

MINUTES of the meeting of the **RESIDENT EXPERIENCE BOARD** held at 10.00 am on 22 September 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, 13 October 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

Ex officio Members:

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

Substitute Members:

Mr Richard Wilson

In attendance

Kay Hammond, Cabinet Associate for Fire and Police Services

63/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies for absence were received from Mike Bennison, Yvonna Lay, Robert Evans and John Orrick. Richard Wilson substituted for Mike Bennison.

64/16 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS [Item 2]

Minutes from the previous meetings were agreed as a true and accurate record.

65/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

No declarations of interest were received.

66/16 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

No questions or petitions were received.

67/16 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SCRUTINY BOARD [Item 5]

There were no responses from Cabinet to report.

68/16 RECOMMENDATION TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 6]

1. The Chairman informed the Board that a number of recommendations were in progress and remained outstanding, these concerned the letter to the Chief Coroner and the recommendations in relation to the Performance & Finance Sub-Group, of which the latter were on hold until budgetary planning was agreed by Cabinet.
2. There was a discussion around the Armed Forces Covenant (AFC). Surrey County Council's Armed Forces Champion asked the Board to consider whether risks to armed forces personnel should be included within the Council's risk assessments that each Board/Committee receives as part of the Council's decision making process. The Chairman advised the request should be looked into by Democratic Services, to see whether it was possible to implement, or whether the Board could take an item on the subject in the future
3. One Member highlighted that there were three outstanding recommendations for the Library Task Group and whether the item should come back to the Board to help accelerate the pace and development. The Chairman explained the Task Group had been very busy over the summer, where visits were made to a variety of library branches across the County. The Board were informed that the Task Group intended to meet very soon and would be happy to bring their initial findings back to the Board as an interim report. The Cabinet Member for Localities and Community was pleased to note that the Libraries Task Group was making progress and welcomed any contribution from Members of the Task Group. The Task Group commended the work and dedication of the volunteers supporting Surrey's Community Partnered Libraries, and recognised that their

hard work was a contribution to the successful running of the ongoing library service.

4. The Board reviewed the forward work plan and were given notice that the next Resident Experience Board will be held at the Surrey History Centre in October, the schedule for this meeting was being finalised and would be circulated to Members in due course.

Actions:

- Interim Report to be added to the Board's Forward Work Programme.

69/16 SURREY COMMUNITY SAFETY BOARD [Item 7]

Declarations of Interest:

None

Witnesses:

Joanna Grimshaw, Anti Social Behaviour Manager, Surrey Police
Chief Inspector Nolan Heather, Surrey Police
Jane Last, Head of Community Partnerships & Safety
Gordon Falconer, Community Safety Manager
Louise Gibbins, Community Safety Officer

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. An Officer introduced the report by outlining that as a two tier authority, Surrey has the Community Safety Board (CSB) and a network of Community Safety Partnerships (CSP). The CSPs operate at Borough and District level and their work has an emphasis on local issues. On the other hand the CSB oversees the strategic elements of Community Safety. Membership of the CSB is wide and includes District and Borough representation, allowing the link between the local level and strategic level to integrate.
2. The Board was advised that annually the CSB sets its county wide community safety priorities which implements action on the ground at District and Borough level, managed by a coordinating group who have a strategy and action plan to deliver their priority. Mental health was identified as one of the key issues arising from these priorities and notable work was undertaken to deliver the action plan during the past year.
3. An Officer informed the Board of the ongoing work in implementing the new legislation within the Anti Social Behaviour Crime & Policing Act 2014, delivering a framework from the strategic level to the CSPs. Case studies provided in the report [Item 8] showed the work being carried out had made a difference for Surrey residents.
4. The Chairman invited witnesses and wanted to explore how the police service deals with issues mentioned above on the front line. The Anti Social Behavioural Manager from Surrey Police explained how the CSB allows work to be escalated on the operational side, giving

opportunities that were not available before, allowing work to be carried out with a smarter approach. There were concerns around the absence of professionals in multi agency meetings and that this area would need improvement so there is no disconnect.

