



Audit and Governance Committee

Minutes of the meeting held at County Hall, Colliton Park, Dorchester,
Dorset, DT1 1XJ on Wednesday, 7 December 2016

Present:

Trevor Jones (Chairman)

Kate Wheller, Pauline Batstone, Andrew Cattaway, Hilary Cox, Lesley Dedman, Matthew Hall,
David Harris, Peter Richardson and Peter Wharf.

Other Members Attending:

Peter Finney, as Cabinet Member for Environment, Infrastructure and Highways

David Mannings, County Councillor for Lodmoor

Daryl Turner, County Councillor for Marshwood Vale

David Walsh, County Councillor for Gillingham

Officers Attending:

Andrew Martin (Service Director – Highways & Emergency Planning, Dorset County Council)

Kevin Cheleda (Traffic Team Leader, Dorset County Council)

Simon Gledhill (Network Management Service Manager, Dorset County Council)

Mark Taylor (Group Manager - Governance and Assurance, Dorset County Council)

Denise Hunt (Senior Democratic Services Officer, Dorset County Council)

Simon King (Senior Economic Regeneration Officer, Dorset Councils Partnership)

Kevin Stewart (Managing Director, Ironman UK)

Alan Rose (Race Director, Ironman UK)

Chief Inspector Chris Weeks (Dorset Police)

PC Heidi Moxam (Dorset Police)

(Notes: These minutes have been prepared by officers as a record of the meeting and of any decisions reached. They are to be considered and confirmed at the next meeting of the Committee to be held on **Friday, 20 January 2017.**)

Apologies for Absence

31 No apologies for absence were received.

Code of Conduct

32 There were no declarations by members of any disclosable pecuniary interests under the Code of Conduct.

Minutes

33 The minutes of the meeting held on 20 September 2016 were confirmed and signed.

Public Participation

34 Submissions by members of the public were considered during the following item.

Call to Account - Ironman Weymouth 2016

35 The Service Director – Highways and Emergency Planning outlined the report concerning the Ironman Weymouth event on 11 September 2016 and made some suggestions for future improvements.

The Committee heard that the event management plan included the requirement for a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO) to cover a schedule of road closures in order to facilitate the event. Both Dorset County Council (DCC) officers and the Safety Advisory Group (SAG) had the opportunity to comment and amend the plan based on

the knowledge and expertise of its members. DCC had also opened its traffic control centre and provided 2 officers at the centre on race day.

DCC officers had not been aware that a marshalling company had withdrawn its services until the day of the event and no mention had been made of the revised marshalling arrangements at a pre-race meeting between DCC officers and Ironman staff that took place 4 days prior to the race.

During the event a significant number of incidents occurred across the route and evidence emerged that marshals were not fully briefed on the traffic management proposals, had no local knowledge and were closing roads unnecessarily. Traffic did not flow freely on the highways network and the lack of knowledge contributed towards cars stopping unnecessarily. Eighty complaints were received from road users following the event.

A “wash up” meeting with Ironman organisers and SAG took place on 27 September 2016 when it was accepted by Ironman representatives that the marshals had played a key factor in the problems experienced on the day.

The Service Director advised that the correct process had not been followed by DCC officers for the TTRO and the Secretary of State had been informed of the error and had decided that no retrospective action would be taken. Although this had not affected the delivery of the event, he acknowledged that this had resulted in reputational damage to the Council and that a review of the checklist process had since been undertaken to avoid a future occurrence of this nature. In addition, refresher training would be arranged in order to update staff on processes and practices.

He was disappointed that the highways network had not operated correctly on 11 September 2016 and that proportionate responsibility should be placed on the event organisers. One of the suggestions in the report included a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) to outline the respective responsibilities of each party that would be developed in conjunction with SAG and signed off in February of each year.

With regard to marshalling, DCC had a large staff resource to assist in future events which he hoped would be accepted by the organisers as well as a review of the integration of the DDC traffic control centre and race centre.

The participants viewed the event as a great success and despite the frustrations it was important to acknowledge the financial benefit to the area.

Submission by Simon King, Senior Economic Regeneration Officer – Dorset Councils Partnership

The Committee heard that both the event management and traffic management plans had been considered by SAG and that sign off was the responsibility of the local authorities.

