

MINUTES of the meeting of the **COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.00 am on 19 May 2014 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Monday, 21 July 2014.

Elected Members:

- * Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos (Chairman)
- * Mr Chris Norman (Vice-Chairman)
- Mr Mike Bennison
- * Mrs Yvonna Lay
- * Mrs Jan Mason
- * Mr John Orrick
- * Mr Saj Hussain
- * Mrs Mary Lewis
- 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

22/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Michael Bennison, Robert Evans and Barbara Thomson.

The Chairman welcomed new Members to the Committee; Yvonna Lay and Michael Bennison, and thanked the outgoing Members; Rachel I Lake and Christiane Mahne for their work with the Committee in the last year.

23/14 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS: 15 JANUARY 2014 AND 20 MARCH 2014 [Item 2]

The minutes of the meetings on 15 January 2014 and 20 March 2014 were agreed as true records of the meetings.

24/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

None were received.

25/14 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: None

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. One public question was received from Dr I Mason. A copy of the question and response can be found attached to the minutes.
2. Councillor Alan Young provided clarification about a question he had asked during the Cycling Strategy scrutiny meeting on 28 November 2013. He had asked the Police representative at the meeting how many cyclists stopped in Surrey had English as their first language. This question was asked as he had been informed by the Police, at an earlier meeting of Surrey Hills Parish Councils, convened by Surrey County Council, that a significant number of cycling groups stopped by the Police in the Surrey Hills did not speak English and therefore had difficulty communicating with officers. Mr Young's intention in asking this question had been to highlight this and to raise the possibility that safety information for cyclists should be provided in more than one language. The Chairman thanked Councillor Young for his clarification.

Recommendations: None.

Actions/further information to be provided: None.

Committee next steps: None.

26/14 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE [Item 5]

The Committee noted the response to recommendations from the Cabinet Member.

**27/14 RECOMMENDATION TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME
[Item 6]**

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Chairman informed the Committee that following a review of the work within the Chief Executive's Office, Rachel Crossley had taken over responsibility for the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector (VCFS) work, previously led by Policy & Performance. At the next meeting of the Committee Rachel Crossley and Saba Hussain were invited to attend for the VCFS item instead of Mary Burguieres and Liz Lawrence.

Recommendations: None.

Actions/further information to be provided: None.

Committee next steps: None.

**28/14 CABINET MEMBER (AND ASSOCIATE) PRIORITIES FOR YEAR AHEAD
[Item 7]**

Declarations of interest: None

Witnesses:

Helyn Clack, Cabinet Member for Community Services
Kay Hammond, Cabinet Associate for Fire and Police Services

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Cabinet Member and Cabinet Associate provided an overview of their priorities for the next year. The Cabinet Associate informed the Committee that it was a challenging time within the Fire Service as they were still in a period of strike action, and she continued to challenge the Chief Fire Officer to ensure contingency was in place. However, work was being done on putting a bid into government for the Blue Light Collaboration work, which they hoped would be successful to assist in the transformation of the emergency services collaborative work. On 10 June 2014 there would be a meeting with all agencies involved and politicians from across Surrey and Sussex to discuss further collaboration.
2. The Committee were informed that the Leader had agreed to put aside money for defibrillators on fire engines, as it was felt that it was appropriate that fire fighters would be able to respond if an ambulance was not present at the time.
3. The Cabinet Associate was leading on a project to map the locations of all the defibrillators in Surrey. It was felt this would take between

three to six months and would enable the council to challenge local businesses to acquire one if gaps were identified. This work would be done alongside the ambulance trust, SECAMB, and would utilise the knowledge of the Local Committees.

