

**NORTH EAST LINCOLNSHIRE COUNCIL
DEMOCRATIC SERVICES**

Scrutiny call-in mechanism on key decisions

Date	1/2/26
Key Decision Item (title and state whether Cabinet/Portfolio Holder/Officer)	FULLER STREET BRIDGE AND THE NORTH WALL IN CLEETHORPES <u>PETITION – IMPROVE SAFETY AND LIGHTING AROUND</u>
Decision Notice No.	DNPH.SSC.2
Reason(s) for Call-in	This decision does not appear to have been based on analysis of crime data, evidence of community consultation and with appropriate police input.
Desired outcome for Call-in	Cabinet asks officers to work with other agencies and service delivery partners to develop a robust plan to avoid the area becoming a no-go part of our town.
Intended Recommendation to Decision maker	We recommend that the Decision maker takes more steps to safeguard people using the bridge, beyond advising them not to as it is dangerous.
Details of estimated/actual cost	N/a
To be referred to which Scrutiny meeting?	Communities

SIGNATURES OF TWO MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

(signature)

(printed name)

(1)



Paul Henderson

(2)Councillor Holland agreed by email (2.2.26)

Steve Holland

**NORTH EAST LINCOLNSHIRE COUNCIL
DEMOCRATIC SERVICES**

Notes on Scrutiny call-in mechanism on key decisions

- 1 A Decision Notice of a key decision (taken by for example, Cabinet, an individual Portfolio Holder or by an officer with delegated authority from Cabinet) will be published within two working days of the meeting/decision and will be sent to all Members of the Council with a copy of this form. That notice will include the date on which it is published and will specify that the decision will come into force, and may then be implemented, on the expiry of five working days after the publication of the decision, unless any two Members of the Council object to it and call it in.
- 2 The notice must be signed (electronic signatures permitted) by any two Members of the Council (including co-opted members, provided the Proposal relates to their area of responsibility) and must give reasons for the call in and referral of the decision to Scrutiny.
- 3 The notice must be received by the Chief Executive no later than 4.00 p.m. on the fifth working day after publication of the Decision Notice, and must specify the item reference number in question and indicate which Scrutiny meeting the matter will go to with reasons for preference. The Chief Executive will adjudicate on allocation to the appropriate Scrutiny meeting and the decision-taker shall be notified of the call-in.
- 4 A maximum period of 28 days will be set for scrutiny to hear a call-in following receipt of notice. Having considered the decision in question, the Scrutiny Panel must resolve either to:
 - (i) free the decision for implementation (the decision shall take effect on the date of the relevant Panel meeting); or
 - (ii) refer the decision back to the decision making person or body with recommendations for consideration; or
 - (iii) In the event of the decision being found to be contrary to the local policy framework or not wholly in accordance with the annual budget set by Council, Scrutiny may refer the decision to full Council for approval.
- 5 If referred back to the decision making person or body, they shall reconsider the matter within a further four weeks before adopting a final decision. It is a matter for the decision maker as to what weight (if any) is given to any recommendation made by Scrutiny. Once considered, by the decision maker, the matter cannot be further called in.
- 6 If the matter is referred to full Council and the Council (on a simple majority) does not object to the decision which has been made, then no further action is necessary and the decision shall take effect on the date of the Council meeting. However, if the Council does object it has no power to make decisions in respect of a key decision, or implementation thereof, unless it is contrary to the local policy framework, or contrary to or not wholly consistent with the setting of the annual budget. Unless that is the case, the Council will refer any decision to which it objects back to the decision making person or body, together with the Council's views on the decision. That decision making body or person shall choose whether to amend the decision or not before reaching a final decision and implementing it. Where a decision was taken by the Cabinet as a whole, a meeting will be convened to reconsider within four weeks of the Council request. Where the decision was made by an individual, the individual will also reconsider within four weeks of the Council request.
- 7 The call-in procedure set out above shall not apply where a decision is urgent. A decision will be urgent if any delay likely to be caused by the call in process would seriously prejudice the Council's or the community's best interests. The record of the decision, and notice by which it is made public shall state whether in the opinion of the decision making person or body, the decision is an urgent one and the reason for this, and therefore not subject to call-in. The Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council must agree both that the decision proposed is reasonable in all the circumstances and to it being treated as a matter of urgency. In the absence of the Leader and/or Deputy Leader, the head of paid service (Chief Executive) or his/her nominee's consent shall be required. In all cases, the decision maker will be required to consult with the Chair of the relevant Scrutiny Panel to satisfy that person that urgency is justified. In the absence of the Chair of the relevant Scrutiny Panel, a Chair of another Scrutiny Panel shall be consulted. Decisions taken as a matter of urgency must be reported to the next available meeting of the Council, together with the reasons for urgency.
- 8 The operation of the provisions relating to call-in and urgency shall be monitored annually, and a report submitted to Council with proposals for review if necessary.