5. The Community Safety Officer referred to the new legislation, Anti Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act, and assured the Board it gave the service the opportunity to deal with Anti Social Behaviour (ASB) in a more modern, efficient and appropriate way. The Officer highlighted that there were plans to get the victims voice in the agenda, as Officers recognised that it was not being identified at most levels, especially at low level incidents which still had huge impacts.
6. The Chief Inspector shared the concerns and emphasised front line services were more focused on the offenders than the victims. They suggested that the work of the CSB around this strategic priority of ASB will help Surrey Police to adapt to provide better support for victims, the people who are suffering whilst placing more accountability on those who are the cause.
7. The Cabinet Associate for Community Safety Services agreed with the witnesses, that there was room for improvement in supporting victims of ASB. In terms of collaboration, the Cabinet Associate was confident the relationship between the CSPs and CSB had improved. The concern around attendance was recognised at all levels, which the Board could perhaps influence to encourage a better attendance level.
8. There was a discussion around new legislation increasing the responsibility of Community Safety. The Officer reported that whilst modern slavery, terrorism and serious organised crime were all contributors to this increasing demand; meetings were lined up for to discuss how to: respond to these issues as a partnership; share intelligence, and working out the necessary processes to tackle the problems.
9. One Member queried that, to help raise awareness of the work of the CSB, could some work be done to quantify the benefit of the resources allocated, so that residents can understand the significant return and benefit to this work. An Officer reported that there was data available such as crime statistics and customer satisfaction data, as well as local and police intelligence. The Board were assured that Surrey was a low crime County, one of the safest in the Country, and work was being done to maintain and continue that record.
10. The Chief Inspector advised the Board that work was being done by the Police and Crime Commissioner to make Surrey a safe county and also highlighted significant change in the policing neighbourhood model. The new model would allow Police Officers to be more focused at District & Borough level, which would help identify trends and patterns in the area being monitored by them. This new model promotes the increase of local knowledge and would give police officers a sense of ownership and responsibility in making their area a safer place.

11. The Cabinet Associate for Community Safety Services raised a concern about young people and how they've become more street wise, acknowledging that Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) do not have powers of arrest as an attested constable. The Board were informed that discussions were in progress with the Chief Constable with a view for developing PCSO powers at low level incidents to help improve this issue.
12. A Member touched upon the problem regarding attendance and suggested to the Board that representation at each level should be insisted upon or where absence is identified, a substitute should be present. This would promote a more productive meeting, as one absence from one area weakens the meeting. It was also pointed out that it was a statutory duty of the partners to promote attendance. The Officer indicated it was difficult to engage with the Housing Association because there are thousands across the country. Officers have been working on setting up a forum which includes 350 members, the majority of whom are housing officers.
13. There was a discussion around PCSO powers and whether all the available powers were being implemented for PCSOs in Surrey. The Chief Inspector assured the Board PCSO powers had changed and that PCSOs received comprehensive training and development, which was built up across a long period with experienced officers. As a result, PCSOs were delivering key pieces of work for the Police. The Board learnt that PCSOs also have the power to disperse, to detain and to issue penalties. The Officer was happy to provide a list of the powers available to PCSO's in Surrey to the Board at a later date.
14. One Member sought more clarity around child sex exploitation (CSE) as it was a new area of responsibility for the CSB. Officers pointed out that CSE always existed but had been brought into the public domain due to recent high profile cases. It was explained to the Board, at a partnership level, the work involved making links between the children's services and safeguarding children's board and sharing intelligence at a local level.
15. The Chairman enquired whether Members who were not involved in CSPs were familiar with the work carried out for community safety. Members showed little awareness so the Chairman suggested perhaps the CSB could encourage CSPs to better promote their work to Members, so that they receive a better understanding of what was going on in their area. The Cabinet Associate suggested a newsletter approach for the Board to consider.
16. One Member brought forward a suggestion that the Board recommend that Local and Joint Committees, invite neighbourhood inspectors to local committee meetings, to give a presentation on the new policing model mentioned previously.

