

DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

CABINET

4 September 2012

Report of the Director of Finance

Risk Management Security Projects

1. Purpose of the Report

To seek the approval of Cabinet to proposed security projects.

2. Information and Analysis

Background Information

Derbyshire County Council has provided funding assistance for fencing schemes in school (including Secondary Schools) since at least 1995.

The purpose of these fencing schemes is to;

- Protect the safety of the pupils, visitors and employees
- Protect assets from
 - Vandalism Damage
 - Arson
 - Theft – particularly of IT equipment

Funding support is only recommended when it is established by the Risk and Insurance Manager and Property Risk Manager that there is a need for the project based upon;

1. Request by the establishment including detail of any problems experienced which are not insurance-claim related.
2. Review of the annual completed Risk Assessment Questionnaires.
3. Experience of any existing ongoing problems or any anticipated problems.
4. The location of the establishment.
5. Site visit by the Property Risk Manager to verify the contents of the annual Risk Assessment and validate the necessity and anticipated benefit.

Between 1991 and 2011 Derbyshire County has experienced direct financial loss resulting from damage to or theft of assets from schools totalling £12.5million (£11million arson, £1million theft and £0.5million malicious damage). This level of loss does not include the extra staff

costs in dealing with claims, the knock-on increases in insurance premiums caused by poor claims experience, reputational aspects or disruption to the learning of pupils.

Since 1995 the Risk Management Budget has contributed around £1.4million to schools fencing and security schemes.

Derbyshire County Council is self-insured for the first £150,000 of any fire loss in education establishments and completely self-insured for theft and malicious damage at education establishments.

Schools with completed fencing projects have seen considerable improvements in these types of losses. Further information is included in Appendix 3.

Funding

The 2012-13 Capital programme includes funding for risk management projects of **£188,105** comprised of:

- 2011-12 Risk Management Contingency Capital carried forward £ 63,105
- 2012-13 Capital Budget – Risk Management £125,000

Given the restricted schools' devolved formula capital for 2012-13 (£100,000) it is hard to maintain a requirement of 50% matched funding from individual schools. It is therefore proposed that primary and infant school projects approved this year onwards are subject to 25% contribution from the establishment and 75% met from the Risk Management Budget. Funding matching will remain at 50/50 for non-school establishments and for secondary schools.

Projects for approval

At the present time most bids are still awaited but due to the need to progress with existing bids this report has been submitted on a provisional basis.

Attached at Appendix 1 is a list of school bids (and informal bids) which are being recommended for approval. All schools were contacted in February 2012 and asked to submit their bids and their security risk assessment form. The updated information formed the basis for selection of priorities for funding, in line with Government guidance in respect of school security. The schools listed are all anticipated to contribute 25% of the total project cost.

The risk assessment takes account of various factors, including incidence of trespass, vandalism, theft, arson and the standard of existing safety measures.

This year's schemes involve fencing, fire prevention, access control and safeguarding measures at schools across the County.

Contingencies

As in previous years it is being recommended that the remaining risk management budget be retained to fund further issues that arise throughout the year, a number of which are already identified (as detailed in Appendix 1), but still require detailed costing or planning advice.

The contingency amount is:	£
Risk Management Capital Budget	£188,105
Less confirmed project bids	£ 8,261
Risk Management Capital Contingency	£179,844

3. Considerations (to be specified individually where appropriate)

In preparing this report the schemes have been discussed with the heads of the establishments, and, where appropriate, the County Property Division Area Surveyors and/or CAYA Area Health and Safety Officers to ensure that the works planned are the most appropriate to address the problems at the individual sites.

3.1 Financial Considerations

The total cost of potential risk management improvements is £250,806 for 2012/13. It is proposed that this be financed as shown in Appendix 2.

3.2 Legal Considerations

The County Council has a duty of care to provide a safe environment for staff, pupils and visitors.

3.3 Human Resources and Health Considerations

Completing these projects will show the Council's continued commitment to safeguarding and personal safety, in protecting staff, pupils, service users and visitors. It will help to protect the Council's assets from vandalism, theft and arson, which can be costly and cause significant disruption to services.

3.4 Other considerations

The relevance of the other following factors have been considered: prevention of crime and disorder, equality and diversity, environmental, property and transport considerations.

4. Key Decision

No

5. Call-in

Is it required that call-in be waived in respect of the decisions proposed in the report? No

6. Background Papers

Held in the Risk and Insurance Section.

7. OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

1. The Cabinet approves the confirmed security projects set out in Appendix 1 of the report and the contingency amount being used for further projects as they arise.
2. That security requirements for all schools continue to be assessed using the current risk based approach and secondary schools continue to be included in this process.

Peter Handford

Director of Finance

County Hall
MATLOCK
8th August 2012

APPENDIX 1

Risk Management Security Projects 2012 /13				
Confirmed Capital Bids				
Establishment	Scheme	Total Cost	Establishment Contribution	Risk Management Contribution
Henry Bradley Infant School	Internal fencing/segregation of carpark	£11,015	£2,754	£8,261
		£11,015	£2,754	£8,261
Expected or Potential Capital Bids				
Establishment	Scheme	Total Cost	Establishment Contribution	Risk Management Contribution
Killamarsh Youth Centre	Fire door	unknown		
Brimington Hostel	Fencing	unknown		
Anthony Bek Primary School	Non-wooden sheds required	£10,000	£2,500	£7,500
Creswell Infants	Fencing	£19,000	£9,500	£9,500
Woodbridge Junior School	Site security/Fencing	£20,000	£5,000	£15,000
Town End Junior School	Site security/Fencing	£16,000	£4,000	£12,000
New Mills School Business and Enterprise College	Fencing	£20,000	£5,000	£15,000
Clay Cross Library	Fencing during renovation	£10,000	£5,000	£5,000
		£95,000	£31,000	£64,000