PORTFOLIO HOLDER
SAFER AND STRONGER COMMUNITIES
DECISION NOTICE

Publication Date: 28th January 2026

At the meeting of the Portfolio Holder – Safer and Stronger Communities, held on the 26th January 2026 the following matters were discussed. The decisions of the Portfolio Holder are set out below in each item along with reasons for the decision and other options considered.

DNPH.SSC.1 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made with regard to any items on the agenda for this meeting.

DNPH.SSC.2 PETITION – IMPROVE SAFETY AND LIGHTING AROUND FULLER STREET BRIDGE AND THE NORTH WALL IN CLEETHORPES

The Portfolio Holder considered the findings of the report in response to the above petition.

RESOLVED –

- 1. That signage at the bridge be installed warning people not to cross at night and use alternative routes.**
- 2. That the Rapid Deployment Camera remain in place and be reviewed after a three-month period.**
- 3. That officers look at options to make the street lighting brighter in the area and the new signage visible at night.**

4. That a communications plan be devised between Humberside Police and North East Lincolnshire Council for informing the public about the levels of crime in the area.

REASONS FOR DECISION – To respond to the concerns raised in the petition.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED – Do Nothing – The crime statistics provided indicate that levels of crime on Fuller Street Bridge and the surrounding area are low and do not warrant the level of investment required to undertake the lighting and CCTV coverage of the bridge and the lighting to the Sea Wall.

Removal of Bridge – as mentioned in the report, another option to be considered is the removal of the structure. As it is not a recognised Public Right of Way or Highway Structure the requirements for removing one of those don't apply, only any historical legal agreement that may exist between the Council and Network Rail. Public opinion must also be considered for any removal. It should be noted the close proximity of a new accessible footbridge (Suggitts Lane Footbridge) which could be used by the public as an alternative access to the sea wall area should this option be progressed.

PORTFOLIO HOLDER – SAFER & STRONGER COMMUNITIES

DATE	26 th January 2026
REPORT OF	Carolina Borgstrom – Director of Economy, Environment & Infrastructure
SUBJECT	Fuller Street Bridge Petition Response
STATUS	Open

CONTRIBUTION TO OUR AIMS

This report contributes to the Council’s strategic aims, which benefit the people in North East Lincolnshire, namely to

- Stronger Economy
- Stronger Communities

Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 places a statutory duty on local authorities, including councils, to consider the impact of their decisions and functions on crime and disorder in their area.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On 23rd April 2025 a formal petition was received by NELC with regards to improving safety and lighting of Fuller Street Bridge and the North Wall in Cleethorpes, this petition which was signed by over 200 residents.

The formal petition was presented to Cllr Ron Shepherd, Portfolio Holder for Safer and Stronger Communities on the 18th of June 2025, with a follow up meeting held on the 17th September 2025 where officers provided initial feedback around the concerns raised. It was agreed that a further report be presented back to the Portfolio Holder around the following areas:-

- Installing lighting and CCTV at Fuller Street Bridge with full costings and timeframes included.
- Installing lighting at North Wall from Fuller Street Bridge to Wonderland and from Fuller Street Bridge to Park Street with full costings and timeframes included.
- Determine the structural integrity of the bridge to include feedback on any repairs and remedial works.
- More detailed information on the crime figures be brought back before the Portfolio Holder.

1. BACKGROUND AND ISSUES

1.1. Fuller Street Bridge, Cleethorpes acts as a gateway between Fuller Street and The North Wall. The original date of construction is unknown, although archived data suggests the footbridge had been reconstructed in 1975 to its existing general arrangement. The structure carries a pedestrian footway across the railway lines near Fuller Street. There is currently no lighting or CCTV on the bridge. There is also no pedestrian access onto the North Wall

in close proximity to Fuller Street Bridge.