Weymouth & Portland Borough Council (WPBC) had approved the event and entered into an agreement with Ironman for use of a transition area at Lodmoor Country Park, the Pavilion forecourt and designated car parking.

Following the event, a “wash-up” meeting took place on 1 November 2016 between WPBC and Ironman organisers to overcome issues experienced in Weymouth. He described a very proactive working relationship with Ironman, DCC colleagues and partner agencies.

He reported that provision of documentation by Ironman to SAG had been delayed

leading to increased pressure to review and provide constructive feedback. He therefore supported an MoU that included a clear timetable of meetings and outcomes so that all deadlines were met and the appropriate advice and feedback could be provided.

With regard to the improving operational logistics in Weymouth he made the following suggestions:-

- A clear understanding by marshals of legitimate access to Weymouth beach, including the beach cleaning machine, beach chalets and lifeguard operation and for Dorset Waste Partnership vehicles to empty litter bins.
- To resolve access issues experienced around the harbour due to a section of cargo stage being used as a drinks station that had not been included in the event management plan.
- A command structure involving local authorities and emergency services that looked at both inward and outward impacts of the event.
- An action log open to the command structure to ensure issues are logged and dealt with appropriately
- A contingency plan to mitigate risks such as the failure of marshalling. Local authorities and interested local parties with local knowledge could assist in this role.
- To actively monitor audio outputs and compliance with noise abatement regulations.

In summary, he stated that the 2016 Ironman event was successful for participants and the local economy and that the issues experienced could be overcome if the necessary steps were taken at this stage.

Submission by Chief Inspector Chris Weeks and PC Heidi Moxam - Dorset Police

Chief Inspector Weeks stated that he was the lead officer for operational events and traffic management plans and explained the police priority to ensure that an event was run safely.

He had been reassured that SAG had been utilised and that it would be beneficial for this group to have a greater focus on the traffic management plan, including looking at what staff were needed where and at what time. He explained that it was the ambition of Dorset Police to limit resources at events as these should be run through private enterprise.

PC Heidi Moxam stated that she had attended SAG meetings and discussed road closures for the Challenge Weymouth and Ironman Weymouth events and explained that this was the first year that the route had been used. She advised that there had been good communication in the control room on race day and that the downfall of the event had been due to the marshalling. Police officers had been requested and paid for by Ironman at certain hotspots throughout the day, however, these officers had played a greater role than anticipated due to the problems with marshalling. Traffic motorcycles had also been used to roam and assist as necessary. She considered that this could be a successful event with appropriate advice and contingency support from Dorset Police.

Submission by Kevin Stewart, Managing Director and Alan Rose, Race Director – Ironman UK

The Managing Director of Ironman UK explained that he had responsibility for 6 races in the UK. Ironman brought a strong brand identity to the triathlon event which could be evidenced by the number of entries.

He advised that athletes had stayed 2-3 nights and brought additional people with them. There had been an economic benefit of approximately £1m in Dorset with 91% of athletes likely to return to the area and 96% likely to recommend the area to friends and family. This positive economic impact would grow in future years. The event also inspired people to take part and become fitter and healthier. The aim was to minimise the negative impacts of this event in future years.

The Race Director explained that a robust communications plan was in development for 2017 that included attendance at 3 SAG meetings, parish council meetings as well as meetings with County councillors, community groups and businesses along the route.

A Public Relations Plan was also being developed in conjunction with Love Weymouth and Visit Dorset that included communication via the local press, council newsletters, posters, social media and redesign of information sent to residents.

Meetings had already taken place with Highways England with a view to improving access along the routes, including a fully accessible A352 and improving signage placement.

He advised that Ironman UK had changed its traffic management supplier and had engaged with DCC's resources and suppliers to assist with signage and traffic management. Referring to the issues experienced with marshalling, he explained that 3 companies had been employed to undertake marshalling and that 2 of these companies had withdrawn their services 10 days prior to race day. The one remaining company had sourced the remaining marshals, but had been clearly overstretched. Ironman was already engaging with local companies and DCC officers in order to build in this element early for next year.

An MoU had been developed for 2017 and was currently with DCC officers for their comments and it was hoped to have a workable document with reasonable timelines.

Following an internal review of the 2016 event it had been agreed to run the 70.3 event only which would mean that the roads would reopen from between 10.15am and 1.30pm, thereby reducing the period of road closures by 5 hours.

