

Notice of Meeting

Resident Experience Board

**Date & time**

Wednesday, 13
January 2016 at
11.00 am

Place

Ashcombe Suite
County Hall
Penrhyn Road
Kingston upon Thames
KT1 2DN

Contact

Dominic Mackie
Room 122, County Hall
Tel 020 8213 2814

dominic.mackie@surreycc.gov.uk

Chief Executive

David McNulty

**NOTE: Members
Private Workshop
starting at 10.30am**

If you would like a copy of this agenda or the attached papers in another format, eg large print or braille, or another language please either call 020 8541 9122, write to Democratic Services, Room 122, County Hall, Penrhyn Road, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN, Minicom 020 8541 8914, fax 020 8541 9009, or email dominic.mackie@surreycc.gov.uk.

This meeting will be held in public. If you would like to attend and you have any special requirements, please contact Dominic Mackie on 020 8213 2814.

Elected Members

Mr Colin Kemp (Chairman), Rachel I Lake (Vice-Chairman), Mr Mike Bennison, Mrs Yvonna Lay, Mrs Jan Mason, Mr John Orrick, Mrs Mary Lewis, Mr Karan Persand, Ms Barbara Thomson, Mr Alan Young, Mr Robert Evans, Mr Ramon Gray.

Independent Representatives:

Mrs Sally Ann B Marks (Chairman of the County Council), Mr Nick Skellett CBE (Vice-Chairman of the County Council)

TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Committee is responsible for the following areas:

Community Safety	Adult and Community Learning
Crime and Disorder Reduction	Cultural Services
Relations with the Police	Sport
Fire and Rescue Service	Voluntary Sector Relations
Localism	Heritage
Major Cultural and Community Events	Citizenship
Arts	Registration Services
Customer Services	Trading Standards and Environmental Health
Library Services	Legacy and Tourism

AGENDA

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

2 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:

(Pages 1
- 12)

To agree the minutes as a true record of the meeting.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To receive any declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests from Members in respect of any item to be considered at the meeting.

Notes:

- In line with the Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012, declarations may relate to the interest of the member, or the member's spouse or civil partner, or a person with whom the member is living as husband or wife, or a person with whom the member is living as if they were civil partners and the member is aware they have the interest.
- Members need only disclose interests not currently listed on the Register of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests.
- Members must notify the Monitoring Officer of any interests disclosed at the meeting so they may be added to the Register.
- Members are reminded that they must not participate in any item where they have a disclosable pecuniary interest.

4 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

To receive any questions or petitions.

Notes:

1. The deadline for Member's questions is 12.00pm four working days before the meeting (Thursday 7 January 2016).
2. The deadline for public questions is seven days before the meeting (Wednesday 6 January 2016).
3. The deadline for petitions was 14 days before the meeting, and no petitions have been received.

5 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE BOARD

(Pages
13 - 16)

To review responses from Cabinet to recommendations made by the Board.

6 RECOMMENDATION TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME

(Pages
17 - 24)

The Committee is asked to monitor progress on the implementation of recommendations from previous meetings, and to review its Forward Work Programme.

7 THE NEW JOINT TRADING STANDARDS SERVICE: UPDATE ON PROGRESS

(Pages 25 - 34)

The new Joint Trading Standards Service for Buckinghamshire and Surrey was launched on 1 April 2015.

This report summarises the progress made in the first eight months of the new service. It invites the Board to note the progress, and to identify any issues which they would want to explore in more detail at future meetings.

8 DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

The next meeting of the Committee will be held at 10:30am on Thursday 17 March 2016.

**David McNulty
Chief Executive**

Published: Monday 04 January 2016

MOBILE TECHNOLOGY AND FILMING – ACCEPTABLE USE

Those attending for the purpose of reporting on the meeting may use social media or mobile devices in silent mode to send electronic messages about the progress of the public parts of the meeting. To support this, County Hall has wifi available for visitors – please ask at reception for details.

Anyone is permitted to film, record or take photographs at council meetings with the Chairman's consent. Please liaise with the council officer listed in the agenda prior to the start of the meeting so that the Chairman can grant permission and those attending the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place.

Use of mobile devices, including for the purpose of recording or filming a meeting, is subject to no interruptions, distractions or interference being caused to the PA or Induction Loop systems, or any general disturbance to proceedings. The Chairman may ask for mobile devices to be switched off in these circumstances.

It is requested that if you are not using your mobile device for any of the activities outlined above, it be switched off or placed in silent mode during the meeting to prevent interruptions and interference with PA and Induction Loop systems.

Thank you for your co-operation

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES of the meeting of the **RESIDENT EXPERIENCE BOARD** held at 10.30 am on 19 November 2015 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Wednesday, 13 January 2016.

Elected Members:

- * Mr Colin Kemp (Chairman)
- * Rachael I. Lake (Vice-Chairman)
- * Mr Mike Bennison
- Mr Robert Evans
- * Mrs Yvonna Lay
- * Mrs Jan Mason
- * Mr John Orrick
- * Mr Chris Pitt
- * Ms Barbara Thomson
- * Mr Alan Young
- * Mr Saj Hussain
- * Mr Ramon Gray

- * denotes attended
- A denotes apologies

Ex officio Members:

Mrs Sally Ann B Marks, Chairman of the County Council
Mr Nick Skellett CBE, Vice-Chairman of the County Council

14/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Robert Evans.

15/15 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 16 OCTOBER 2015 [Item 2]

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

16/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

No declarations of interest were received.

17/15 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

There were no questions or petitions.

18/15 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SCRUTINY BOARD [Item 5]

There were no responses to report.

19/15 RECOMMENDATION TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 6]

The Board noted that all actions and recommendations on the Recommendation Tracker remained outstanding.

The Board was informed that two pieces of scrutiny work were to be completed around the Library service; the first as an overview of the Surrey Library Service and the second looking at the changing role of the Library Service in relation to new demands and pressures facing a modern library service.

The Chairman suggested that a workshop for the Board to look at 2016/17 budgets would be arranged for January 2016.

The Board was informed that a formal response to the “Enabling Closer Working Between the Emergency Services” consultation was submitted to Cabinet for response. The response outlined that the Board agreed with and supports collaboration between the emergency services, but had reservations about the possible governance structure proposed in the consultation.

Actions:

Surrey Libraries and 2016/17 Budgets were added to the Forward Work Programme.

Alan Young arrived at 10.41am
David Hodge arrived at 10.42am

20/15 CUSTOMER SERVICE EXCELLENCE IN HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT [Item 7]

Declarations of Interest:

None.

