

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the **RESIDENT EXPERIENCE BOARD** held at 10.00 am on 20 July 2016 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Board at its meeting on Thursday, 22 September 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
- \* Ms Barbara Thomson
- Mr Karan Persand
- Mr Alan Young
- Mr Ramon Gray
- \* Ms Denise Turner-Stewart

**In attendance**

Richard Walsh, Cabinet Member for Localities and Community Wellbeing

**1/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Alan Young, Robert Evans, Ramon Gray and Jan Mason. Chris Norman is substituting for Alan Young and Margaret Hicks is substituting for Ramon Gray.

**2/16 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]**

The minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting on 30 June will be tabled at the next meeting on Thursday 22 September 2016.

**3/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests.

**4/16 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]**

There were no questions or petitions.

**5/16 QUESTIONS FROM SOCIAL MEDIA [Item 5]**

1. The Chairman of the Board informed Members that Democratic Services had run a Twitter poll. Social media users voted on questions that they wished the Resident Experience Board Chairman to answer. The poll was to encourage engagement on social media between the Board and Surrey's residents. The Chairman answered all three questions that were successful in the vote.

**Question 1** - What sparked your passion for resident engagement and what do you see as the future for resident engagement over the coming years?

2. The Chairman responded that everything the Board did centred on serving Surrey's residents, including engagement with residents before, during and after decisions are made. Unfortunately, in many cases residents provide feedback at a time when something had gone wrong. The Chairman went on to say that residents needed to be encouraged to give input to the decision making process earlier so that decisions made by the Council are focused on what the needs of the residents are and not what the Council believe they are.

**Question 2** - What are the primary benefits/challenges of moving to a digital delivery model for Council Services?

3. The Chairman explained that the benefits of using a digital delivery model could make Council services more accessible to a larger percentage of Surrey's population, particularly for younger generation. The Chairman conceded that a big challenge would be communicating the availability of these online services, and making sure what was communicated was relevant and interesting.

**Question 3** - How can the public influence and engage in the work of the Resident Experience Board?

4. The Chairman replied, the Resident Experience Board's purpose is to scrutinise any department within the County Council that directly engages with Surrey residents. He explained that in doing this, the Board was keen to look at Services' engagement processes and assessing what can be improved. This could be supported by residents sending in questions, informing the Board of their experiences; in doing so, residents would help set agendas and work programmes for future meetings.
5. In response to these answers, a Member emphasised that resident needs and wishes can be two different things and differentiating between them was important. Members also added that the older generation should not be forgotten and every avenue should be explored and opened up in terms of the digital delivery model. Furthermore, a Member shared the view that working alongside Local Committees would promote putting items in the right context.

**6/16 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE BOARD [Item 6]**

There were no responses to report.

**7/16 RECOMMENDATION TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 7]**

1. The Chairman thanked the Cabinet Member's response regarding recommendation REB 17/2016, in relation to community engagement in the local decision making process.
2. A Member queried whether the Resident Experience Board was the right Board for Community Recycling Centre related issues. The Chairman clarified that it would be a matter for Economic Prosperity, Environment and Highways Board.
3. There was a discussion around the flooding and community engagement item which is scheduled to come to the Board on 17 November 2016. Members encouraged residents who were affected by the flooding to attend the meeting to share their experience.
4. The Strategic Director for Customer and Communities informed the Board that the Reforms to the Death Certification Process & Introduction of the Medical Examiner item would be better served when further information on the reforms was available; therefore it was suggested the item was unsuitable to come to the Board meeting on 17 November 2016. It was agreed by the Board to defer the item to 2017.

## **8/16 THE IMPACT ON SURREY'S COUNTY CORONER RELATING TO DEPRIVATION OF LIBERTY SAFEGUARDS [Item 8]**

### **Declarations of interest:**

None

### **Witnesses:**

Giles Adey, Coroner Service Manager  
Yvonne Rees, Strategic Director for Customer and Communities  
Jim Poyser, Senior Manager, Mental Capacity Act and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards  
Andy Butler, Principal Social Worker  
Andy Tink, Senior Principal Accountant

### **Key points raised during discussion:**

1. The Chairman briefed the Board that it was essential to understand the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS) before understanding the impact and the purpose of the report.
2. Officers introduced the report by informing the Board that a dedicated team within Adult Social Care was in place which gave advice to the applicant families and carers, ensuring that procedures were followed. Training involved a full five day programme to cover the complexities surrounding the area and level of detail.
3. Officers explained that in essence DoLS are there to ensure the protection of individuals that are dependent on third party treatment because they are vulnerable. The legislation in place aimed to ensure the prevention of harm to vulnerable people through requiring carers and medical professionals to and act in the best interest of those in their care.
4. The Board were informed that under the Mental Capacity Act 2009 (MCA), an application to restrict and restrain a person was made through the Court of Protection. Although a system was in place, central Government was still seeking to install a more efficient system for managing DoLS applications. Due to changes in legislation, statistics had shown a sharp increase in applications being submitted, which in turn created other issues and concerns around demand on the Coroner's Service.
5. The Chairman of the Board sought clarification on the average time a DoLS application was completed and authorised. Officers indicated two types of authorisations, standard and urgent. Due to financial pressures, applications were prioritised, Officers explained that there was over 5000 outstanding applications awaiting approval.
6. Surrey County Council supports the Coroner Service financially, with some additional funding from Surrey Police. Surrey has a busy coronial district including 5 prisons, a significant highways network,

and these factors bring considerable work for the County Coroner, alongside DoLS.