- 1.2. Following the meeting on 18th June 2025, an internal Officer Group was established to provide a range of information to questions raised at the meetings in June and September 2025. Below is a summary of the findings provided by Council officers:-
- 1.3. **INSTALLING LIGHTING AND CCTV AT FULLER STREET BRIDGE WITH FULL COSTINGS AND TIMEFRAMES INCLUDED.**
- 1.4. ***Lighting Installation*** - There are currently no plans to add lighting to Fuller Street Bridge. However, if lighting was considered as an appropriate option two ten-metre-high columns would be required at either side of the bridge. One of the columns would have to be solar powered due to the lack of power supply on the seaward side of the bridge. The other column would replace the existing sign pole on Harrington Street, and the sign would be re-erected on the new ten-metre-high lighting column.
- 1.5. Permission would be needed from the landowner Network Rail to install a new lighting column on the seaward side of the bridge but also regarding the additional glare over the railway. No landowner permissions have been sought at this time. If permission was granted the cost of installation would be in the region of £7000 for all the work.
- 1.6. It should be noted solar lights are more expensive to maintain and prone to vandalism and theft of the solar panels as we have experienced in other areas across the borough.
- 1.7. Timescales: Subject to permission from the landowner which may take several months, specialist equipment would then need to be ordered which would be procured following land owner permission and would take up to 16 weeks for delivery. A work order would then need to be placed for the installation work.
- 1.8. ***CCTV Installation*** - Following engagement with the Councils CCTV provision, a full site visit was undertaken which identified that 2 x Pan Tilt and Zoom cameras would be required to provide adequate CCTV coverage. Consideration was also given to the transmission requirements. The cameras would be mounted onto new lighting columns supplied via Highways which are costed as part of the lighting requirements above. The total cost for camera installation would be £21,000 with an annual maintenance cost due to the coastal location of £3000 (£1,500 per camera). These cameras would be viewed live within the NELC CCTV security office. The anticipated commissioning and installation time following approval would be approximately 10 weeks.
- 1.9. **INSTALLING LIGHTING AT NORTH WALL FROM FULLER STREET BRIDGE TO WONDERLAND AND FROM FULLER STREET BRIDGE TO THE PORT ENTRANCE WITH FULL COSTINGS AND TIMEFRAMES INCLUDED.**

- 1.10. To install lighting to the North Wall from Wonderland to Fuller Street Bridge would initially require the installation of a new power supply cable for the length of the proposal as there is currently no power on the sea wall, Wonderland to the Bridge, and onward to the port entrance gate further along the sea wall beyond Park Street.
- 1.11. A high-level survey has been completed with respect to installing lighting onto the North Wall. To install lighting on the north wall itself, permission would be required from the Environment Agency to drill and trench the wall or have planted columns behind the wall with outreach brackets. To have columns planted behind the wall would be significantly lower in cost as it removes any risk of damage or drilling into the north wall sea defence.
- 1.12. To light this section of the north wall up to the bridge itself, an additional section of new footway would be recommended to ensure safe access up onto the wall from the bridge and vice versa. This footway would link to the section of North Wall between Fuller Street and the entrance to the Port. The footway length required to enable safe access onto the wall without amendment to the sea wall is approximately one hundred and ten metres, which would be lit in addition to the sea wall itself. CCTV cameras could be fitted to a couple of columns and movement sensors could be fitted to the lights so the lighting wouldn't be on all night, and a pool of light would follow the pedestrian. All of the proposals are subject to landowner permission and Environment Agency Permission, and Network Rail permission (for lighting adjacent to the railway. It should be noted having regard to the Councils equality duty, that whilst a new footway would provide access to the sea wall it would not resolve the accessibility issues with Fuller Street Bridge which has no accessible ramps.
- 1.13. ***Option 1 – Standard Street Lighting – New Power Cable and columns on the sea wall.***
- 1.14. More power capacity has been identified on North Promenade so we would need to contact the electricity board and request a new supply installation to a feeder pillar sited outside Wonderland at the end of North Promenade. This new power source would then provide the power connection to lay a new power cable along the North Wall. The new cable will provide the power to new street lighting columns along the sea wall and the footway down to Fuller Street Bridge. Lighting would also be included to access Suggitts Lane footbridge from the sea wall.
- 1.15. The total cost for new street lighting cabling would be approximately £325,000 for a contractor to lay the new cabling for the new sea wall lights but this could reduce considerably if permission is granted to trench and put columns behind the sea wall (possibly 40% reduction to £195,000). £10,000 would be required for the electricity board to supply a new feeder pillar outside Wonderland. £25,000 would be required for the new lights and columns to light the footpath to Fuller Street bridge.
- 1.16. Total approximate costs are estimated at £360,000 which does not include the cost of installation of the 150m long footway