Witnesses:

David Hodge, Leader of the Council
Mark Irons, Head of Customer Services
Mike Dawson, Customer Service and Improvement Manager, Environment and Infrastructure
John Furey – Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Flooding
Richard Walsh, Cabinet Member for Localities and Community Wellbeing
Richard Wilson – Chairman of Member Reference Group on Customer Service Excellence
Mr Thompson, Surrey Resident
Mr David Innocent, Surrey Resident
Mr Roger Spolton, Surrey Resident
Mr John Hoskins, Surrey Resident
Ms Marianne Meinke, Surrey Resident
Mr Ross Daniell, Surrey Resident

Key Points Raised During the Discussion:

1. Officers introduced the Customer Service Excellence and the importance held for it by the Council.
Officers suggested that the Resident Experience Board represents a desire to improve the Surrey residents' experience with the Council, and that Customer Service Excellence helps provide a research grounded framework, focused on driving improvement to public services.
2. Officers outlined the process for achieving the Customer Service Excellence Award and that each improvement framework is based upon a review of the service in question, and the Award is retained after addressing areas of improvement after independent annual review.
3. Officers informed Members that, as well as Surrey Highways, Business Operations, Finance, Customer Services and the Community Partnership Team had achieved the Customer Service Excellence Award and that other Surrey services are working towards accreditation.
4. The Board was informed by Highways Officers that despite retaining the Customer Service Excellence Award for another year, Highways viewed customer service as part of its ongoing improvement scheme and thanked the Customer Service Member Reference Group for its support.
The external assessment of Highways highlighted further areas for improvement: using customer insight to improve the service and improving communication with customers throughout the life of their enquiry/complaint and keeping customers informed with updates.

5. Officers reported to the Board of the introduction of a new works management system which is now linked in to the main contractor database. The new software improves links within the County Contact Centre and that new features allow residents and customers to view photographs and responses to reported road faults and enquiries. The Customer Service Excellence annual review found this as an item of best practice.
Officers also reported the launching of the www.roadworks.org website, designed to be more informative for customers, providing more information on roadwork schemes, diversions and signposting customers to self-service channels online.
6. When addressing improvements from customer insight, Officers reported of the introduction of the Highways Customer Panel, a survey of which was tabled in the report, though no improvements had been drafted from the results from the panel as it was in it's infancy.
7. Members raised queries over the timeline for Highways enquires and complaints. Officers clarified that reports to Highways are inspected within five days, after which a decision is taken dependent on the severity of the enquiry judged by an assessment of risk to the public. Complaints are taken through the County's general complaint procedures with the Customer Relations Team.
Officers confirmed that where enquiries are logged by a number of customers they will receive the same enquiry ticket number, but each report is logged individually. The practice assists officers with their information gathering for each enquiry.
8. Members expressed concerns of increasing workload pressures for local highways teams with limited numbers of staff and resource. Officers explained that the increased responsibility would give the local teams more powers and responsibilities to manage their orders and resources. The Cabinet Member confirmed that a qualified Highways Officer would be recruited to each local team to deal with the new responsibilities.
9. Members requested that a publicity document be created to provide residents with further guidance on the Highways enquiry procedures. Officers reported a newsletter had been created for this purpose and that Highways was evaluating further customer information before circulating publically.
10. Members raised the point that all Members of Council can help their local residents by endeavoring to find answers to their queries from information already made available to them, consequently reducing some of the workload and pressure from local Highways Officers. This position was backed by the Leader.

David Hodge left at 11.22am.

11. Resident Mr Daniell joined the Board to discuss his experience of Highways. Mr Daniell, a resident of the Knaphill area, had experience of reporting issues of antisocial driving. Mr Daniell reported that communication from Highways was often slow and outside the response targets.

Mr Daniell had received erroneous notifications claiming works had been completed when in fact they hadn't started. In his experience the error fell on the customer to chase up and instigate corrections. Officers acknowledged that an issue with email notifications had resulted in erroneous updates being sent to customers and that the issue had been addressed.

Mr Daniell took an issue to his local joint committee but did not receive a satisfactory answer. At the joint committee meeting he was promised a meeting with a local highways officer, however this was not forthcoming.

Members queried whether there was a mechanism to feed back issues and enquiries brought up at joint committee meetings. Highways Officers outlined that the service relies on the officers present at the meetings to feed the enquiries back onto the highways system.

Mr Daniell commented on the lack of communication of decisions made by Highways in response to enquiries, especially around how officers reached a decision or decide a cause of action for each enquiry.

Officers reported the service was actively promoting a culture of openness and honesty with their customers. Highways contractors are required to photograph completed works which are then linked with information available to customers online.

12. Resident Mr Thompson, a resident of Epsom, joined the Board to discuss his experience of Highways.

Mr Thompson commended the staff at the Surrey Contact Centre but queried whether their training was always the same as some staff appear to work differently to others.

Officers responded; Contact Centre staff received the same training before operating the front line service but that there is no suggested script for calls, leading to potentially different working methods around the same systems.

When reporting issues with highways furniture, such as lamp posts or signs, by asset number Mr Thompson has experienced occasions where additional information has been requested. On occasion this information has led to apparent errors in the asset cataloging system. He suggested that highways assets are catalogued more accurately in order for customers to report faults easier.

Highways Officers conceded that enquiries should only require an asset number and road name however Contact Centre staff had been asked to acquire additional information as a method of gathering information for highways officers on the ground. The additional information also generates a background for risks of the area with the enquiry.

Mr Thompson also commented on out of date signage left on highways after road works or road events have passed or expired. Officers, Members and the Cabinet Member agreed the issue required addressing and confirmed that steps were being undertaken.

13. Molesey resident, Mr Hoskin joined the Board to discuss his experience of Highways.

Mr Hoskins reported that he had seen an improvement in communication from Highways in the past twelve months, citing the text service in particular.

Mr Hoskins had reported issues with contractors leaving a completed roadworks site with debris and loose material across the highway surface. Questions around potential damage to vehicles and personal safety for road users, especially cyclists, were raised.

Highways Officers reported they expected contractors to fully clear away the road surface and that local highways officers spot check completed works and are responsible for reporting any back issues. Officers also highlighted that in some cases responses to an enquiry highlight that a major repair is the required solution, yet part of the road defect requires an initial temporary repair.

Members queried whether this information was reported back to customers and Officers conceded it was not as a matter of course.

14. Ms Meinke, a resident of Woking, joined the Board to discuss his experience of Highways. Ms Meinke informed the Board of the varied range of enquiries and complaints she had reported to Highways covering fly-posting, blocked drains, double-yellow lines, street lighting.

Ms Meinke's primary example was that of a loose drain cover that she originally reported to Highways three years previously. Initially the drain cover was deemed not strong enough and a repair was made, however the issue returned.

A year later Highways informed Ms Meinke that the drain cover belonged to Thames Water and that they should undertake a suitable repair. After contacting Thames Water directly, Ms Meinke was advised the drain cover was the property of Surrey County Council. Ms Meinke initiated an official report into the problem which highlighted serious issues with communication. The report was completed in July 2015 yet the drain cover remained an issue.