4. The Cabinet Member outlined her responsibilities within the portfolio of Cabinet Member for Community Services and Cabinet Lead for Continuous Improvement. Her additional role involved looking at services across the council and ensuring services were continuing to improve.
5. The Committee congratulated the work being done with defibrillators as they felt that this was an excellent and important project. Members were informed that a joint agreement had been made with the Fire unions as there was an understanding of their use, but that they would probably not be introduced until the mapping project had been completed.
6. Members queried whether all Community Partnered Libraries (CPL) would be open by the end of 2014 or the financial year, and whether there had been any issues recruiting and retaining volunteers for these libraries. The Cabinet Member stated that the CPLs had been well received and supported. She had not heard of the volunteer recruitment issues, but would raise this with officers to ensure support was provided to the CPLs. There had been some legal issues with the remaining CPLs though they were hoping to overcome these and for them to be open as soon as possible.
7. The Cabinet Associate refuted claims that there was disproportionate fire cover in the county as response times were being met in rural areas. Furthermore current changes to cover in the county were trying to address any difficulties in response times.

Recommendations:

1. The Committee supports the Cabinet Member and Associate priorities.

Actions/further information to be provided: None.

Committee next steps:

Cabinet Member and Associate be invited to attend a future Committee meeting to update Members on their priorities.

29/14 UPDATE ON MAGNA CARTA ANNIVERSARY PROPOSALS [Item 8]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Peter Milton, Head of Cultural Services
Geri Silverstone, Project Manager National Trust
Susie Kemp, Assistant Chief Executive
Helyn Clack, Cabinet Member for Community Services

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Committee were provided with a presentation which showed the progress of organising Magna Carta celebrations in 2014, 2015 and beyond.
2. Members raised concerns that residents in Egham were upset with the plans as they felt that been ignored and their ideas had been disregarded by officers, and that the talent in Runnymede would not be showcased at the concert at the Royal Albert Hall. Officers stated that the £1 million fund from Surrey County Council was to be spent on all residents of Surrey, as there was a wish to raise awareness of the Magna Carta. It was important that the Runnymede site told the story of the signing of the Magna Carta which it currently did not do and the priority had been the completion of the HLF bid.
3. Officers assured Members that money had been put aside for events in Egham High Street for local residents and visitors, and the plans would be discussed with local Members in due course. The Cabinet Member stated that the concert at the Royal Albert Hall would showcase the talent of residents with a themed focus on the Magna Carta. Members requested that future similar events took place in Surrey as they were concerned that residents would not stay the full length of the concert due to travel concerns.
4. Members requested to see the Business Plan submitted to the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF), however officers advised that this could not be circulated until the HLF had made a first round decision in July 2014. The partnership Masterplan had cost £50,000 to which Surrey County Council had contributed £12,500.
5. The Committee were concerned about plans if the HLF bid for £4.3 million was not successful. The Project Manager stated that the Surrey Partnership were committed to develop the site, and HLF funding would provide an enhanced legacy offer, if successful. Members were however concerned that there was not a viable alternative to not being successful at HLF funding.
6. Parking would be provided on the site, with current parking provision being developed.
7. Members were concerned that the highways improvements would not be completed in time as they were to go to the Local Committee on 9 June 2014 and works often took a long time to be completed. Officers assured the Committee that there was a fully specked and specified programme that Surrey Highways officers had been instructed to deliver by the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding Recovery, and this is due to be presented to the next Local Committee meeting.
8. The Committee queried whether the art installation would be ready in time for the June 2015 events and were informed that only artists and their proposals which could be delivered in time, and on budget at £700,000, were being considered.

9. There was an aspiration to use the Brunel Boat House as part of the overall development of the site and the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead were fully engaged with the site and event developments. Officers felt that it was important to encourage tourists from Windsor to visit the Runnymede site in the future.
10. Members were informed that the event on 15 June 2015, to which the HRM would attend, would be balloted for audience capacity of 5,000. Officers were in process of scoping potential fundraising opportunities for the official event and noted that it would not be fully funded by the council.
11. The Cabinet Member stressed that there had been little time to form plans but there was a commitment for the celebrations to be about community development.