- 1.17. Additional maintenance costs including energy of circa £2500 per annum.
- 1.18. ***Option 2 – Solar Lighting- No power cable required***
- 1.19. This option provides for new solar lights to be installed behind the sea wall with a bracket to light the sea wall itself.
- 1.20. Purchase of lighting equipment and to fit the lights would cost approximately £80,000. Installation of the columns and solar panels would cost approximately £120,000 for the full length.
- 1.21. It should be noted these solar lights are more expensive to buy and maintain and are prone to vandalism and theft of the solar panels as we have experienced in other areas across the borough.
- 1.22. Total approximate costs are estimated at £200,000, not including additional installation of new footway.
- 1.23. Additional maintenance costs of approximately £10 per unit per year = £350. If solar panels are vandalised each replacement is circa £3000, which could put significant pressures on available maintenance budgets.
- 1.24. The options above both include the additional section of lighting to the gated entrance to ABP land further along the sea wall.
- 1.25. Without permission from the landowner and the Environment Agency we would be unable to carry out these works. Discussion would also be required with Ecology to determine if the initial proposal was acceptable.
- 1.26. **DETERMINE THE STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY OF THE BRIDGE TO INCLUDE FEEDBACK ON ANY REPAIRS AND REMEDIAL WORKS.**
- 1.27. **Inspections informing these findings** - The below findings are based on the 2024 Principle Structural Inspection (PI) which includes track access information for 2019 obtained by Network Rail. It is also based on site safety inspections undertaken by the Highway Structures Engineer and Highway Maintenance Technician on 6/10/25.
- 1.28. **Site Safety works required** - The recent site inspections found the main deck and the stairway to be free from trips or similar failures. The report from a member of the public that there was a hole in the deck was not correct, it is assumed that they were referring to the bottom of the parapets. Of concern were the areas of parapet mesh that have become exposed at the bottom by the complete failure of the kicker plates. These plates were shown as badly corroded in the PI and has since disintegrated or been removed by vandalism. This has left holes at foot level with sharp edges of the rusting parapet mesh exposed. If this was detected on the highway it would be given a score of 3 Low Likelihood and 2 Low Consequence, giving a risk priority score of 6 (Low). This would result in repairs within 3 months.
- 1.29. The minimal work required to make this site safe is to fix protective panels over the failed areas. It was observed on site that similar repairs have been

done in the past by spot welding steel plates to the parapet structure. This seems like a suitable repair methodology, so it is suggested that plates are manufactured to fit the failed areas; at least 6 x flat and 6 x sloped areas were observed at the time, but that may have increased since so measurements on site by the fabricator or bridge owner are recommended.