Ms Meinke re-reported the issue via email and online and informed the Board that obtaining reference numbers for enquiries has improved greatly. The last communication received from Highways suggested the drain cover belonged to Thames Water. The issue remained outstanding.

Officers apologised to Ms Meinke for the problems experienced with the drain cover and informed Members of the Board that Highways can approach utility companies regarding highway faults of their concern, however does not have any authority to ensure the companies action any repair. Officers also conceded that this issue had a link to the

required improvement of the asset register, which was underway. The Cabinet Member agreed that there were issues with utility companies and roadwork sites and informed the Board that options were being explored to improve this situation in the future.

15. Mr Spolton, a resident of South Cheam, joined the Board to discuss his experience of Highways.

Mr Spolton queried whether checks to Surrey roads being carried out every three months was sufficient and raised that checks should be more frequent.

Officers reported that the frequency of inspections to roads varies depending on the nature of the road in question and that the Highways' checks of roads in Surrey fall within accordance with a national code of practice. Officers also commented that increasing checks would incur increased costs and funding was not currently available to accommodate this.

Mr Spolton also commented on the delay in repairs of street furniture after road incidents and recommended better communication between the Council and Surrey Police in order to resolve damage sooner. Officers reported that damage to street furniture is considered as damage to Council property and that delays were caused when gathering payment for repairs from motor insurance companies prior to repair works being carried out.

Mr Spolton queried whether measures were in place to ensure a continuity of work quality when changing contractors. The Cabinet Member informed the Board that the current contractor, Kier, had worked very closely with the Council to improve the service and efficiency. The Kier contract was valid for fourteen years and contained reviews and break clauses. The Cabinet Member, Board and Officers noted that the Kier contract falls within the remit of the Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board.

16. Mr Innocent was the last resident to join the Board to discuss his experience of Highways.

Mr Innocent commented that responses and communication from Highways was very poor. An enquiry, reported in July, regarding overgrown vegetation around a junction following a road traffic incident was cited. It was reported that communication only became forthcoming after Mr Innocent contacted Cllr Richard Walsh.

Highways Officers apologised for the poor communication around the enquiry and thanked Mr Innocent, and all the resident witnesses present, for raising real-world issues as they outlined that the Highways service had further to go in order to improve customer service.

Officers informed the Board that the service can receive between ten and twelve thousand enquires a month and that, although not an excuse, it was possible that some enquiries get missed.

17. Members thanked all the residents for attending the Board meeting and concurred that the point had been made that improvement to communication was required. Members agreed that Members of Council could do more to manage residents' expectations and that

residents' needed to be aware that there is a degree of prioritisation to roadworks.

18. Members queried the process of contacting the utility companies and questioned whether it was usual practice to assume the customer makes the enquiry with them.

Officers reported that although Highways notifies utility companies under Section 81 of the Building Act 1984, the authority has no power to ensure that repair work is carried out. In practice, it was reported that the utility companies were more inclined to respond and repair a fault should a customer contact them directly, rather than the County.

19. Members questioned whether there were any ramifications for contractors should repair work be unsatisfactory, and how often roadwork sites inspected.

Officers reported that checks were a random selection and that if the contractor has not completed work to a satisfactory standard there is a financial penalty; contractors would be required to attend the site again and make good the repair at their own cost.

20. Members questioned whether the Contact Centre could deflect customers when reporting a fault already logged in the Highways system.

Officers replied saying that new systems are improving and that having multiple calls for a single fault can help gather information for highway officers on the ground.

Ms Meinke expressed the opinion customers could feel "fobbed off" if their calls were not dealt with individually.

Recommendations:

That the Board requests that the Highways team:

- Develops the asset management system to ensure that all assets are logged (request update in 3 months)
- Distribute the information leaflet brought to the Board to all Surrey libraries
- Develops a plan of engagement with local and joint committees to enable feedback that is given there to be logged into the main system.
- Write to all residents who attended the Board explaining what went wrong and steps that are being taken to address these issues, and to copy this to the Board.
- Work with County Councillors to emphasise their role in distributing key information to residents.
- Encourage the Member Reference Group to continue monitoring the standard and timeliness of response to residents.

Lunch 13.05pm - 13.40pm

**21/15 MAGNA CARTA 800TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATION DEBRIEF
[Item 8]**

Declarations of Interest:

None.

Witnesses:

Helyn Clack, Cabinet Member (formally responsible for the Magna Carta programme)

Peter Milton, Head of Cultural Services

Graham Cook, Project Manager for the 15 June 2015 event

Richard Walsh, Cabinet Member

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. Officers tabled a presentation to debrief the Board on the events and activities celebrating the Magna Carta 800th Anniversary. The presentation only contained information on parts of the celebration which Surrey County Council made a financial contributions. The presentation contained:
 - a. Images of the main anniversary event as well as events leading up to and after 15 June 2015.
 - b. Information on the background and preliminary work at the beginning of the planning process for the event, negotiations and collaborative work with The National Trust, who manage the Magna Carta site.
 - c. A brief overview of the Magna Carta app, created and supported by Royal Holloway.
 - d. The Magna Carta garden exhibit at the Chelsea Flower Show, since relocated at the Runnymede Hotel.
 - e. The Magna Carta banner project and the county flag project undertaken by Surrey schools.
 - f. Events, displays of the Salisbury Magna Carta facsimile and David Starkey author talk and book launch event at Guildford Cathedral.
 - g. Events held by the Surrey Ethnic Minorities Forum, promoting the importance of Magna Carta.
 - h. Artwork and plaque unveilings at the Magna Carta site.
 - i. Details of the visits from members of the Royal household at the 15 June 2015 event.
2. Officers reported that an initial bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund by the local stakeholder partnership for improvements to Runnymede Meadows had been unsuccessful, but that a second bid of £2m was being prepared for submission to the Heritage Lottery Fund South East Committee for the improvement of access to the site.
3. Members questioned whether there remained any ongoing costs after the Magna Carta event. Officers informed Members that an archiving process would be undertaken to ensure that a record of the anniversary events will be available for future generations. Officers reported ongoing investigations into obtaining a facsimile of the Surrey copy of the Magna Carta dating from 1297, which is owned by the

Australian Parliament, for the use of display and exhibiting in the county. Under the terms of The Juror's loan agreement the National Trust are responsible for the maintenance of the artwork.

4. Members sought clarification of the infrastructure costs outlined in the report and Officers informed Members that the infrastructure costs were for the installation and packing up of stages, portable track ways, towers, audiovisual equipment hire and seating.
5. Members expressed their thanks to the Officers and all Officers involved in the Magna Carta anniversary events, and for ensuring the event came within budget.

22/15 WELFARE REFORM TASK GROUP VERBAL UPDATE [Item 9]

Barbara Thomson reported that the Welfare Reform Task Group had nothing to report and that work was continuing and an update will follow.