Recommendations:

1. The Committee continues to receive updates on Magna Carta, including the funding position from the Heritage Lottery Fund.
2. That the Project Manager (National Trust) engage with local Members in Runnymede to understand views of local people, involve local talent and help inform the work of the Magna Carta Surrey Partnership.

Actions/further information to be provided: None.

Committee next steps:

The Committee to review progress of Magna Carta anniversary proposals at a future meeting.

30/14 PROGRESS REPORT ON COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIPS (FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS MADE AT THE ANNUAL SCRUTINY MEETING ON 31 OCTOBER 2013) [Item 9]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Yvonne Rees, Strategic Director for Customer and Communities
 Jane Last, Lead Manager for Community Safety and Partnerships
 Gordon Falconer, Community Safety Unit Senior Manager
 Louise Gibbons, Community Safety Manager
 Helyn Clack, Cabinet Member for Community Services
 Kay Hammond, Cabinet Associate for Fire and Police Services

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. Members queried progress against recommendation two as Tandridge had not been too happy with the approach being taken. Officers informed the Committee that it was an interesting proposal which was being led by the three Boroughs and Districts, with Surrey County Council being a partner. Significant conversations had taken place and the changes had gone through the relevant democratic services

processes. Officers were not aware of any issues at present but would look into it further.

2. Officers felt that a benefit had been that there had been fewer meetings which enabled officers to put more resources into the Community Support Programme. The aim was to concentrate more on local delivery, however they would continue review and evolve the process to ensure it worked appropriately.
3. With the Woking Joint Committee the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) had a different role and officers suggested that a review of this should be brought to the Committee in six months.
4. Members were informed that anti social behaviour was often considered on the proportionality of the actions.
5. The Committee requested to see a breakdown of the HMIC report by Boroughs and Districts.
6. The Chairman thanked the officers for an excellent and clear report.

Recommendations:

1. The Committee to receive a further update on collaborative working between Community Safety Partnerships – including lessons learned from the east divisions CSPs.

Actions/further information to be provided:

Officers to provide a breakdown of HMIC report by Boroughs and Districts.

Committee next steps:

The Committee to complete the annual scrutiny of Community Safety Partnerships in October 2014.

31/14 SCRUTINY OF EVALUATION OF PILOT SPECIALIST RESCUE AND CONTINGENCY CREWING CONTRACT AND PROPOSALS TO TENDER FOR A NEW CONTRACT TO PROVIDE CONTINGENCY CREWING AND SPECIALIST RESCUE [Item 10]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Russell Pearson, Chief Fire Officer
Kay Hammond, Cabinet Associate for Fire and Rescue Services
Helyn Clack, Cabinet Member for Community Services

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Chief Fire Officer explained that the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) did have a contract with a commercial provider for contingency crewing to fulfil their statutory requirement, however the

contract went beyond the statutory requirements to provide specialist rescue also.

2. SFRS had been able to provide the highest level of contingency crewing, and had been awarded certificates after a review during the flooding incident found them to be completely compliant. The contract had been in action for 18 months, during which time it had been tested stringently due to a number of incidents, and the pilot scheme had been extended to March 2015 though a decision now needed to be made whether as to go out to tender for a new contract for these services. It was felt that the pilot scheme had performed well.
3. As many of the services provided by the commercial provider were outside statutory requirements previously it took a number of hours to rescue scenarios, which the Chief Officer stated was unsatisfactory as he considered rescue to be a large part of the Fire Services responsibility. It was believed that SFRS had one of the highest capabilities within the country with a small team providing a variety of services.
4. Due to the extended pilot scheme it was stated that they were in a position to know what was necessary for a new contract. There was now increased interest in the contract through soft testing and some Fire Authorities interested in the contract arrangements.

Recommendations:

1. The Committee endorses Option 3 of broadening of the contract scope.

Actions/further information to be provided: None.

Committee next steps: None.