- 1.30. These plates can then be spot welded into place in the same manner as the existing plates, though it is noted that the areas to be welded to will have to be cleaned to acceptably clean metal to allow the welds to hold. The structural engineer is unaware of any paint testing having taken place on the bridge or any record of the paint type so we cannot be sure it is not lead based paint. The plates will be around 800-900mm by 200-240mm depending on the location, and should be 3-4mm thick mild steel painted to match the existing structure with a suitable protective paint system.
- 1.31. **Additional works to improve the site** - While the above works will make the site safe, it will not resolve the underlying problem of corrosion that has caused the issues. It is recommended that the parapet mesh be removed and replaced with a suitable alternative and the rest of the parapet be clean of paint and rust, repaired where needed, and repainted with a suitable protective paint system. The existing anti slip system is of unknown age, so replacing that at the same time may be beneficial. If the plate panels over the primary deck are also cleaned and repainted it is recommended that an anti-graffiti paint system is included over the protective system to allow easy removal of future graffiti. It is typically the case that rain is enough to remove the graffiti on such a system, or a light pressure washing at most.
- 1.32. **Full works** - In order to retain remaining service life and minimise whole life costs, the above works will not be adequate. The inspection from the 2019 track access shows the structural elements of the main span are beginning to rust, and the bearings are rusted which will have got worse in the following 6 years.
- 1.33. All the steel of the structure, other than the outside of the truss of the main span, needs to be stripped, repaired where section loss requires it, and repainted with a suitable protective paint system. As mentioned in other sections it is not known whether there is lead in the paint or asbestos in the span. The outside of the truss of the main span should be included in this to maximise the time until additional painting work will be needed.
- 1.34. In order to bring the structure up to a good condition, safeguard the remaining service life, and minimise whole life costs, the following works will be required (please note that the detailed design process may reveal additional works that are currently unknown):
 - Strip paint and corrosion back to sound metal and repaint - This would need encapsulation, lead content checking (all the way down through the paint layers) and an asbestos survey. If any of these hazardous materials are found they will need to be removed in a safe manner.
 - Repair any metal loss that is structurally required, likely using a bolted

system

- Replace failing parapet mesh (most if not all of the stair parapets), and replace or repair lost metal in parapets
- Replace anti-slip surfacing to stairs and deck - The stair risers and deck that is below the surfacing may need works that can't be investigated without taking up the anti-slip surfacing, which may include but is not limited to repair, replacement, re-waterproofing, or asbestos removal.
- Anti-graffiti coating over the new paint system would make removing graffiti much easier.

- 1.35. **Site specific issues** - This site has some specific challenges for the works. The main challenge is that the structure is over a live rail line. From other works over this track, we know that Network Rail will only allow track possessions on weekend nights, severely limiting working time especially when access and encapsulation will need to be put up and taken down each night. Any works on the bridge, even those on the stairs, will need Network Rail involvement which can result in a Basic Asset Protection Agreement (BAPA), a legal agreement between the Council and Network Rail setting out what can and can't be done and how the works are done. The larger the works and the more involvement over the tracks and outside the pedestrian area the more likely a BAPA will be needed. This can't be put into place before a contractor is on board as it needs detailed RAMS (risk assessments and method statements) which only the contractor can provide. BAPAs and track possessions have to be paid for, the cost of which is determined by Network Rail and can range from £5k to £250k (the high end is for longer and larger works than this, of course). There's no way to know what it will cost before it's been created, but suggest including at least £30k in the budget for this alone on the full works option.
- 1.36. The reported anti-social behaviour near the bridge and its concealed nature means site clearance needs to involve sharp sweeps.
- 1.37. There is no space for a site compound at the bridge, alternative arrangements will need to be made for staff welfare, materials storage, and staff vehicles. Anything placed on the sea defences north east of the bridge will have to have approval from the owner of that asset.
- 1.38. **Potential for bridge removal** - Another option to be considered is the removal of the structure. As it is not a recognised Public Right of Way or Highway Structure the requirements for removing one of those don't apply, only any historical legal agreement that may exist between the Council and Network Rail. Public opinion must also be considered for any removal. It should be noted the close proximity of a new accessible footbridge (Suggitts Lane Footbridge) which could be used by the public as an alternative access to the sea wall area should this option be progressed.

MORE DETAILED INFORMATION ON THE CRIME FIGURES BE BROUGHT BACK BEFORE THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER.