23/15 PERFORMANCE AND FINANCE SUB-GROUP VERBAL UPDATE [Item 10]

Rachael Lake gave the Board an update from the recent meeting of the Performance and Finance sub-group, at which the sub-group discussed:

1. Socrata, a public online performance analysis tool currently being rolled out across all Surrey services
2. A recommendation from the Council Overview Board to consider the scrutiny of Local Committee Budgets
3. An audit report on Surrey Arts
4. An update on the Fire Transformation Grant.

Recommendations:

1. The Board is impressed with the Socrata tool and feel it is highly valuable in terms of reassuring residents of the service that Surrey provides them. The Board requests that the officers consider a search function for the website and to ensure that relevant information is presented on the pages.
2. The Board would like to see every department that collates performance data included on Socrata by the end of 2015.
3. The Performance and Finance Sub-Group has given consideration to the request from the Council Overview Board that Local Committee budgets be scrutinised by the Resident Experience Board. The Sub-Group does not feel that they can add value to this process and notes that scrutiny arrangements for some of the issues raised are already in place.

The Sub-Group considered the direct benefit to residents, and although they felt that it would be difficult to scrutinise without looking at each individual case, which is done already by the Member and the Local Committee, they agreed it was a benefit to our communities.

The Performance and Finance Sub-Group asks the Board to recommend to Cabinet that they protect this service which is valued by our residents and communities.

4. The Board is satisfied with the progress made by Surrey Arts on the actions in the Management Action Plan, and recommends that Internal Audit conducts a follow-up review in April 2016.
5. That Surrey Arts considers the use of volunteers and looking at its business model.
6. The Board is satisfied with the progress made by Surrey Fire and Rescue Service on the actions in the Management Action Plan, and recommends that Internal Audit conducts a follow-up review in the summer of 2016.

Actions:

- *Officers to send recommendation 1 and 2 to Tim Yarnell.*
- *Colin Kemp to report back to Eber Kington at next Council Overview Board meeting.*
- *Officers to send recommendation 3 to Cabinet.*
- *Officers to send recommendation 4 to Internal Audit and Surrey Arts.*

24/15 DATE OF NEXT MEETING: [Item 11]

The next full public meeting will be held at 10.30am on 13 January 2016 at the Ashcombe Suite, County Hall.

Meeting ended at: 2.49 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET RESPONSE TO RESIDENT EXPERIENCE BOARD

ANNUAL SCRUTINY OF COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIPS (considered by Resident Experience Board on 16 October 2015)

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the Cabinet Member:

- leads a discussion with County Members who sit on Community Safety Partnerships on how the work of the Community Safety Partnerships reflects local concerns and priorities of residents.
- requests that the Cabinet Associate leads a discussion with the Lead Members Group to explore how the work of Community Safety Partnerships reflects local concerns and priorities of residents.
- requests that the Community Partnership Team gathers evidence of how local concerns and priorities of residents are reflected by Community Safety Partnerships and feeds this information back to a future Resident Experience Board meeting within six months.

RESPONSE:

I will be arranging to attend a meeting of the Local Committee Chairs and the Chairman of each Community Partnership in order to establish how the Partnership reflects local concerns and priorities of the residents to progress this discussion.

In response to the second point, this will be included on the agenda for the next Community Safety Lead Members meeting, Chaired by Kay Hammond, and I will be attending the next meeting of this group on 10 December, 2.00pm, at County Hall. (SCC Officer contact for this is: Gordon Falconer).

In line with the final point, this request will be incorporated into the annual refresh of the Surrey Single Strategic Assessment, which will take place by the Community Safety Team. I will be organising a meeting with each of the officers engaged in all these aspects of Community Safety Partnerships.

Richard Walsh
Cabinet Member for Localities and Community Wellbeing
24 November 2015

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET RESPONSE TO RESIDENT EXPERIENCE BOARD

DISCUSSION OF 'ENABLING CLOSER WORKING BETWEEN THE EMERGENCY SERVICES' CONSULTATION

(considered by Resident Experience Board on 16 October 2015)

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the Board agrees with and supports collaboration between the emergency services, but has reservations about the possible governance structure proposed in the consultation.

RESPONSE:

I would like to thank the Resident Experience Board for their observations and can confirm that Surrey County Council's response was submitted to the Home Office on 23 October 2015. This document encompasses the Board's recommendations and a full copy is available upon request.

Richard Walsh
Cabinet Member for Localities and Community Wellbeing
24 November 2015

This page is intentionally left blank

Resident Experience Board Forward Work Programme 2016/17

13 January 2016

Ashcombe

- Review of the joint Trading Standards Service with Buckinghamshire
- Budget Scrutiny

17 March 2016

- Libraries of the Future (2 papers)

09 May 2016

- TBC - Final Public Safety Plan

20 July 2016

- VCFS Performance Framework
- Surrey County Council's use of RIPA

22 September 2016

13 October 2016

17 November 2016

TBC

TBC

**RESIDENT EXPERIENCE BOARD 2015/16
ACTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER – 13 JANUARY 2016**

The recommendations tracker allows Board Members to monitor responses, actions and outcomes against their recommendations or requests for further action. The tracker is updated following each Board. Once an action has been achieved and reported to the Board it will be removed from the tracker.

Date of meeting	Item	Ref:	Recommendations/Actions	Achieved/Outstanding?	Deadline	Responsible Cabinet Member/Member/Officer
16 OCTOBER 2015	UPDATE ON SFRS WORKSHOP	REB 4/2015	In discussion with Democratic Services, for SFRS to consider providing Members with CPR training, suggested holding around the full Council meeting. Update 30 November 2015: Training scheduled for Wednesday 16 December 2015 at Guildford Fire Station. Further events will be organised and circulated to Members in due course.	Outstanding	Update requested for the January meeting	Russell Pearson Katie Booth Martin Garrod Richard Walsh Kay Hammond
16 OCTOBER 2015 Page 19	DRAFT PUBLIC SAFETY PLAN	REB 5/2015	Members of the Board to engage with the consultation on the Public Safety Plan (PSP) and to promote to residents and groups the summary document that will be provided.	Outstanding	In line with consultation timeline for PSP	Russell Pearson Sally Wilson REB members Richard Walsh Kay Hammond
16 OCTOBER 2015	DRAFT PUBLIC SAFETY PLAN	REB 6/2015	To include further information on what happened next regarding case study on p30.	Outstanding	To be included in final PSP	Russell Pearson Sally Wilson Richard Walsh Kay Hammond
16 OCTOBER 2015	DRAFT PUBLIC SAFETY PLAN	REB 7/2015	Member Reference Group for SFRS Transformation and PSP to discuss best approach to public consultation. Update 30 November 2015: A discussion on the consultation approach was held at the Member Reference Group on Monday 23 November.	Achieved	To be discussed at ongoing MRG meetings	MRG members Russell Pearson Sally Wilson
16 OCTOBER 2015	DRAFT PUBLIC SAFETY PLAN	REB 8/2015	Performance and Finance Sub-Group to look at additional duties being carried out by SFRS and how it affects core services, and what additional financial	Outstanding	To be discussed at Performance and Finance	Rachael I Lake Russell Pearson Sally Wilson

