

MINUTES of the meeting of the **COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.30 am on 11 July 2013 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Thursday, 26 September 2013.

Elected Members:

- * Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos (Chairman)
- * Mr Chris Norman (Vice Chairman)
- * Mrs Jan Mason
- * Mr John Orrick
- * Mr Saj Hussain
- Rachael I. Lake
- * Mrs Mary Lewis
- Mr Christian Mahne
- Mr Chris Pitt
- * Ms Barbara Thomson
- * Mr Alan Young
- * Mr Robert Evans

Ex officio Members:

Mrs Sally Ann B Marks, Vice Chairman of the County Council
Mr David Munro, Chairman of the County Council

Substitute Members:

Richard Wilson
Denis Fuller
Colin Kemp

1/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Chris Pitt, Rachael I Lake and Christian Mahne.

Richard Wilson substituted for Rachael I Lake, Denis Fuller for Christian Mahne and Colin Kemp for Chris Pitt.

2/13 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 21 MARCH 2013 [Item 2]

The minutes were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.

3/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interests.

4/13 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

There were no questions or petitions.

5/13 RECOMMENDATION TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 5]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. Members were made aware that further to publishing, there were some slight changes to the scheduling in the Forward Work Plan. The Chairman informed the Committee that scrutiny of Surrey's Tourism Strategy had been moved from September to November's meeting to allow for more time to scrutinise this item. The Chairman also informed the Committee that scrutiny of the Joint Committee model had been moved from September to November due to a change in timescales.
2. A member of the Committee asked for the detailed income generation plans for Surrey Fire and Rescue Service, being prepared for Cabinet be included with the papers on the contingency crewing item for the September meeting.
3. A member of the Committee suggested that stakeholders be invited for the Scrutiny of community partnered libraries.

Recommendations:

None

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

6/13 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE [Item 6]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. It was noted that a Cabinet response to the Select Committee's recommendations on the changes to the emergency response cover locations for Epsom & Ewell and Reigate and Banstead had been received.
2. The Committee agreed to note this response. Mrs Jan Mason asked for it to be minuted, that she had voted against approving the proposed changes to the emergency response cover locations at the Select Committee meeting on 21 March 2013. This had previously not been minuted because a recorded vote had not been requested by any Committee member.

Recommendations:

None.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

7/13 SCRUTINY OF SURREY FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE INCOME STRATEGY [Item 9]

Declarations of interest:

None.

Witnesses:

Kay Hammond, Cabinet Associate for Police and Fire Services
Liz Mills, Chief of Staff, Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS)

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The report was introduced to members of the Committee by Mrs Kay Hammond, Cabinet Associate for Police and Fire Services and Liz Mills, Chief of Staff, SFRS. Mrs Hammond provided the Committee with some context to the report in terms of the aims of the Public Safety Plan.
2. The Cabinet Associate stated the importance of Committee members having sight of the Public Safety Plan 2011-2020, if they haven't already. The Chairman of the Committee asked for a copy of this to be circulated to all members on the Committee.
3. The Chief of Staff explained how the Service was already generating income and their plans to expand this and plough this back into the Service.
4. The Chief of Staff referred to different income operating models such as a Local Authority Trading company and a Surrey Fire Service independent charity. The Chief of Staff also stressed the importance of understanding and learning different ways of working from other Local Authorities.
5. A member of the Committee questioned whether achieving an additional income target of £660k by the end of 2017/18 was realistic. The Chief of Staff stated that they had built in the realism factor when preparing the business model for this income target, to ensure the target was realistic. The Chief of Staff explained that resources planning would also ensure the target was realistic. Both the Chief of Staff and Cabinet Associate felt confident this target could be achieved.
6. A member of the Committee sought clarification on which services SFRS would be charging for. The Chief of Staff explained that it was services which SFRS were not required to provide e.g. occupational health, but which SFRS could use their expertise creatively in order to generate income.
7. Members of the Committee referred to the opportunities available for SFRS to sell technical services to private companies, for example events safety management. The Cabinet Associate for Police and Fire Services explained how the Fire and Rescue Service already works alongside the Local Resilience Forum, looking at possible risks with events and how best to manage these with both the police and ambulance services. The Cabinet Associate for Police and Fire Services commented that the Fire and Rescue Service were already supporting large events, for example, the recent Epsom Derby.