7. Members expressed concern over the backlog of 5037 DoLS applications and queried whether plans were in place to reduce this. Officers explained that they didn't anticipate a reduction because a number of points in the process cause delays. Officers also outlined that if Adult Social Care Officers were able to process the outstanding applications, this could cause a significant increase in demand for DoLS inquiries for the Coroner Service.
8. The Board indicated whether any funding could be sought to help ease the pressures on the Service. Officers informed Members that the Council had been actively lobbying for additional funding and that the Department of Health gave initial funding to councils as the additional burden came through the Courts and not through the legislation change.
9. The Cabinet Member for Localities and Community Wellbeing acknowledged that significant additional funding would be required to deal with the potential pressure on the Coroner's Service.,
10. Members expressed concern around the amount of time that was required to complete the assessment process for a DoLS application and requested more information on this. In response to that Officers informed Members that due to legislation there was little room for flexibility as the service had to comply with set rules and regulations within the six separate assessments.
11. There was a discussion around where the help and responsibility lied with regards to supporting the families involved, in particular for when there were delays in releasing the body. Officers explained there were bereavement services available for affected families, and that the service always aimed to reduce the time before bodies can be released. Where a DoLS inquiry is required, Officers indicated that families were assigned a dedicated liaison Officer to help support that family through the process.

### **Recommendations:**

The Board recommends:

- That the Coroner Service and Adult Social Care continue to work together to discuss the ongoing implications of DoLs.
- That the Chairman writes to the Chief Coroner, the DoH and the Law Commission to lobby for a timetable in terms of the publication of the Law Commissions proposed changes, and when they are likely to be implemented.

**9/16 REGULATION OF INVESTIGATORY POWERS ACT 2000 (RIPA) REVIEW  
2015/2016 [Item 9]**

**Declarations of interest:**

None

**Witnesses:**

Steve Ruddy, Head of Trading Standards

**Key points raised during discussions:**

1. The Officer introduced the report by reminding the Board that there was a requirement to annually review the County Council's use of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (RIPA).
2. The report outlined the background of RIPA, focused on the types of activity that RIPA could be used for and summarised how Trading Standards had used RIPA over the last year.
3. The Officer also mentioned that although the Trading Standards were the sole Council user of RIPA, in the period covered, in future and in appropriate circumstances, other services, could utilise RIPA when investigating serious crime.
4. The Board were advised that the Investigatory Powers Bill was beginning to go through the Parliamentary process and once law, updates to the RIPA process may need to be made accordingly. Officers conceded that it was not yet clear what changes may be made.
5. In addition the report mentioned that the last audit by The Office of Surveillance Commissioners took place in November 2014. The feedback received from the report indicated an efficient and robust system was in place. Some minor recommendations came out of the review and had been implemented subsequently.
6. Members sought clarification on the Covert Human Intelligence Source authorisations; whether such operations included the use of secret shoppers to tackle under age sales. The Officer clarified that the report focused primarily on RIPA, however, covert operations were often conducted by the Police. The Officer was not aware of any Covert Human Intelligence Source authorisations exercised by the Trading Standard in the period the report covers. The Chairman of the Board advised that further information needed to be provided to understand which services were carrying out the different kinds of investigative operations.
7. With the new Bill coming in, Members wanted to know the possible effects on RIPA regulations. The Officer advised the Board that the main change will be to modernise legislation to make it more fit for the

digital age, to tackle problems which did not exist when legislation was originally written.

**Recommendations:**

- The Board agreed to the recommendations outlined in the report.

**Actions:**

The Board noted the summary of the Council's use of RIPA.

**10/16 PROTECTION RESIDENTS OF BUCKINGHAMSHIRE AND SURREY [Item 10]**

**Declarations of interest:**

None

**Witnesses:**

Steve Ruddy, Head of Trading Standards

**Key points raised during discussions:**

1. The Officer outlined the main themes that were contained within the report, including: how residents access could consumer advice; how residents could be protected from scams, and Buckinghamshire and Surrey Trading Standards' use of Proceeds of Crime legislation. The Board were asked to help continue the development of new approaches and partnerships to better protect residents, especially the most vulnerable people in the community.
2. The Board were informed that residents were signposted to contact the Citizen Advice Consumer Services (CiTACS) for consumer advice and assistance. Trading Standards analyse the complaints and information received via CiTACS and other sources and use the intelligence to determine which cases to investigate further.
3. The Officer also highlighted some key points from the report with regards to tackling scams and financial abuse. Some examples of this were: lonely older people are more likely to be at risk of being scammed; dementia causes a fluctuation of mental capacity; technology facilitates the issue of scams, and scams can be a major factor in the decline of health in older people, and undermines wellbeing and quality of life.
4. The Board were also addressed on how Trading Standards communicated with residents, the officer was keen to demonstrate the balance used to tailor information to all audiences. For example for those who do not have access to social media, material is distributed via doorstep or in places where vulnerable people go such as libraries and pharmacies. Trading Standards utilised social media sources such

as Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn and Twitter, and have achieved a large number of followers.