			burdens these additional services put on the SFRS budget.		meetings	
16 OCTOBER 2015	DISCUSSION OF 'ENABLING CLOSER WORKING BETWEEN THE EMERGENCY SERVICES' CONSULTATION	REB 9/2015	To Cabinet Member and Associate Cabinet Member: The Board agrees with and supports collaboration between the emergency services, but has reservations about the possible governance structure proposed in the consultation. Update 30 November 2015: Response received on 24 November 2015 which was circulated by email on 30 November and is found in this agenda.	Achieved	Submitted to Cabinet for response on 24 November	Russell Pearson Sally Wilson Richard Walsh Kay Hammond
16 OCTOBER 2015 Page 20	ANNUAL SCRUTINY OF COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIPS	REB 10/2015	That the Community Safety Board develop a memorandum of understanding with the local Community Safety Partnerships. This should reflect that we can be stronger together and deliver better outcomes for residents through joint working, and include joint performance management arrangements for issues that are of common concern across the county, such as domestic abuse, anti-social behaviour and the Prevent work, to be sent to the Resident Experience Board within six months.	Outstanding	Within six months (by May REB)	Gordon Falconer Jane Last Louise Gibbins Richard Walsh Kay Hammond
16 OCTOBER 2015	ANNUAL SCRUTINY OF COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIPS	REB 11/2015	That scrutiny officers for county, district and borough councils and community safety officers review scrutiny arrangements for the Community Safety Partnerships, to confirm local scrutiny arrangements and consider whether the Resident Experience Board should focus on the scrutiny of the Community Safety Board and county-wide strategic issues or whether it should scrutinise local Community Safety Partnership activity in more detail, to be reported back to the Resident Experience Board within six months.	Outstanding	Within six months (by May REB)	Louise Gibbins Richard Walsh Kay Hammond
16	ANNUAL	REB	That the Cabinet Member:	Achieved	Submitted to	Richard Walsh

<p>OCTOBER 2015</p> <p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 21</p>	<p>SCRUTINY OF COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIPS</p>	<p>12/2015</p>	<p>- leads a discussion with County Members who sit on Community Safety Partnerships on how the work of the Community Safety Partnerships reflects local concerns and priorities of residents. - requests that the Cabinet Associate leads a discussion with the Lead Members Group to explore how the work of Community Safety Partnerships reflects local concerns and priorities of residents. - requests that the Community Partnership Team gathers evidence of how local concerns and priorities of residents are reflected by Community Safety Partnerships. and feeds this information back to a future Resident Experience Board meeting within six months.</p> <p>Update 30 November 2015: Response received on 24 November 2015 which was circulated by email on 30 November and is found in this agenda.</p>		<p>Cabinet for response on 24 November</p>	<p>Kay Hammond</p>
<p>16 OCTOBER 2015</p>	<p>ANNUAL SCRUTINY OF COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIPS</p>	<p>REB 13/2015</p>	<p>The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner offered to make available information on what community safety fund bids have been successful.</p> <p>Update 30 November 2015: A report was circulated by email on 30 November 2015 which went to the Police and Crime Panel outlining which applications were successful in 2014/15. The Office for the Police and Crime Commissioner is still in the process of awarding grants for this financial year so a final report won't be available until year end.</p>	<p>Achieved</p>	<p>OPCC to respond ASAP</p>	<p>Sarah Haywood</p>
<p>19 NOVEMBER 2015</p>	<p>CUSTOMER SERVICE EXCELLENCE IN HIGHWAYS AND</p>	<p>REB 14/2015</p>	<p>That the Board requests that the Highways team develops the asset management system to ensure that</p>	<p>Outstanding</p>	<p>Request update in February 2016 for</p>	<p>Mike Dawson John Furey Richard Walsh</p>

	TRANSPORT		all assets are logged (request update in 3 months).		March Agenda.	
19 NOVEMBER 2015	CUSTOMER SERVICE EXCELLENCE IN HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT	REB 15/2015	That the Board requests that the Highways team distribute the information leaflet brought to the Board to all Surrey libraries.	Outstanding	Request update in February 2016 for March Agenda.	Mike Dawson John Furey Richard Walsh
19 NOVEMBER 2015	CUSTOMER SERVICE EXCELLENCE IN HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT	REB 16/2015	That the Board requests that the Highways team develops a plan of engagement with local and joint committees to enable feedback that is given there to be logged into the main system.	Outstanding	Request update in February 2016 for March Agenda.	Mike Dawson John Furey Richard Walsh
19 NOVEMBER 2015 Page 22	CUSTOMER SERVICE EXCELLENCE IN HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT	REB 17/2015	That the Board requests that the Highways team writes to all residents who attended the Board explaining what went wrong and steps that are being taken to address these issues, and to copy this to the Board.	Outstanding	Request update in February 2016 for March Agenda.	Mike Dawson John Furey Richard Walsh
19 NOVEMBER 2015	CUSTOMER SERVICE EXCELLENCE IN HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT	REB 18/2015	That the Board requests that the Highways team works with County Councillors to emphasise their role in distributing key information to residents.	Outstanding	Request update in February 2016 for March Agenda.	Mike Dawson John Furey Richard Walsh
19 NOVEMBER 2015	CUSTOMER SERVICE EXCELLENCE IN HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT	REB 19/2015	That the Board requests that the Highways team encourages the Member Reference Group to continue monitoring the standard and timeliness of response to residents.	Outstanding	Request update in February 2016 for March Agenda.	Mike Dawson John Furey Richard Walsh
19 NOVEMBER 2015	PERFORMANCE AND FINANCE SUB-GROUP VERBAL UPDATE	REB 20/2015	The Board is impressed with the Socrata tool and feel it is highly valuable in terms of reassuring residents of the service that Surrey provides them.	Achieved. Responses from Tim Yarnell were circulated to the Board on 18/12/2015	Request update for January 2016 agenda.	Tim Yarnell Richard Walsh

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Board requests that the officers consider a search function for the website and to ensure that relevant information is presented on the pages. 2. The Board would like to see every department that collates performance data included on Socrata by the end of 2015. 			
<p>19 NOVEMBER 2015</p> <p>Page 23</p>	<p>PERFORMANCE AND FINANCE SUB-GROUP VERBAL UPDATE</p>	<p>REB 21/2015</p>	<p>The Performance and Finance Sub-Group has given consideration to the request from the Council Overview Board that Local Committee budgets be scrutinised by the Resident Experience Board. The Sub-Group does not feel that they can add value to this process and notes that scrutiny arrangements for some of the issues raised are already in place.</p> <p>The Sub-Group considered the direct benefit to residents, and although they felt that it would be difficult to scrutinise without looking at each individual case, which is done already by the Member and the Local Committee, they agreed it was a benefit to our communities.</p> <p>The Performance and Finance Sub-Group asks the Board to recommend to Cabinet that they protect this service which is valued by our residents and communities.</p> <p>Update 30 November 2015:</p>	<p>Achieved</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>