8. Some members of the Committee raised concerns over selling services to companies that would have previously received these services free of charge. The concern was that these businesses may now be putting themselves at risk by opting out of receiving these services. The Chief of Staff explained that the SFRS intended to apply charges to new companies they planned to go into business with rather than companies they already provided services for free of charge. Furthermore, operating as a trading company provided SFRS with more flexibility to promote the right services to companies who were interested and willing to pay.
9. Members of the Committee raised concerns over staffing capacity for these proposals, having to provide extra services with low staffing levels, especially in the case of fire fighters who could not leave fire stations unmanned. The Chief of Staff stated that these plans did not negatively impact staffing for SFRS core services. Instead staffing would be achieved through collaboration with other emergency services and opportunities would be made available to those employees looking for secondary opportunities.
10. A member of the Committee questioned whether there could be a perceived conflict of interest between the Service operating as a trading company and as a local authority service, using the SFRS brand in both cases. The Chief of Staff stated that the service would continue to provide high quality free advice and service provision in their capacity as a Local Authority, thereby maintaining the strong SFRS brand. Furthermore, Equality Impact Assessments would be carried out to ensure resident needs were addressed. The Chief of Staff stated the importance of ensuring residents' confidence was not compromised and hence feasibility studies for these proposals would be carried out over the next few months. The Cabinet Associate for Police and Fire Services commented that it was important to be mindful of the public's views and that Councillors could assist the service in ensuring resident opinions are heard. Legal advice would also be sought in respect of potential conflicts of interest. A member of the Committee noted the importance of public buy in for such incentives and the fact that there were examples of positive public reaction to emergency service collaboration already taking place in Surrey.
11. Some members of the Committee questioned how extra employees required to support this new service provision would be funded. The Chief of Staff explained that details on resource and asset requirements and funding would be set out in a detailed business plan going to Cabinet.
12. Some members of the Committee commented on their reservations about the business case as a whole given some of the issues raised

by the Committee. The Cabinet Associate for Police and Fire Services explained that Committee members could be given the opportunity to scrutinise the detailed business plan going to Cabinet once this had been finalised. Furthermore the Cabinet Associate stated the Fire and Rescue Service had more capacity than it has had for the last 10 years because the numbers of incidents the Service were attending had decreased. SFRS wanted to utilise additional capacity and the specialist skill set within the service, and these proposals could help achieve this.

13. A member of the Committee asked what the provision was for animal rescue callouts and if these costs were covered by the taxpayer. The Chief of Staff stated that the costs incurred depended on the individual situation. There was a 'special service charge' in place for situations which did not meet the standard Fire and Rescue criteria. It was further explained that people requesting services were told in advance if the service they required would incur a charge.
14. Members of the Committee asked for the opportunity to scrutinise the detailed business plan for income generation by SFRS before it went to Cabinet. The Cabinet Associate for Police and Fire Services agreed to this approach.
15. Members of the Committee agreed for 'endorse' to be replaced with 'reconsider' in the first line of the recommendation.

Recommendations:

- a) The Communities Select Committee noted the approach taken by the Fire & Rescue Service to ensure the income generation target in the Medium Term Financial Plan is achieved.
- b) The Communities Select Committee recommends that prior to a decision being taken by Cabinet to endorse the income generation strategy of SFRS, a more detailed income generation strategy, addressing the Committee's concerns, be presented to the Committee for scrutiny.

Actions/further information to be provided:

Public Safety Plan 2011-2020 and 'Facing the Future' report (Sir Ken Knight CBE) to be circulated amongst members of the Committee.

Committee Next Steps:

None

8/13 MAGNA CARTA PROGRAMME [Item 7]

Declarations of interest:

None.

Witnesses:

Peter Milton, Head Of Cultural Services
Paul Turrell, Chief Executive of Runnymede Borough Council
Nic Durston, Assistant Director of Operations, National Trust
Simon Higman, Registrar and Director of Operations, Royal Holloway University

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. A member of the Committee stated that no financial information relating to the proposals was included in the report and a number of key officers responsible for the report were not present. It was questioned whether the proposals could be adequately scrutinised on the basis of the information available.

11.45am- The meeting was adjourned to decide whether financial information relating to the proposals was part 2. The Committee decided to proceed to the next Item and return to this Item later on.

12.30pm- The Senior Manager for Scrutiny and Appeals explained that the financial figures relating to the paper were part of a report going to Cabinet and had been seen by the relevant Cabinet Member. It was therefore possible to have an open discussion about the financial information which would have a bearing on the overall discussion about the report.