5. The Officers made reference to Checkatrade and Trustmark who Trading Standards work in partnership with in promoting approved, accredited traders that residents may use confidently. The two schemes were designed to help drive out rogue traders in both counties.
6. There was a discussion around call blocking services and the Board were addressed on a device which had been fitted in homes to accommodate those who were victims of scam calls. Since starting this provision, around 11,500 calls had been blocked and feedback had shown positive results.
7. Members were briefed on Trading Standards' use of Proceeds of Crime legislation; how criminal assets were reallocated and compensated back to victims.
8. Members expressed the importance for simple and understandable information to be circulated and available to all different types of audience, in particular for people with special education needs and disabilities. The Officer assured the Board that information was already tailored and produced for all audiences was readily available.
9. Officers informed the Board of a recent successful prosecution in Guildford, where residents were a victim of deceptive sales, Trading Standards were in the process of discussing compensation for the victims.
10. Members referred back to RIPA, in particular with regards to communication and whether there was a network of sharing information and promote using those resources to identify problems pro-actively. Officers explained that joint checks are taken and intelligence is shared nationally.
11. Officers clarified some concerns regarding Checkatrade, explaining to Members that the system was more robust than it used to be, and a positive scheme for both Counties. Officers further assured the Board the Checkatrade system worked very well and further added that companies which falsely advertised membership to the scheme can face criminal charges. Officers suggested that the Checkatrade Chief-Executive may be invited to attend a future Board meeting to answer further queries if the Board decide an update on the scheme should be considered a future item for scrutiny.
12. Members queried what proportion of assets recovered was compensated back to the victims of crime. The Officer explained that victims would receive as much compensation as possible from the assets from the proceeds of crime raised. If there was a surplus of assets after identified victims had been fully reimbursed, then the



remainder would be distributed to the Home Office, HM Courts and Tribunal Service the prosecution and investigative authorities.

13. The Officer reported that the funding behind the leaflets tabled at the meeting was provided from private sector sponsorships, funds received from the Proceeds of Crime and the office of the Surrey Police Crime Commissioner. The Officer offered provide Member's with a stock of leaflets if they wanted to distribute them in their divisions.
14. Board Members suggested that, in order to save funds, electronic versions of leaflets should be circulated through online media to widen the awareness of scams and the work of Trading Standards. In addition it was proposed, in an effort to promote the website, the TS Alert link should be shared and circulated as effectively as possible by Members.
15. Officers clarified to the Board that the voluntary sector may get involved in the scam conferences that are due to take place, promoting the expansion of a broader network.

**Actions:**

The Board congratulated Trading Standards for the approach taken to protect residents and supported the range of initiatives taken to protect residents from scams in Buckinghamshire and Surrey.

In particular, the Board supported the proposal to hold a Scams conference later this year and associated new initiatives such as Friends Against Scams and encouraged Members to partake in a Stand Against Scams training session to become Scamchampions or Scambassadors, and use their knowledge actively in their role as Councillors.

**11/16 PERFORMANCE & FINANCE SUB GROUP VERBAL UPDATE [Item 11]**

**Key points raised during discussions:**

1. The Chairman of the Performance and Finance Sub-Group gave the Board an overview of the findings from the recent Performance and Finance Sub-Group meeting.
2. The Board endorsed recommendations raised from the meeting.

**Recommendations:**

- The Board requests that IMT officers provide Cultural Services with an update on the MARS system.
- The Board requests that IMT officers set a launch date for Weybridge so that the ceremonies team can be integrated in Leatherhead.

- The Board requests that IMT officers provide Cultural Services with an update as to when improvements will be made to ORBIT.
- The Board requests that Cultural Services and IMT Officers to investigate commercial opportunities of the online registration and ceremonies booking system (ORBIT and MARS).
- The Board requests that Cultural Services explore further alternative and sustainable income streams or service models for Surrey Arts and Adult Learning.
- In view of the potential savings in staff time and the opportunity for income generation, the Board recommends that the two relevant Cabinet Members work together to help support Cultural Services and IMT Officers achieve the recommendations outlined.

**12/16 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 12]**

The next Resident Experience Board will take place on 22 September 2016 at 10:30am in County Hall.

Meeting ended at: 12:55pm

---

**Chairman**