Public Participation

Tricia Dovell addressed the Committee and spoke about the problems with marshalling and incorrect signage which she felt could have resulted in public safety issues due to diversion of heavy vehicles and angry people.

Mr Terry Pavey addressed the Committee on behalf of his group of 4 self-employed boat men whose businesses had been cut off during the event. He asked for the cargo stage on the harbour to be kept clear and for the winning entrants to be at the seaward side of the Pavilion. The announcements had been over the decibel limit for that area. He was disappointed that there was a lack of assistance to resolve issues on the day and that there had been no redress due to loss of business. He suggested that the event would be better run in the tourist shoulder period.

David King, addressed the Committee concerning the Rotary bike ride for Cancer Research which was to be held on the same day as Ironman Weymouth in 2017 and asked for the Rotary event to be taken into consideration due to clashes along the route.

Richard Frampton- Hobbs, a business owner, said that although he was not against sporting events, he felt that Ironman UK did not understand how tourism operated in Dorset and that if he chose to close his businesses for the day on behalf of someone

else's business then this should be compensated. He considered that only a few roads needed to be closed with the least impact and greater consultation during the lead in time.

He felt that the credibility and trust with Ironman UK had been lost and that further evidence of the economic benefit should be provided. He also felt that it was better to hold the event after the summer.

Malcolm Shakesby, a local resident, relayed his personal experience on race day in trying to access Broadmayne. He asked how much officer time had been used in arranging the event. He highlighted that most of the route went through the Purbeck area and that conflicts with other road races and memorial events should be taken into account.

Justin Oakley addressed the Committee as a Co-ordinator for British Cycling with experience in running road races. He advised that cycling, triathlon and sports were managed very differently and asked about the level of accreditation for marshals.

Mona Porte, a local resident, addressed the Committee and requested some clarification of the laws governing the use of PA and loud music at 6:30am on a Sunday. She requested an undertaking that residents, who did not wish to be disturbed or listen to the type of music being played to be allowed to slumber undisturbed as the noise was far reaching.

Councillor David Mannings, County Councillor for Lodmoor, spoke about problems with traffic along Preston Road / Littlemoor Road and the danger the cyclists posed due to the course layout at the end of Coombe Valley Road.

Councillor Ian Bruce, WPBC Councillor for Preston, reported that information had been available which conflicted with a letter sent to residents and that access to homes and business had been difficult on race day. He suggested that Littlemoor Road should remain open at times when the Preston Beach Road was closed and that circumventing the route once rather than twice would alleviate some of the problems. A full Ironman event was possible if the issues relating to the road closures for the bike race were resolved.

Questions and Comments by the Committee

a) Involvement of Dorset Police

Members were informed that there was a national initiative to reduce police involvement in events, however, organisers were able to pay for police resources as a contingency and these officers came under the responsibility of the Silver Commander. He confirmed that responsibility for the race was with Ironman UK and the host authority.

It was suggested that Neighbourhood Watch groups would be a useful volunteer resource due to the expertise of its members and the Chief Inspector indicated that he would relay details of the Chief Inspectors who dealt with Neighbourhood Watch groups in the relevant areas.

PC Moxam informed the Committee that only the police could enforce a TTRO. Eight officers had been deployed during the event, paid for by Ironman, who were located on hotspots along the route to support marshals and prevent a breach of the peace. Their role was not to direct traffic unless in an emergency. She felt that it would have been beneficial to have accredited marshals who had undertaken relevant training and were able to enforce certain closures.

Members asked whether the MoU for cycling events had been considered for this

event and were informed that no further progress had been made due to the ill health of the lead police officer. It was suggested that this could be taken into account for the Ironman Weymouth event.

PC Moxam confirmed that she was also in consultation with West Yorkshire Police who were in the process of revisiting the 1960s legislation relating to sporting events.

b) Temporary Traffic Regulation Order

Members asked about the criteria for issuing the TTRO and the powers in place to enforce or alter future events and were informed that the criteria was mostly based around safety and that a TTRO could be denied if there was a lack of confidence in the arrangements.

It was confirmed that the TTRO had been awarded later than anticipated, however, a clear timeline would be included in the proposed MoU. The Ironman representatives confirmed that the event would not take place if a TTRO was refused as the route would be unsafe.