Recommendations:

- a) The Board requests for a list of Surrey PCSO powers to be circulated to all Members.
- b) The Board requests for the Community Safety Board to encourage Community Safety Partnerships to better promote their work to Local and County Members.
- c) For Local/Joint Committees to invite local Police and Community Safety Partnership Officers to present on new policing models and local community safety partnership plans in Surrey.

BREAK 11:25 - 11:35

70/16 TACKLING ANTI SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR IN SURREY [Item 8]

Declarations of Interest:

None

Witnesses:

Joanna Grimshaw, Anti Social Behaviour Manager, Surrey Police
Chief Inspector Nolan Heather, Surrey Police
Jane Last, Head of Community Partnerships & Safety
Gordon Falconer, Community Safety Manager
Louise Gibbins, Community Safety Officer

Key points raised during the discussion:

- 1. An Officer began the item by summarising key points of the report; referring to the Anti Social Behaviour Crime & Policing Act 2014 as the trigger to generating a renewed response to tackling ASB across Surrey in a more efficient and practical way. The Officer explained work was underway to tackle anti social behaviour (ASB) across Surrey to provide better outcomes for the residents of Surrey.
- 2. One Member enquired about dispersal orders, what the order involved and achieved, as it was noted from **Appendix four** that these were used frequently across the county. It was explained that a dispersal order, under the new Act, was a tool that enables Police officers to remove people, for example in the town centre for behaving anti socially. Dispersal Orders allow the Police to order a person(s) to leave an area if an anti social behavioural situation was about to rise or was occurring. The Board were assured that a proportionality test would be carried out before an Order is placed to ensure that this power would not be abused and only used in appropriate circumstances.
- 3. These circumstances include; partnership working with perpetrators, no knee jerk reactions, never issue for a 'youth issue/problem" and the

order has to be very objective i.e. what's the harm/risk to perpetrators vs benefit to other residents.

4. The Members of the Board requested more information on what resources were available to residents to promote how residents can contact regarding ASB. The Board were notified that there was a website which contained all the necessary information and links were also in place to direct the user to the district or borough that concerned them. Members' implied there was a need for information to be more accessible, in terms of other advertising material and Officers assured this was a working progress.
5. The Chairman queried what information was available in the public domain and if not what measures were being carried out to convey the message to residents. Officers explained They discussed a map of ASB incidents which was based solely on police data (therefore may not be full picture) but was not publically accessible
6. There was a discussion around reasonability and how people's perception differ in their views with what was acceptable and not acceptable behaviour. A Member highlighted that Anti Social Behaviour is usually associated with young people but in reality it's not the case. Officers clarified that young people were not the biggest proportion of offenders and pointed out that the public often confuse ASB with nuisance and this is why young people are commonly mistaken for the main offenders. It was addressed that more work needed to be done on promoting a distinction between ASB and nuisance, so residents are clear between the distinctions.
7. The Chief Inspector promoted the new mobile data terminals, which allowed Police Officers to work more efficiently whilst out in their communities as the terminals made it easier to process and be granted authorisation for issuing a Dispersal Order in relation to ASB powers.
8. The suggestion to reinvigorate Neighbourhood Watches was put forward to the Board, to empower communities, to make sure residents knew what to be cautious of and stay better protected. The Cabinet Associate for Community Safety Services explained to the Board that Neighbourhood Watches were effective and running well in certain places and that any person could sign up to Neighbourhood Watches in their area.
9. Members made reference to the growing problem of fly tipping/littering and whether there were powers in place to control this issue. The Board were informed that in anticipation of a growing problem of fly tipping, the Council's Environment Service was launching a strategy to combat this issue.
10. The Chairman queried whether the data in Appendix four was an accurate representation of the use of ASB Tools and Powers. The Community Safety Officer suggested that there could be a number of reasons why no legal enforcement was being carried out in some Districts or Boroughs. It was explained to the Board that when the new powers came in to use, staff were trained at a high standard but some

Boroughs may not have chosen to exercise their new powers, continuing with the former option. Other areas may not have an enforcement officer in post, and some areas may have been reluctant to use the new powers because of the costs associated with them. The Chairman advised that the information shared here to be circulated to Members so some Boroughs can be more confident in enforcing action, as some Boroughs showed good practice in using these powers which deterred further crime.