			Please note that following the REB meeting on 19 November the Chairman has reviewed the agreed recommendation around Local Committee budgets and asking Cabinet to protect them, as the budgets will be scrutinised by the Board as part of the upcoming budget scrutiny process. Following this process, the REB will then make recommendations to Cabinet. Information was circulated to the Board on 30 November 2015. The Chairman has formally responded to the recommendation from the Council Overview Board.			
19 NOVEMBER 2015 Page 24	PERFORMANCE AND FINANCE SUB-GROUP VERBAL UPDATE	REB 22/2015	The Board is satisfied with the progress made by Surrey Arts on the actions in the Management Action Plan, and recommends that Internal Audit conducts a follow-up review in April 2016.	Outstanding	April 2016	Philip Trumble Peter Milton Sue Lewry-Jones Richard Walsh
19 NOVEMBER 2015	PERFORMANCE AND FINANCE SUB-GROUP VERBAL UPDATE	REB 23/2015	That Surrey Arts considers the use of volunteers and looking at its business model.	Outstanding	April 2016	Philip Trumble Peter Milton Sue Lewry-Jones Richard Walsh
19 NOVEMBER 2015	PERFORMANCE AND FINANCE SUB-GROUP VERBAL UPDATE	REB 24/2015	The Board is satisfied with the progress made by Surrey Fire and Rescue Service on the actions in the Management Action Plan, and recommends that Internal Audit conducts a follow-up review in the summer of 2016.	Outstanding	September 2016	Ian Thomson Russell Pearson Sue Lewry-Jones Richard Walsh

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL

RESIDENT EXPERIENCE BOARD

DATE: 13TH JANUARY 2016

LEAD OFFICER: STEVE RUDDY
HEAD OF TRADING STANDARDS

SUBJECT: THE NEW JOINT TRADING STANDARDS SERVICE
UPDATE ON PROGRESS

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

The new Joint Trading Standards Service for Buckinghamshire and Surrey was launched on 1st April 2015.

The new service is providing an improved service for residents and businesses in both counties whilst at the same time making efficiency savings and increasing income generation.

This report summarises the progress made in the first eight months of the new service. It invites the Board to note the progress, and to identify any issues which they would want to explore in more detail at future meetings.

The new service has been created against a challenging context nationally where the pressures faced by Trading Standards, and reduced resources, have resulted in three national reviews being launched looking at how the service should be delivered and what its priorities should be. The report provides an update on those reviews.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that:

1. The Residents Experience Board note this report and identify any issues they would like to consider in more detail at future meetings.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Resident Experience Board has a responsibility to oversee a range of service areas including Trading Standards. The Board has previously asked for an update on progress with the new shared Buckinghamshire and Surrey Trading Standards service.

DETAILS:

1.0 BACKGROUND

1.1 The Trading Standards service exists to:

- Protect individuals, communities and businesses from harm and financial loss,
- Help businesses to thrive by maintaining a fair trading environment,
- Improve the health and wellbeing of people and communities, and
- Fulfil the council's statutory responsibilities to deliver consumer and public protection services.

1.2 The new joint service was created and designed to:

- provide a better quality service to consumers, businesses and our partners,
- build on the strengths and successes of the previous two teams
- provide additional expertise and capacity to create a stronger, more resilient service,
- have a greater impact and influence locally, regionally and nationally,
- reduce our delivery costs, offering better value for money, and
- be more innovative in developing new services and protecting residents.

1.3 A growing service challenge is tackling organised cross border crime, rogue traders, scams and the growth of internet enabled crime. Increasingly, consumer crime, rogue traders, and scams, are cross border problems. A rogue trader doesn't just operate in one area. A scam targets the most vulnerable not a locality. Internet crime isn't geographically limited. A larger shared service provides the scale, capacity, competence and the range of expertise required to more effectively tackle such issues and offer better protection to residents.

1.4 Previously both Buckinghamshire and Surrey Trading Standards services have made significant budget savings, In Surrey the implementation of the Public Value Review of Trading Standards delivered service improvements and savings of 20%. Further savings were made in 2013/14 and the Medium Term Financial Plan required further savings of 12% in the period 14/15 to 18/19. The creation of the shared service enhances service resilience and enables the required savings to be made without damaging front line services, and without reducing the vital protection afforded to residents

1.5 The joint service was launched in 1st April 2015 and hence is still very new. The transition to the new service was successful despite some initial IT connectivity issues with BT Openreach. The service staff are all now employed by Surrey County Council (23 staff transferring from Buckinghamshire to Surrey in April 2015) and remain based in Redhill and Aylesbury, ensuring a strong local presence in each county.

- 1.6 The service is overseen by a newly created Joint Committee comprising the Portfolio Holders from both local authorities and their two deputies. From Surrey the joint Committee Members are Cllr Richard Walsh and Cllr Kay Hammond.
- 1.7 The Business Case, including anticipated benefits from the creation of the shared service, was agreed by the Cabinet's in both Surrey CC and Buckinghamshire CC in October 2014.
- 1.8 An Inter Authority Agreement sets the legal framework for the partnership and the proportions of contributions to the budget from each partner. The business case includes the budget for the Service in 2015/16 and for the following 3 years. It sets out a range of anticipated service benefits, cost reductions, and areas where income will be increased.
- 1.9 The creation of the new shared service has enabled us to achieve the required savings (as set out in the Medium Term Financial Plan) without any damaging impact on service delivery and without reducing protection for Surrey residents. It also puts the service in a stronger position to face future challenges.

2.0 VISION

The Vision for the shared service is as follows:

“Buckinghamshire and Surrey Trading Standards working together to protect our communities, delivering excellent public services, locally trusted and nationally recognised.”

3.0 PRIORITIES

3.1 The new service priorities, agreed by both Cabinets are:

- **Protection: protecting individuals, communities and businesses from harm and financial loss**
- **Economic Prosperity: Helping businesses to thrive and supporting growth**
- **Improving Health and Wellbeing**
- **Innovation**
- **Customer Focus / Resident Experience**

3.2. Protection

3.2.1 This is a central priority for the new service. In April the new Joint Committee agreed a new joint Enforcement and Investigation policy. The vulnerability and impact on victims is a key consideration in determining which cases require further investigation by the service. There have been several major prosecution cases in the first few months of the service and the investigation

case load continues to increase. Doorstep crime and scams continue to be an issue of major concern.