The Managing Director confirmed that the event operated to a high standard elsewhere in the Country and that Ironman UK would comply with the MoU which was both reasonable and sensible. He accepted that there had been an issue with marshalling on this occasion.

In mitigation he confirmed that there had been significant expenditure for marshals to ensure the safety of the public and participants and that this commitment had continued despite being let down. He advised the Committee that marshals were paid in order to ensure that the event was fully staffed at relevant points.

The Committee noted that DCC could not approve the TTRO unless it was satisfied that key conditions had been met and members asked whether highways experts were consulted during the planning stage of the route. The Service Director confirmed that Ironman representatives had previously consulted with officers and were currently liaising with highways officers and Highways England on the route for next year.

c) Liaison with local communities

The Committee noted that another aspect that did not go well related to engagement with local communities and that there had been minimal attendance at meetings arranged with parish councils.

Members commented that some parish councils had not received a meeting invitation and that greater efforts were required to engage with parish councils as they wanted to become involved.

The Managing Director confirmed that he had attended some meetings with parish councillors, but the lists of attendees were not available. He advised that a different route had been used from the previous Challenge Weymouth event and that staging the event led to increased awareness in the local community, as had been evidenced in Pembrokeshire. He assured the Committee that organisers would identify new ways of communicating with people, including the Neighbourhood Watch groups.

d) Signage

The Managing Director confirmed that signage would be in place 2 weeks prior to the event, including 2 weekends. There was a risk of conflicting with signage for other events and a reduction in impact if signage was in place in advance of this timescale.

Members advised that some signage had been installed the day before the race and had not been subsequently removed.

e) Contact Telephone

Members advised that complaints had been received regarding the quality of the telephone response and it was suggested that local people employed by Dorset Direct could fulfil this role.

The Managing Director advised that there would be improvements to the contact e-mail and phone number for the event in 2017.

f) Engagement with SAG

Members heard that there had been a delay in completion of the event management plan considered by SAG and that increased engagement with SAG would be beneficial prior to sign off by DCC and the local authorities.

The Managing Director confirmed that the opinion of SAG was very important to the organisers who took on board any feedback.

g) Economic Benefit

Members considered the economic benefit of the event and acknowledged that, whilst there had been business opportunities arising from the event, there were many small businesses that were badly affected on the day. The Committee wanted to be reassured that this impact would be minimised in future and that consultation would take place with businesses prior to the event.

The Race Organiser advised that he had met with 25 businesses following this year's event to explore what went well or not so well and advise of changes that would be made in 2017.

Members asked whether DCC had received payment in respect of officer time and were informed that a charge of £275 could be made for the TTRO and that it was part of its statutory obligation to provide staff time as the highways authority. Discussions were taking place with the organisers with on how costs in respect of officer time, aside from this obligation, could be recovered in future.

Members suggested that the financial impact could be further increased by avoiding clashes with other events held in the area on the same day. They also considered that the economic analysis had not recognised the impact in Purbeck and asked whether there was scope to reconsider the route in order to reduce the impact on this area or change the time of year that the event was held.

The Managing Director confirmed that the economic impact assessment had been undertaken by DCC and paid for by Ironman UK and that the course routes were currently being reviewed for 2017. The time of year the event was held was restricted by water temperature and weather conditions in order to limit safety concerns.

It was one of the objectives of organisers to minimise disruption to business and communicate other events on the same day. Although not all impacts could be avoided, the organisers would provide better access to routes. In terms of accommodation, there was an opportunity to fill bed spaces at a premium rate a year in advance.

h) Chairman's concluding comments

The Chairman concluded that there would be increased awareness of the event within local communities each year and there was an opportunity for traffic arrangements to become better rehearsed and understood. The situation that had arisen with the marshalling of the event had been unprofessional and the relevant information should have been shared with DCC officers prior to the event. Members therefore needed to have confidence that problems would be shared openly in future events. The

problems experienced needed to be dealt with by both Ironman and DCC and the Committee would be framing some recommendations to Cabinet in January 2017 to ensure that this happened. He thanked the Ironman representatives and the other parties for their attendance and contribution at the meeting.

Questions from County Councillors

36 No questions were asked by members under Standing Order 20.

Meeting Duration: 10.30 am - 1.00 pm