2. Members of the Committee noted the international significance of the anniversary of the sealing of the Magna Carta and the potential to create a legacy for Surrey by marking this historical occasion.
3. A member of the Committee commented on the financial information regarding the highways budget linked to the proposals. It was questioned whether there was capacity for the highways department to cover the proposed costs required for the programme. The Head of Cultural Services stated that there was enough money available from the highways department and these costs were necessary in respect of road crossings and dealing with the impact of increased travel.
4. A member of the Committee commented on the Runnymede roundabout scheme and whether there would be money available to fund a park and ride in the area. The Head of Cultural Services stated that at the present moment, work relating to car parking and traffic management was being undertaken by the master planners and this was still being developed. The Head of Cultural Services commented that 4 million for the roundabout had been included in the budget arrangements for over two years. The budget for the roundabout was

not specifically in place for the Magna Carta programme but was an initiative which had been in the pipeline for some time. It was important to get the work relating to the roundabout done in coordination with the Magna Carta programme so disruption could be limited. In respect of a park and ride, this would need to be further discussed with transport planners.

5. A member of the Committee asked the Head of Cultural Services to confirm that £1.2M would be the total contribution to the programme from Surrey CC. The Head of Cultural Services confirmed this was the amount being contributed aside from the highways costs. Clarification was sought with regards to the definition of 'resourcing costs'. The Head of Cultural Services stated that this would be the costs required to cover staffing for the programme. Some members expressed concerns over this financial commitment at a time when there was already considerable pressure on the Council's resources.
6. A question was asked as to how Runnymede Borough Council would celebrate the anniversary of the Magna Carta. The Chief Executive of Runnymede Borough Council explained that an activity programme for the Magna Carta was being prepared which would work alongside the event plans of Surrey County Council.
7. Members of the Committee raised concerns over incomplete statistics and why statistics (page 27 of the report) on the wider surrounding areas had not been included in the report for benchmarking purposes. The Head of Cultural Services commented that when the report was drafted neighbouring areas requiring extra support from the County Council were highlighted. This was additional information that would be included in the Cabinet report, and showed how the proposals went beyond the immediate objectives of the Magna Carta celebrations.
8. A member of the Committee asked if there were details relating to the expected increase in visitor numbers to the area to justify the business case for these proposals. The Chief Executive of Runnymede Borough Council commented that expected visitor numbers were available but that these related to the previous proposal for the Magna Carta visitor centre. He added that visitor numbers would be available in due course. Nic Durston, Assistant Director of Operations, National Trust commented that he was confident that as awareness of the Magna Carta increased so would visitor numbers.
9. A member of the Committee commented that it would be useful to have a copy of the various masterplans for the area once these were available. The Chief Executive of Runnymede Borough Council stated that a Masterplan for the regeneration of Egham town centre was underway and that phase one of the plan would be completed by next year.

10. Members of the Committee raised concerns over how much investment would be committed by Runnymede Borough Council. The Chief Executive of Runnymede Borough Council confirmed that £125,000 had already been committed and more would be invested in due course. Simon Higman, Registrar and Director of Operations, Royal Holloway University stated that the university had committed £200,000 towards the programme and anticipated spending more in partnership with stakeholders.
11. Members of the Committee raised concerns over the lack of detail around these proposals in terms of a business case and detailed financial information. Members felt that if details of the projected financial return on investment could be provided, then the programme was likely to receive more support. At the same time some Members recognised that plans were still in the development phase ahead of 2015 and that not all details would necessarily be available at present.
12. Members questioned whether private sponsorship had been sought for the programme and if an environmental impact study had been undertaken. Nic Durston, Assistant Director of Operations, National Trust stated that CBA (Chris Blandford Associates) were experts in the field of environmental management and would ensure a full environmental study would be undertaken. He further commented that private sponsorship was essential and that a fundraising strategy would be developed in due course.
13. The Chief Executive of Runnymede Borough Council explained that a pageant, planned to be held as part of the celebrations, would be supported through private and commercial sponsorship. With the international interest surrounding the Magna Carta, international sponsorship would also be sought.
14. A member of the Committee asked whether any discussions had taken place with the surrounding areas such as Spelthorne and Windsor and Maidenhead. Simon Higman, Registrar and Director of Operations, Royal Holloway University stated that the Magna Carta programme would go beyond Runnymede and discussions would take place with neighbouring authorities. It was further stated that Windsor and Maidenhead were currently involved in discussions and that Wraysbury Parish Council also expressed interest in being involved in the programme.
15. Concerns over costs of using CBA group and the costs of officer time holding consultation meetings was raised by a member of the Committee. The Head of Cultural Services stated that CBA was funded through the National Trust and that consultation meetings were a necessary part of planning this project.