- 3.2.2 We have taken an active part in the national Scams Awareness month and are working closely with the national Scams Hub team with one of our officers seconded to that team. We receive priority referrals from the national team and officers visit scam victims to provide support to residents. In appropriate cases we can arrange for telephone call blockers to be installed in homes to stop incoming scam calls and to provide us with information and intelligence on their source.
- 3.2.3 Examples of successful cases concluded in the last 8 months include:
The case a serial rogue trader who targeted elderly and vulnerable residents across Surrey and defrauded them of over £100,000 was sentenced to three years imprisonment for fraud and money laundering. He charged extortionate sums for repairs to roofs and drains. He preyed on elderly people, using lies and emotional blackmail to gain their sympathy, and even drove some victims to the bank to ensure they withdrew funds. At least nine victims were conned out of £104,000, including an 89-year-old war veteran who was cheated out of more than £42,000 making him overdrawn for the first time in his life.
- 3.2.4 In another case an Epsom based landscape gardener who preyed on elderly and vulnerable victims who were unable to look after their own gardens was convicted of several fraud and money laundering offences and sentenced to three and a half years imprisonment. Customers complained that queries about price or the standard of work led to threats, verbal abuse and aggression. In one case, a woman in her 90s was charged £24,500 for work worth only £400. In another case, a man was charged £17,000 for work valued at £200. In total, in relation to 8 different cases, over £665,000 was defrauded from elderly and vulnerable victims.
- 3.2.4 In another case a Surrey based importer of fake DVDs, who ignored several warning to stop importing fakes from China, conning customers, undermining legitimate local businesses, and defrauding HMRC, was convicted and jailed. As well as a prison sentence he has been ordered to pay £500,000 under Proceeds of Crime legislation, and his assets are restrained by the courts until he does so.
- 3.2.5 One case in particular demonstrated how the service protects the most vulnerable. A designer, importer and retailer of a highly dangerous cot-bed was convicted of consumer safety offences after two extremely close near misses where young children were very nearly killed by the potentially deadly cot-bed.
- 3.2.6 The shared service, working closely with the Communications teams in both local authorities, has helped maximise the impact and coverage of these cases, and others. They have generated significantly more coverage than would have been the case for either service operating alone.
- 3.2.7 The new service, through combining legal and investigative resources and expertise is enhancing our ability to tackle consumer problems and rogue traders.

3.3 Economic Prosperity

- 3.3.1 The new shared service has also continued to enhance the services we are providing for our businesses. All our business services are available across Surrey and Buckinghamshire.
- 3.3.2 Our Primary Authority Partnerships with businesses such as British Gas, Toyota, Shell, Esso, Toshiba, Dairy Crest, Premier Foods etc continue to grow. Several of these are with trade associations ensuring we are also supporting small businesses. The partnership with the Association of Convenience Stores alone enables assured advice to be provided to 30,000 businesses.
- 3.3.3 Being in a Primary Authority Partnership helps business manage relationships with hundreds of regulators and local authorities across the UK. It simplifies the regulatory process, reducing the burden on businesses and cutting the cost of compliance. Therefore it provides businesses with an assurance of consistency and greater confidence.
- 3.3.4 Our innovative approach also enables the service to be the single point of contact for businesses seeking advice on a wide range of issues including Trading Standards, Health and Safety, Environmental Health and Fire Safety. Our business focused approach has helped see this area of work grow from 42 partnerships to 73 in the last 8 months, with more on the way.
- 3.3.5 Several major businesses, such as Waitrose and Pfizer, have chosen to work with the service rather than other providers specifically because of strengths of the new shared service.
- 3.3.6 The service offers regulatory advice to all Surrey businesses. The first half an hour is free and after that it becomes chargeable. Almost 800 Surrey businesses have registered with us for our advice service.



3.3 Improving Health and Wellbeing

- 3.4.1 We are working in partnership with the Public Health teams in both authorities on a range of initiatives. The Eat Out Eat Well award for restaurants and caterers who offer healthier options, continues to grow and we now have 237 Surrey businesses with the award. The scheme is operated in partnership with local District and Borough Environmental Health teams and it rewards caterers who make it easier for their customers to make healthy choices when eating out.
- 3.4.2 The service is responsible for enforcing food standards (not hygiene issues) for example the labelling, advertising and quality of food to ensure consumers are not misled. We have agreed a new joint Food Plan for the service which brings together the resources and expertise from both counties to focus on tackling issues of highest risk.

- 3.4.3 We have worked in both counties to successfully tackle retailers of Novel Psychoactive Substances (“legal highs”). Despite the difficulties in applying the legislation, and in advance of the new legal ban, we have successfully disrupted the local supply from the known retail premises in both counties, effectively stopping retailers selling these unsafe products. This included three Surrey retailers, one in Ashford and two in Guildford. In November this culminated in Guildford magistrates ordering the forfeiture and destruction of product seized earlier in the year. The service has also highlighted the dangers of NPS through education initiatives, with partners, aimed at colleges and universities in Buckinghamshire and Surrey.
- 3.4.4 We continue to tackle problems of illegal sales of alcohol and tobacco to young people and to tackle the supply of illicit tobacco, utilising sniffer dogs in both counties to identify and seize illegal tobacco.
- 3.4.5 The service has also been active in other areas where vulnerable people may be susceptible to manipulation or fraud. In one example where there was information that a product was being sold as a miracle cure for Cancer (as well as Ebola, HIV, Malaria and Autism) the Service took immediate action to ensure that potential victims were alerted and that a potentially unsafe product could not be sold in Surrey.
- 3.4.6 Most recently the service has been active in tackling the importation and supply of potentially dangerous products including “hoverboards”. This has included offering advice and information to Surrey businesses on how to ensure their products were safe, and also impounding unsafe imports at Heathrow.

3.5 Innovation

- 3.5.1 By bringing together our legal functions we have improved and streamlined our legal work enabling us to speed up cases and to reduce costs by working together.
- 3.5.2 By working with a private sector partner (Checktrade) we have rapidly expanded the number of business who are Trading Standards approved. This enables residents to easily find reputable traders in their area. The new approach involves the service undertaking additional enhanced checks for potential Checktrade members (the service recovers the cost of carrying out the additional checks). Under our previous scheme we reached a maximum of 450 Trading Standards approved traders in Surrey after many years of operation and growth had stalled. **Our new partnership already has over 1,300 Trading Standards approved Surrey based businesses.** Over time we expect this to continue to grow to a total of 2,500. This will help increase awareness and choice for residents, and help us improve compliance with a much higher number of businesses, all at no cost to the Council or to residents.
- 3.5.3 Building upon the Volunteer scheme already in place in Buckinghamshire (with 53 volunteers) the joint service has continued to develop the use and engagement of volunteers in to help protect residents. In Surrey volunteer numbers are now growing and include a diverse range of activities from helping to prevent scam mail to supporting a local community group to develop a lorry watch initiative. We have also provided training to groups such



as Age UK Volunteers, Victim Support Volunteers and Surrey Independent Living Council.