- 1.39. As previously reported, a review and analysis of the crime/ASB data has been completed by the Community Safety Analyst. This showing the period of 01-08-2023 to 31-08-2025 for Fuller Street as follows: -
- Arson and Criminal Damage = 8
 - Burglary = 1
 - Drug Offences = 5
 - Miscellaneous crimes against society = 2
 - Public Order = 7
 - Sexual Offences = 5
 - Theft = 1
 - Vehicle Offences = 1
 - Violence Against the Person = 44
 - Total over 2 years being 74.
 - All Anti-Social Behaviour = 3 (multiple calls from 1 address)
- 1.40. The period between 01-09-2025 & 30-10-2025 has shown a further 7 crimes in Fuller Street, these being as below.
- Violence against the person = 3
 - Public order = 2
 - Drug offence = 1
 - Vehicle offence = 1
 - Total over 2.2 years = 81
- 1.41. The period between 01-09-2025 & 30-10-2025 has shown no further reports of ASB.
- 1.42. The ASB team installed a Rapid Deployment Camera with full view of the Fuller Street bridge and to date no downloads of evidence of a crime have been requested from Humberside Police.
- 1.44 As previously reported, a review was conducted of crimes on Fuller Street Bridge showing the period of 01-08-2023 to 31-08-2025 as follows:-.
- Sexual Offences = 2
 - Violence against the person = 1.
- 1.45 The period between 01-09-2025 & 30-10-2025 has shown no further crimes on Fuller Street Bridge.
- 1.46 A review was also conducted including the surrounding streets which includes Neville Street, Fuller Street, Manchester Street and Harrington Street (the whole length as this can't be separated). This period 01-08-2024 to 31-08-2025 as follows:-
- Arson and Criminal Damage = 28
 - Burglary = 10
 - Drug Offences = 17

- Miscellaneous crimes against society = 13
- Public Order = 23
- Robbery = 1
- Sexual Offences = 14
- Theft = 19
- Vehicle Offences = 5
- Violence Against the Person = 147
- Total over 2 years = 277
- All Anti-Social Behaviour = 9 (3 x Fuller Street, 1 x Harrington Street Manchester Street 2 & 3 x Neville Street)

1.47 The period between 01-09-2025 & 31-10-2025 has shown a further 17 crimes, detailed as below.

- Violence against the person = 8
- Public Order = 2
- Drugs offences = 1
- Vehicle offences = 2
- Theft = 2
- Arson and Criminal Damage = 1
- Miscellaneous crimes against society = 1
- Total over 2 years 2 months = 294

1.48 These figures indicate that there have been 294 crimes over a 2-year 2-month period, which equates to 0.37 crimes per day for the extended geographical area. Fuller Street alone has 81 crimes in the same period at an average of 0.102 crimes per day.

1.49 The bridge itself has 3 crimes in the same period at an average of 0.0037 crimes per day. As a comparison Fuller Street has less reported crime as an average than the rest of the geographical block.

1.50 **Introduction of temporary Rapid Deployment Camera** – following the meeting on the 17th September 2025 a rapid deployment camera was deployed to support any recorded crime in order to capture evidence. Whilst it is acknowledged that the siting of a camera can act as a deterrent, there has not been to date any occasion to utilise any camera footage due to the lack of reported incidents. In normal circumstances, this camera would have been redeployed to an area of higher concern across the borough.

1.51 **CONCLUSION**

1.52 The crime statistics continue to indicate that Fuller Street has less crime than the immediate surrounding area and the bridge itself has significantly less crime. Due to the levels of reported crime, it is reasonable to conclude that the levels of investment articulated in this report to cover the bridge with lighting and CCTV and the wider lighting of the North Wall area are disproportionate to the recorded crime levels and subsequent perceived risk CCTV capital budgets are already challenged and the Council's CCTV strategy sets out the commitment that funding is allocated based where it

can have the greatest impact on community safety.

1.53 **OFFICER RECOMMENDATION– INTRODUCTION OF WARNING SIGNAGE**

- 1.54 Improving signage in the area would allow the public to make informed decisions around crossing the bridge during the hours of darkness including information on alternative routes such as Suggets Lane Bridge or other well lit walking routes such as Cleethorpes Road
- 1.55 As the path leading to the costal path is not a public right of way and unmaintained additional warning signs highlighting the hazards such as (an unmaintained footpath, high tides and poor weather, no lighting etc) would again allow the public to make informed route based decisions without the requirement to invest in infrastructure where the crime and accident data may not evidence investment.
- 1.56 For a pedestrian, making an informed walking choice from Fuller Street to Cleethorpes, the alternative and more weather resistant walking routes are not significantly longer. For example, walking from Fuller Street to Cleethorpes Pier via Suggit Lane bridge adds 100m to your journey. Taking the well-lit path along Cleethorpes Road would add 300m to the journey.
- 1.57 Maintenance or removal of the bridge will be addressed through business as usual processes based on engineering condition surveys and asset valuation and appraisal protocols.