16. Some members questioned the investment benefit to Surrey. The Chief Executive of Runnymede Borough Council commented that although historic projected numbers for the visitor centre were available, visitor numbers for the Magna Carta programme would require a holistic approach. It was further explained that these figures would not be available for the report going to Cabinet on 23 July.
17. The Committee asked what the service would be asking Cabinet to decide on 23 July in relation to these proposals. The Head of Cultural Services stated that the report being taken to Cabinet would ask them to approve the concept, brand and partnership arrangement for the proposals, as well as a budget of £300,000 for the events programme and £700,000 for a new memorial commission. The Cabinet were also being asked to approve the delegation of the implementation of these plans for the Leader and Assistant Chief Executive.
18. The Committee requested to see this report to Cabinet. It was confirmed that the report going to Cabinet would be shared with the Committee as soon as it was available.
19. The Chairman asked members of the Committee if they agreed with marking the occasion in principle. The majority of the Committee agreed to marking the occasion in principle.
20. However the majority of the Committee requested their concerns around these proposals be highlighted to Cabinet. Key concerns included the absence of a detailed business plan justifying the Council's proposed commitment of £1.2m, the absence of detailed impact assessments of the proposals and the absence of detailed information on projected visitor numbers and the concept idea. The Committee requested the opportunity to add to their recommendations to Cabinet based on any further information contained in the report to Cabinet.

Recommendations

- (a) Communities Select Committee's concerns around these proposals be highlighted to Cabinet. Key concerns include the absence of a detailed business plan justifying the Council's proposed commitment of £1.2m, the absence of detailed impact assessments of the proposals and the absence of detailed information on projected visitor numbers and the concept idea.
- (b) The Committee have the opportunity to add to their recommendations to Cabinet based on any further information contained in the report to Cabinet.

Actions/further information to be provided

The report going to Cabinet on 23 July to be shared with the Committee.

Committee Next Steps:

Committee to send any further comments/recommendations, in light of further information contained in the report to Cabinet, to the Chairman of the Committee, to inform the Chairman's report with recommendations to the Cabinet on this item.

9/13 SCRUTINY OF THE USE OF REGULATION OF INVESTIGATORY POWERS ACT 2000 (RIPA) [Item 8]

Declarations of interest:

None.

Witnesses:

Steve Ruddy, Community Protection Manager

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The report was introduced to members of the Committee by the Community Protection Manager. The Community Protection Manager explained the report provided details on how the Council makes use of RIPA and how it had been utilised over the previous financial year. RIPA protects the most vulnerable in the community and can be used to monitor and investigate a wide range of serious crime. Including consumer frauds and scams.
2. A member of the Committee questioned whether the changes to staffing had an impact on the number of surveillance activities undertaken as outlined in paragraph 11 of the report. The Community Protection Manager stated that the reduction in surveillance activity was due to the overall number of investigations being reduced, changes to how RIPA applications were authorised and an increased focus on larger investigations. Furthermore, the Proceeds of Crime Act (2002) makes more information on individuals available to Trading Standards Accredited Financial Investigators which has helped reduce the need to use RIPA in some other investigations.
3. Members of the Committee raised concerns over using officer names when referring to the Authorising Officer for covert human intelligence source authorisation (CHIS) as shown in the report. Members were concerned that this could possibly endanger the named officers. The Community Protection Manager stated that information relating to the Authorising Officers was in the public domain and that it was important

the service made as much information as they had, available to the public.

4. A member of the Committee questioned which services other than Trading Standards, could make use of RIPA. The Community Protection Manager explained that RIPA had only been used by Trading Standards over recent years but that other services could also potentially use RIPA. The ability to use RIPA is available to other services but only if there is an investigation into a serious crime (a crime carrying a sentence of 6 months imprisonment or more), under very tight control and authorisation, hence the need to update the corporate RIPA policy and framework on a regular basis.
5. Members of the Committee were happy to endorse the report and supported the Council's use of RIPA.

Recommendations:

Communities Select Committee endorse the report and support the Council's use of RIPA.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

10/13 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 10]

The date of the next meeting is 26 September.

Meeting ended at: 1.15 pm

Chairman