3.6 Customer Focus / Resident Wellbeing

- 3.6.1 The service receives most of its customer demand from notifications and referrals from the Citizens Advice Consumer Service. Their helpline is delivered from several regional contact centres and is funded by central Government to provide advice to people about any consumer issue. Information is then passed to local authority Trading Standards services, usually on an information only basis. The service then reviews the incoming demand. Intervention is focused on those issues that affect the most vulnerable residents, those that cause the most overall consumer detriment, or that relate to safety issues. The service is only able to investigate a small percentage of incoming demand issues.
- 3.6.2 By bringing together both services has enabled us to look in more detail at a higher number of complaints and, in about a third of those cases, to resolve an issue for the resident or business before it becomes a more complex investigation. This triage approach ensures a greater focus on the needs of residents and ensures that we understand the issue, how it relates to the Services priorities and what we can do about it before it reaches our complex investigation teams. Using this approach allows us to prioritise issues affecting the most vulnerable people and causing the most resident detriment or harm.
- 3.6.3 If Members would like to see how incoming demand is dealt with in more detail they are invited to visit the small team which handles this incoming resident demand for the joint service. The team is based in Aylesbury.
- 3.6.4 Positive media coverage of our work helps raise resident awareness and helps in preventing problems. We have continued to have a high level of media, with local, national and international coverage since April covering press, social media, radio and TV. We have also increased the reach of our preventative work. The TS Alert average distribution has increased to around 2,500 subscribers. Facebook likes have increased from 463 to 619; Twitter followers have increased from 2821 to 3016.
- 3.6.5 In addition to investigating crimes which have occurred, the Service uses a number of initiatives to prevent victimisation and re-victimisation by rogue traders. These include the use of door stickers and overt CCTV cameras at the doorstep. We are also developing the use of “cocooning” packs to reduce the opportunity for rogue traders to target multiple households in a close area.
- 3.6.6 Our new scams awareness sticker packs, produced in partnership with Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner, supplement our previous doorstep crime sticker packs and are widely distributed in both counties. Over 100,000 packs have been printed and distributed across the county.
- 3.6.7 Our use of Accredited Financial Investigators and Proceeds of Crime legislation means we can recoup money to help compensate victims of crime. Working together as part of a larger specialist team has enhanced our capacity in this area and hence our impact. The most recent success has been the court order in December 2015 requiring a Surrey based rogue trader

to repay 10 Surrey residents a total of £114,000. This is particularly significant as many of the victims are elderly and vulnerable.

- 3.6.8 The joint service is committed to ensuring a continued strong local presence and delivery. Specific named officers have a responsibility for liaison with particular Districts and Boroughs. Local update reports are programmed for Local Committees to help ensure that local link is maintained. Those reports focus even more on the local issues of concern.

4.0 DELIVERING THE BUSINESS CASE BENEFITS INTO THE FUTURE

- 4.1.1 Financial Savings from the creation of the shared service are well on track to be delivered. Current projections are that we are likely to exceed our income projections for the year (primarily from growth of service provision to businesses). The service is well placed to ensure it delivers the benefits detailed in the business case over the next few years.
- 4.1.2 We are working to enhance the service locally, and the profession more widely, by making a strong commitment to training. The shared service has been able to create additional trainee posts (where the individual is undertaking professional qualifications) We are also working to develop an innovative Trading Standards specific apprenticeship. (In the past the closest linked apprenticeship NVQ's have been Business & Administration or Customer Services).
- 4.1.3 The service is now considering the scope to expand further. This could be from delivery services for other local authorities or through adding a new partner to our shared service to further strengthen the service.

5.0 NATIONAL SCRUTINY OF THE DELIVERY OF TRADING STANDARDS

- 5.1 Whilst we have been creating our new joint service there have been a range of developments nationally.
- 5.2 In June the Chartered Trading Standards Institute published a vision for the future of Trading Standards. The vision identified a range of problems with the delivery of trading standards services, including a postcode lottery of provision, arguing that nationally the current model of delivery was broken following significant cuts to trading standards and called on government to commission detailed work on the future of the service including reviewing the model for the delivery of Trading Standards services.
- 5.3 In June the Chancellor's Productivity Plan was published immediately after the Budget. In that he announced a review of Trading Standards "to ensure that consumer enforcement capability effectively supports competition and better regulation objectives". The review, being led by BIS will consider efficiency and financial sustainability for Trading Standards. It aims to better define the Governments expectations of Trading Standards. It will examine Trading Standards ability to meet the demands placed on it by central and local government and what could help its delivery and impact, including delivery models and the scope for better regulation.

- 5.4 In July the Local Government Association (LGA) announced their own review to examine the future of Trading Standards. The objectives of the LGA review are:

“On the basis of political and senior managerial input from across local government, analyse what local government needs from its trading standards service, with reference to both the current state of the service in England and what it can be reasonably be expected to deliver in the context of further funding reductions.

Subsequently explore and assess the options for the future of the service, with a view to outlining a series of recommended next steps to further explore and take forward.”

- 5.5 The National Audit Office (NAO) will also be undertaking a review of the wider consumer protection landscape and will report in mid 2016.
- 5.6 Both the BIS and LGA Reviews are gathering evidence now and are expected to report very shortly.
- 5.7 Yvonne Rees, Strategic Director for Customers and Communities at SCC has been appointed as a member of the Stakeholder Panel as part of the LGA review.
- 5.8 The Joint Committee responded to the current consultation on the future of Trading Standards and a copy of that submission is attached as Annex 1.
- 5.9 The reviews may well have reported by the date of the Board meeting in which case a verbal update can be provided.

CONSULTATION:

Many of the issues and the progress made have previously been reported to the Joint Committee in October 2015.

RISK MANAGEMENT AND IMPLICATIONS:

The Inter Authority Agreement for the shared service deals with risk management issues and there are no additional risk management issues arising from this report.

Financial and Value for Money Implications

The Joint Service is on target to deliver the financial benefits set out and agreed in the business case.

Legal Implications

The Inter-Authority Agreement completed by Buckinghamshire and Surrey County Councils prior to the launch of the Service in April provides the legal framework within which the Service is operating. This is working effectively and there is no current need to amend this in any way. Managers in the Service will continue to keep this under review.

The report makes a number of references to relevant legal processes and proceedings that the Service has been involved in over the last 8 months, but there are no other specific legal issues that need to be drawn to the attention of the Committee.

Equalities and Diversity

Equalities and Diversity issues were considered fully in the process of creating the joint service and the associated business case includes an Equalities Impact Assessment. This report does not change any of the considerations included in the business case or in that Equalities Impact Assessment.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT:

1. If the Board requests any further reports on the issues raised then they will be brought to a future meeting.

Contact Officer:

Steve Ruddy, Head of Trading Standards - 01372 371730

Consulted:

Annex 1: Response to the LGA and BIS reviews of the delivery of Trading Standards.

Sources/background papers: None