2. **RISKS, OPPORTUNITIES AND EQUALITY ISSUES**

- 2.1 The risks to the Local Authority would fall around any capital investiture as described within the body of the report. The costs have the potential to be significant which are currently disproportionate when compared to the levels of reported crime.
- 2.2 The Council receive a large number of requests to increase CCTV coverage on streets, parks and open spaces. As the Council has limited capital to expand the existing system, each request is considered and weighted against crime data. There would be a reputational risk to the Council if this request was considered ahead of other CCTV requests where evidenced need is higher.

3. **OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 3.1 This report has focused specifically on providing responses to the requests made by at the Portfolio Holder meeting on the 17th September 2025.
- 3.2 **Do Nothing** – The crime statistics provided indicate that levels of crime on Fuller Street Bridge and the surrounding area are low and do not warrant the level of investment required to undertake the lighting and CCTV coverage of the bridge and the lighting to the Sea Wall.

- 3.3 **Removal of Bridge** – as mentioned in the report, another option to be considered is the removal of the structure. As it is not a recognised Public Right of Way or Highway Structure the requirements for removing one of those don't apply, only any historical legal agreement that may exist between the Council and Network Rail. Public opinion must also be considered for any removal. It should be noted the close proximity of a new accessible footbridge (Suggitts Lane Footbridge) which could be used by the public as an alternative access to the sea wall area should this option be progressed.

4. **REPUTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS CONSIDERATIONS**

It is evident that the safety of bridge users is paramount, and the Council has a duty to consider the impact of their decisions and functions on crime and disorder in their area. Perceived failure to act upon local concerns will impact on the fear of crime and has the potential to attract negative media attention in the event of an incident. However as mentioned above crime statistics confirm that reported issues are very low and providing lighting to the bridge could encourage more people to cross into darkness along the at times hazardous sea wall. This presents additional risks that could have negative impact for bridge users and the Council should an incident occur.

5. **FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

There are significant potential cost implications to both improve the lighting and CCTV requirements of Fuller Street Bridge and install additional lighting to the North Wall. There is currently no capital or revenue monies identified for improvements and ongoing maintenance so any alterations would require capital investment from the Council and would need to go through due process to be approved.

6. **CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE IMPLICATIONS**

Families with Children and Young People do utilise Fuller Street Bridge and the North Wall footpath so any decisions made will have potential impact for Children and Young People.

7. **CLIMATE CHANGE, NATURE RECOVERY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS**

The land in question covers the sea wall and as such is owned by Associated British Ports (ABP) and has oversight from the Environmental Agency. In principle the Environmental Agency agree that the renovations and lighting would add benefit to the structure and is feasible, however have also shown concern over the potential costs being significant, the legal management of the proposed developments and the time that this would take from design to development.

8. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 8.1 There is currently no capital budget provision in place to support the installation of lighting, CCTV or structural works described within this report.

Any progression of these options would therefore require new capital investment and approval through the Council's established financial governance processes.

- 8.2 Should the officer recommended introduction of signage be progressed, the budget required to undertake these works is still to be confirmed at this stage.

9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 The report outlines the officer findings and advice as requested by the Portfolio Holder subsequent to an earlier report and convened meeting. Constitutionally, it is within the Portfolio Holder's remit to determine action in response to a petition.
- 9.2 Any decision must adhere to key public law principles to ensure a robust, accountable and legally sound decision. It should be fair, proportionate, reasonable and transparent, and be based on relevant evidence and facts.

10. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

There are no direct HR implications arising from the contents of this report.

11. WARD IMPLICATIONS

Fuller Street Bridge is located in Sidney Sussex Ward.

12. BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 12.1 Portfolio Holder Meeting– Safer & Stronger Communities 18th June 2025 (no web link available)
- 12.2 Portfolio Holder Meeting– Safer & Stronger Communities 17th September 2025 (no web link available)

13. CONTACT OFFICER(S)

- 13.1 Spencer Hunt, Assistant Director Safer & Stronger Place–
spencer.hunt@nelincs.gov.uk
- 13.2 Paul Evans Assistant Director Infrastructure – paul.evans@nelincs.gov.uk
- 13.3 Holly Hall – Highway Asset Team Manager – holly.hall@nelincs.gov.uk
- 13.4 Paul Caswell, Head of Service Safer Towns & Communities –
paul.caswell@nelincs.gov.uk

Carolina Borgstrom
Director of Economy, Environment & Infrastructure