32/14 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 11]

Resolved that under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information under paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

33/14 SCRUTINY OF EVALUATION OF PILOT SPECIALIST RESCUE AND CONTINGENCY CREWING CONTRACT AND PROPOSALS TO TENDER FOR A NEW CONTRACT TO PROVIDE CONTINGENCY CREWING AND SPECIALIST RESCUE [Item 12]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Russell Pearson, Chief Fire Officer
Kay Hammond, Cabinet Associate for Fire and Police Services
Helyn Clack, Cabinet Member for Community Services

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Chief Fire Officer expanded upon the discussion held within the public part of the meeting.

Recommendations:

1. That Members of Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee discuss procurement matters in relevant committees.

Actions/further information to be provided: None.

Committee next steps: None.

34/14 PUBLICITY FOR PART 2 ITEMS [Item 13]

The Committee resolved not to publicise the minutes of the Part Two discussion.

35/14 UPDATE FROM THE CHIEF FIRE OFFICER [Item 14]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Russell Pearson, Chief Fire Officer
Mary Lewis, Chair of Public Safety Plan Update Member Reference Group

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Chief Fire Officer informed the Committee that union leaders had requested to speak at a future Communities Select Committee meeting on the Public Service Transformation Plan. This would provide the opportunity for Members to ask the unions for their opinions on plans and the reports could be jointly presented. The Chairman agreed in principle, though would consider further and requested the Member Reference Group (MRG) consider having union representatives at witnesses.
2. The Chair of the MRG informed the Committee that the group had been set up to focus on the Public Safety Plan with Councillors Mary Lewis, Jan Mason, Chris Norman and Barbara Thomson as Members. The Members have raised concerns with the service, including the consultation processes followed and would look closely at the key role of community risk modelling.
3. Members suggested that due to the popularity of the MRG that the Chair may wish to consider accepting substitutes at meetings.

Recommendations:

1. The Committee, through the Member Reference Group, have the opportunity to question local unions on the transformation programme.

Actions/further information to be provided: None.

Committee next steps:

The Committee to receive a verbal update from the Chief Fire Officer at future meetings.

36/14 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 15]

The Committee noted the date of the next meeting of the Communities Select Committee would be on 23 July 2014.

Meeting ended at: 12.55 pm

Chairman

Communities Select Committee 19 May 2014

Item 4: Public questions

Submitted by: Dr Ian Mason

Question 1:

At this meeting, minutes will be presented of the meeting of the Communities Select Committee held at 10.00 am on 15 January 2014.

Under section 5.13.2 of these minutes it is noted that:

“Members queried whether businesses would be indemnified against losses on the weekend of the Prudential Ride London-Surrey. The Chairman requested that this be discussed outside of the meeting due to volume of detail which would be required to answer the question.”

I can find no record of these discussions or of their conclusion(s). It seems to me that this question of vital interest to Surrey businesses and residents. Can you help me locate where the relevant records might be lodged, or suggest what steps I might take to ensure this is followed up in the 19th May CSC meeting?

Response:

Following the successes of the 2013 event the London-Surrey 100 and Classic is planned for the 10th August 2014.

As with any event in the county, businesses will not be indemnified for any losses they incur on the event day. The event organiser, London/Surrey Cycle Partnership is working with communities on the route to ensure that wherever possible the opportunities the event brings can be maximised by Surrey businesses. As a key learning outcome access for residents during the event is being reviewed to ensure that wherever possible the impacts of the road closures required to support the safety of residents, spectators and event participants is kept to a minimum. The event organiser is currently working with residents and businesses on the route to share event information and plan for access during the road closures.

Through the changes to the route for the 2014 events, with a focus on the town centres and by working with the event sponsors and organisers we will be building on the success of 2013 to ensure that we continue to grow the event and allow businesses and charities to continue to benefit from the opportunities this world class event brings to Surrey.

Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos
Chairman of Communities Select Committee

This page is intentionally left blank