APPENDIX 2 - Risk Management Budget 2012-13

	Devolved Formula Capital	RM Capital	Total
2011 Capital carried forward	£ -	£ 63,105	£63,105
Total carry forward	£ -	£ 63,105	£63,105
2012	£100,000	£125,000	£225,000
Total 2012/13 Capital Budget	£100,000	£188,105	£288,105

Grand Total required for 75/25 contributions	£250,806
Total Capital Budgets	£288,105
DFC capital remaining	£ 37,299

Security Fencing at Secondary Schools

Background Information

Derbyshire County Council has provided funding assistance for fencing schemes in schools (including Secondary Schools) since at least 1995.

The purpose of these fencing schemes is to;

- Protect the safety of pupils, visitors and employees
- Protect assets from
 - Vandalism Damage
 - Arson
 - Theft – particularly of IT equipment

In recent years funding has taken the basis of a 50% contribution towards a validated project with the educational establishment matching this funding.

Funding support is only recommended when it is established by the Risk and Insurance Manager and Property Risk Manager that there is a need for the project based upon;

1. Request by the establishment including detail of any problems experienced which are not insurance-claim related.
2. Review of the annual completed Risk Assessment Questionnaires.
3. Prioritisation for establishments with most urgent need.
4. Experience of any existing ongoing problems or any anticipated problems.
5. The location of the establishment.
6. Site visit by the Property Risk Manager to verify the contents of the annual Risk Assessment and validate the necessity and anticipated benefit.

Since 1991 Derbyshire County Council has experienced direct financial loss resulting from damage to or theft of assets from schools totalling £12.5million (£11million arson, £1million theft and £0.5million malicious damage). This level of loss does not include the extra staff costs in dealing with claims, the knock-on increases in insurance premiums caused by poor claims experience, reputational aspects or disruption to the learning of pupils.

Since 1995 the Risk Management Budget has contributed around £1.4million to school fencing and security schemes.

Derbyshire County Council is self-insured for the first £150,000 of any fire loss in education establishments and completely self-insured for theft and malicious damage at education establishments.

Financial Information

Dealing just with Secondary Schools it is difficult to calculate all the savings and benefits arising from good perimeter security but analysis of claims costs per secondary school before and after fencing has been completed suggest that the installation of strong perimeter security has reduced the annual average cost per secondary school by 90%.

A difficulty with this analysis is that some fencing schemes are not fully completed and therefore weaknesses still exist where access can be gained.

Analysis of claims costs before and after fencing installed

Only establishments with RM fencing funding	Total 1991-2011	Annual Average per establishment
Total Prior Fencing	£8,722,405.43	£20,447.97
Total After Fencing	£664,207.98	£2,510.59
% Reduction in savings	-94.33%	-88%
	Total 1991-2011	
Amount spent on RM Fencing	£1,453,857.90	

NB. These figures include only secondary schools that have received funding from the RM budget for fencing. Where multiple funding over consecutive years has been provided the last approval date has been used to calculate the "after fencing" figure.

External guidance

Our insurers issue the guidance that "Good physical security will protect a building from both opportunist and premeditated attack". They specifically refer to using a combination of measures including security fencing to achieve this.

The ACPO (Association of Chief Police Officers) 2004 Secured by Design guidance states under its general principles; "The entire school site perimeter must be enclosed, in order to control access by pedestrians and vehicles. There shall be no structures or physical features that compromise the security of the perimeter". They go on to specify that medium risks (ie where there is a crime problem) should, in addition to a basic list of security protection, have security fencing, security lighting in general areas, comprehensive intruder alarm with direct link to police, secure storage areas for high value items and protection of glazing (if necessary). A copy of the full guidance is attached.

The low, medium and high risk principle is echoed in a 1996 Department for Education and Employment publication "Improving Security in Schools Guide 4". This document is currently available on the www.education.gov.uk so the general advice is still considered current. It was written taking account of the findings of the Working Group on School Security, established by the Secretary of State for Education and Employment in January 1996.

One of the other major Local authority insurers has issued a specific School Fire and Security Guidance Document (which can be found at <http://www.zurich.co.uk/NR/rdonlyres/E583FCED-60CB-442B-B1D2-F49B320F728B/0/700457003LoRes.pdf>)

This document states; "The most common crimes on school sites are vandalism/malicious damage, theft, and arson. Good security generally involves a combination of physical, electronic and procedural measures. However, no amount of physical or electronic security will totally eliminate the risk of criminal attack, but security improvements greatly decrease the risk of criminal damage by increasing the degree of difficulty for, and the risk of detection of, the criminals". It then goes on to provide advice on types of gates and fencing and the extent which to fence based on budgetary constraints.

Secondary Schools included in the original 2011-12 schedule of projects

Glossopdale

Glossopdale have had persistent difficulty with security of their site given that there is a public right of way through it. They already have fencing at the site but are still experiencing problems. They also suffered an arson attack in January 2008 which cost £55,000. Insurance claims have also been made for 19 instances of theft and malicious damage over

the last ten years – these will only be instances costing over £500 and we anticipate that actual levels of experience will have been significantly more frequent.

The school buildings are already partially fenced and the scheme being proposed is for “infill fencing work” to make the current fencing fully effective and would also protect against unmonitored access during the school day.

There are also another two pending requests for assistance with minor fencing works – mainly of the infill variety – from secondary schools.