigorous analysis and professional assessment to ensure that it provided the best possible service, even when finances, risks and populations were changing.

The proposal to build a blue light hub would ensure that the excellent response standard which had been in place since 2008, providing a fire engine in less than 10 minutes on 80% of occasions would still remain and be met. The number of fire engines in Milton Keynes would not decrease and there would be no firefighter redundancies. The proposal would save the taxpayer in the region of £6M over the next 10 years.

The population and diversity of Milton Keynes was changing. It was growing and spreading as the city continued to expand. It had been shown that there was no correlation between the growth in population and an increase in demand. As the population in Milton Keynes had increased, the demand had reduced. Many would choose to make the assumption that less demand equals less fire engines. In this proposal the number of fire engines in Milton Keynes would be protected.

The firefighters in this service continue to do an incredible job. They are a shining example of a modern workforce embracing change. They visit thousands of homes every year, preventing incidents and saving lives through education. They are dementia champions, they help reduce childhood obesity and they have attended emergency medical incidents in their thousands saving more lives in the last two years than ever before. In short, they

make a difference every single day to the community. The proposal was to move to a more flexible mobile response which allows the service to save more lives than ever before.

This proposal would save the taxpayer £6M over the next 10 years, but there would be no less fire engines in Milton Keynes, the excellent response standard would remain and be met and there would be no firefighter redundancies. At times when demand was low, the new facility would ensure there was space and time to train with our partners from the police and ambulance, whilst not disturbing the neighbours, so that the service can provide the best possible response when called upon.

It being proposed by Councillor Wilson supported by at least 2 Members Recommendation 1 was put to a recorded vote.

RESOLVED -

That the resources from Great Holm and Bletchley are relocated and merged into the new 'blue light hub' facility with Thames Valley Police at West Ashland and the existing station premises vacated. The Service will continue to ensure that current response standards are met via its dynamic mobilising system, utilising the fire crews that are out in the community delivering vital life-saving community safety work, or when appropriate utilising standby points strategically located across Milton Keynes, ensuring our communities will always benefit from the quickest possible attendance in an emergency be approved.

Details of the recorded vote are set out below:

	For	Against	Abstained
Bendyshe-Brown	✓		
Busby	✓		
Clarke	✓		
Dransfield	✓		
Exon		✓	
Glover	✓		
Gomm	✓		
Huxley	✓		
Lambert		✓	
Mallen	✓		
Marland		✓	
Morris	✓		

Reed	✓		
Schofield	✓		
Vigor-Hedderly	✓		
Watson	✓		
Wilson		✓	

The Chairman proposed to adjourn the meeting to allow Members to have a break. The meeting adjourned at 2.15pm.

The meeting resumed at 2.30pm.

Councillor Vigor-Hedderly left the meeting.

FA44

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMITTEES:

Overview and Audit Committee – 2 December 2015

The Authority considered the recommendations of the Overview and Audit Committee held on 2 December 2015 relating to:

- Treasury Management Strategy

(a) Treasury Management Strategy

The Authority considered the Treasury Management Policy Statement, the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and the Annual Investment Strategy.

The current strategy was operating effectively and outperforming the benchmark targets. There were no significant changes to the proposed strategy for 2016/17.

RESOLVED:

That the Treasury Management Policy Statement, Treasury Management Strategy Statement and the Annual Investment Strategy for 2016/17 be approved.

Executive Committee – 3 February 2016

The Authority considered the recommendations of the Executive Committee held on 3 February 2016 relating to:

- The Prudential Code, Prudential Indicators and the Minimum Revenue Provision
- Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) 2016/17 – to 2019/20

(b) The Prudential Code, Prudential Indicators and the Minimum Revenue Provision

The Authority considered the Prudential Code, the Prudential Indicators and the Minimum Revenue Provision policy statement.

The Authority noted that the Prudential Code had been established to ensure the capital investment plans were affordable, prudent and sustainable, and equated to an acceptable level of risk to the Authority.

The Authority was currently in an over-borrowed position but due to the prohibitive penalties early repayment of borrowing was not an option. The Authority would therefore ensure that no additional borrowing be undertaken for the foreseeable future.

RESOLVED:

That the Prudential Indicators and the Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Statement be approved.

(c) Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) 2016/17 to 2019/20

The Vice Chairman introduced the report previously presented to the Executive Committee meeting held on 3 February 2016, which included an updated Appendix 1. Last year there was a reduction of 1% in council tax precept, this year the forecast was not as favourable. If the Authority achieved a 1.98% increase it would balance the budget. There was also a recommendation to reduce contingency to a level which should not give the Authority a significant underspend.

A question was asked as to why there was a relatively high amount for fire appliances and equipment for the next two years and then it significantly reduced. It was advised that there was a need for the Authority to reinvest in its vehicles as there had been no new fire appliances purchased for over five years and this recognised the immediate need for four new appliances.

A question was asked as to why contingency needed to be reduced. It was advised that the Authority had consistently underspent over the last few years and wanted to move to a situation where it did not rely on contingency.

RESOLVED:

That the Authority:

1. note and have due regard to the report and Statement of the Chief Finance Officer;
2. approve a Council Tax precept of £59.70 for a band D equivalent property (a 1.98% increase from 2015/16 – equal to 2.2p per week) and the revenue budget as set out in Appendix 1;
3. approve the capital programme as set out in Appendix 2.

Details of the recorded vote are set out below:

	For	Against	Abstained
--	-----	---------	-----------

Bendyshe-Brown	✓		
Busby	✓		
Clarke	✓		
Dransfield	✓		
Exon	✓		
Glover	✓		
Gomm	✓		
Huxley	✓		
Lambert	✓		
Mallen	✓		
Marland	✓		
Morris	✓		
Reed	✓		
Schofield	✓		
Vigor-Hedderly			
Watson	✓		
Wilson	✓		

FA45

MILTON KEYNES SAFETY CENTRE, REVIEW OF FUNDING AGREEMENT

The Lead Member for Community Safety advised Members that prevention was a priority of this Authority, and the Safety Centre was an excellent asset to have in the area.

The Head of Service Delivery asked the Authority to note that the current agreement committed the Authority to a grant of £25k per annum for five years (2011-2016) and the proposed renewed arrangement would commit the Authority to £25k per annum for the next three financial years, a total of £75k.

The current agreement commits the Authority to provide a vehicle for five years (2011-2016), a new arrangement had been agreed in principle with the Safety Centre, where a grant was provided for travelling expenses incurred by Safety Centre staff undertaking outreach activities using their own vehicles or public transport. Staff would claim travelling expenses. This grant would be capped at a maximum of £2,000 per annum. This would commit the Authority to a maximum expenditure of £6,000 during the course of the Funding Agreement.

As part of the review of the Funding Agreement, the Safety Centre was subject to a critical examination and report by the Authority's Community Safety Officer. The report recommended a number of improvements to the safety scenarios. The associated improvements had been agreed with the Safety Centre and were now part of an improvement schedule which was detailed in the proposed revised Funding Agreement.

RESOLVED:

That a new funding agreement with the Safety Centre (Hazard Alley) Ltd on the terms set out in the report be approved.

FA46

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Authority noted that the next meeting of the Fire Authority was to be held on Wednesday 8 June 2016 at 11.00am

THE CHAIRMAN CLOSED THE MEETING AT 3.00pm