11. One Member referred to the Surrey ASB strategy group "Putting Victims First" review and whether there will be an update on this paper. The Officer made clear that an update will follow in a year's time, and it would entail what the CSB will be working towards in the next few years.

Recommendations:

- a) For Community Safety Partnerships and the Community Safety Board to keep the victims of Anti-Social Behaviour the focus of their work in tackling Anti-Social Behaviour in Surrey.
- b) The Board requests for a list of Borough tools and powers introduced by the Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014
- c) The Board requests for a link to the Surrey Community Safety website to be shared to all Members
- d) The Board requests for Surrey Matters to publicise the work of the Community Safety Team to help provide residents with information on how to tackle Anti-Social Behaviour.

71/16 UPDATE ON THE VOLUNTARY, COMMUNITY AND FAITH SECTOR (VCFS) INFRASTRUCTURE IN SURREY AND THE VOLUNTEERING PROJECT [Item 9]

Declarations of Interest:

None

Witnesses:

Saba Hussain, Policy & Strategic Partnerships Manager
Rachael Crossley, Assistant Director (Chief of Staff)

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. In introducing the report, the Officer highlighted that on the whole the sector was doing well. There has been an increase in volunteers from the previous two years and the results from the independent survey of users of the infrastructure organisations were positive, indicating that 92% were highly satisfied with the Councils for Voluntary Services (CVSs) and how additional funds were secured into the area.

2. Although the infrastructure organisations was showing positive good work, the Officer outlined sustainability as one of the main concerns. The organisations were working to tackle this problem by seeking further collaborations and ways of working to support further efficiencies and create a sustainable infrastructure base.
3. A Member sought more information on the relationship between the CVSs and corporate organisations. The Officer was pleased to address the Board that Surrey County Council has a strong connection with local businesses and last year alone, the infrastructure organisations facilitated a hundred events with over 1,600 individuals from businesses engaged in volunteer activity. In addition the Board were informed of an event that would take place next week called 'We are Surrey', aimed at inspiring businesses to support their local communities.
4. One Member expressed concern with the continuance of volunteers through the generations, as a great number were older and that category would be lost soon. The Officer explained that they are trying to reach out and engage with young people through targeted projects and also looking at opportunities to encourage inter-generational volunteering.
5. There was a discussion around the funding which was distributed amongst the infrastructure groups as Members wanted to know why different amounts were given to different groups, as outlined in **Annex A**. The Officer explained that figures were different as certain groups had merged and covered larger areas, subsequently changing the amount that they were be allocated to reflect the efficiencies of scale.
6. Reference was made to the unemployed and a Member encouraged individuals who were in this category to consider volunteering as a route back into work, developing new skills and strengthening their CVs with additional experience.
7. The Vice Chairman conveyed to the Board that money could be a barrier for some individuals volunteering, emphasising that that there could be a possibility that some people would like to volunteer but cannot afford it. The Officer noted this concern and the importance of ensuring money is not an obstacle, and assured the Board that this would be tackled by analysing the issue and understanding what is required to further support these individuals.

Recommendations:

- a) The Board requests an end of project report on the Driving up Volunteering Project.
- b) The Board requests for officers to provide promotional materials to all Members and.
- c) The Board recommends all Members to share information with local residents through all appropriate channels available.

72/16 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 10]

The next meeting of the Board will be held on Thursday 13 October at Surrey History Centre, Woking at 10am.

Meeting ended at: 1.00 pm

Chairman