

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the **RESIDENT EXPERIENCE BOARD** held at 10.00 am on 2 February 2017 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, 9 March 2017.

**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 Karan Persand
- Ms Barbara Thomson
- Mr Alan Young
- \* Ms Denise Turner-Stewart
- Mrs Denise Saliagopoulos
- \* Mrs Mary Angell

**In attendance**

Richard Walsh, Cabinet Member for Localities and Wellbeing  
Kay Hammond, Cabinet Associate for Community Safety Services

**1/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from John Orrick, Alan Young, Barbara Thomson, Denise Saliagopoulos and Yvonna Lay. Mary Angell substituted for Yvonna Lay.

**2/17 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: TUESDAY 22 NOVEMBER 2016 [Item 2]**

Minutes from the previous meeting, 22 November 2016 were agreed as a true and accurate record upon correction of Richard Walsh's title which was printed twice in error.

**3/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

No declarations of interest were received.

**4/17 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]**

No questions or petitions were received.

**5/17 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SCRUTINY BOARD [Item 5]**

There were no responses from Cabinet to report.

**6/17 RECOMMENDATION TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 6]**

1. The Chairman informed Members that recommendation REB 44/2016 and REB 45/2016, regarding the feature article on the Surrey History Centre would remain outstanding until a further response from Surrey Matters was received.
2. A Member queried whether historic records that were lost in the fire at Clandon House were in duplicate and available at the Surrey History Centre and whether this could be looked into for a future item.
3. The Chairman also notified the Board that REB 47/2016, regarding an update of the Council's born-digital records strategy, would also remain on the Recommendation Tracker.
4. The Vice-Chairman indicated whether publicity with Surrey Matters could be pursued further, indicating more stories to be published in relation to the work of the Resident Experience Board. The Chairman advised that the previous recommendation requesting Surrey Matters to publicise the work of the Community Safety Team regarding anti-social behaviour was underway and an update would be provided for a future REB meeting.
5. Members were informed of interests.me, an online platform which provides news and information about what is going in your community. Members were encouraged to utilise this platform in communicating with residents.

6. The Cabinet Associate for Community Safety Services requested whether the Board would consider reviewing the Community Safety Board's work in relation to preventing the radicalisation of young people and having this put on the Forward Work Programme as a future item.
7. There was a discussion around the Extraordinary meeting, taking place on Thursday 9 March, and whether it would be necessary to keep the Spelthorne Consultation item on the agenda as Staines Fire Station would remain open. The Board decided it would be essential to have the Spelthorne consultation item presented in the next public meeting so that responses are reviewed and considered.
8. The Service Improvement Manager from the SFRS informed the Board that although Staines Fire Station was not being closed down, the consultation process would still continue in relation to having an on call at the new fire station at Fordbridge and responses on this would be presented to the Board in March. The Board resolved to continue with the item on 9 March 2017.
9. Before the meeting continued the Chairman invited the Board to pay respects to Alan Grant, Assistant Group Commander on the Fire Investigation and Community Risk Reduction Team, who passed away on duty.

**7/17 SURREY FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE - IMMEDIATE EMERGENCY CARE RESPONSE PILOT (CO-RESPONDING) [Item 7]**

**Witnesses:**

Karen Pointer, Assistant Group Commander, Surrey Fire Rescue Service  
Matt England, Blue-Light Collaboration Lead, South East Coast Ambulance  
Richard Jones, Fire Brigades Union Secretary

**Declarations of Interest:**

None

**Key points during the discussion:**

1. The Assistant Group Commander for Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) opened the discussion by informing the Board that the Service have been participating in the National Joint Council (NJC) pilot, whereby the SFRS have taken part in co-responding alongside the South East Coast Ambulance Service (SECAmb). The Officer explained the NJC trial would end on 28 February and that Cabinet would need to make a decision on whether or not SFRS may continue to co-respond as a voluntary basis until a decision has been made by the NJC on whether this will form part of a firefighters' role, or not.
2. The Blue-Light Collaboration Lead from SECAmb reported that the co-responding not only assisted the Service but also helped and served residents significantly. The witness gave positive feedback on the co-responding, reporting that the SFRS, when available, were able to respond quickly under blue-light conditions and were on many

occasions' primary responders. The Board noted that co-responding allowed response times to be achieved.

3. It was noted in terms of team work and collaboration, shared understanding had increased between the SFRS and the SECAMB. Both Services were more aware of the aptitude of their work.
4. The Board noted that SECAMB were also encouraging the public to use defibrillators where possible, starting lifesaving treatment before the arrival of the ambulance service. It was stated the chances of a successful defibrillation declines at a rate of around 10% with each minute of delay.
5. It was stated that public defibrillators could be registered with the SECAMB system, which would benefit the public when needing to track the nearest one during an emergency situation that requires one.
6. It was stated that the SFRS were currently responding to Red 1 and Red 2 calls as these are among the most serious and life threatening emergencies and going forward would only continue to co-respond to Red Calls and not Amber or Green.
7. The Blue-Light Collaboration Lead explained that the Ambulance Response Programme was under review and from April 2017 changes would take effect. This will remove the distinction between a Red 1 and Red 2, they will all be classified as Red. Some calls that are currently Red 2 call will become Amber.
8. The representative from the Fire Brigades Union shared the view that the trial was positive and informed Members that the Union will be instructing membership in accordance with the NJC. Although the trial will be ending on 28 February 2017, the Union will be following the NJC guidance. Members were also advised that funding from the Government was important, otherwise the Service would not receive support if it continued on a free of charge basis.
9. The Cabinet Associate for Fire and Police Services advised that with the new Policing and Crime Act 2017 legislation in place, there was a duty to collaborate. The Board noted this suggestion and shared the view that it would be appropriate in these circumstances to put a recommendation forward that the trial continues as it impacts hugely on the lives of Surrey residents.
10. Members shared the view that withdrawing the co-responding service would leave a degree of trauma, especially for Surrey residents.
11. There was a discussion around the location of SFRS appliances; Officers clarified that vehicles were tracked by GPS and this would allow the available and nearest units to be dispatched when called.
12. A Member raised concern with the potential for SFRS not being available to respond to its core responsibilities while out co-responding. Officers assured the Board that only one incident occurred

where there was a clash in the 18 months that the trial had been running and that there was no effect on the SFRS statutory duties.

13. The FBU representative shared concerns with Members and highlighted that it was important to understand the national context of the trial, as Surrey was 1 of over 30 Fire and Rescue Services taking part in the national pilot. There would be different results demographically and to await a direction from the NJC on best practice, without securing funding from the Government could jeopardise a better sustainable outcome.
14. The Cabinet Member for Localities and Community Wellbeing suggested, in the absence of funding from the Government, for the Board to consider SECamb to make a contribution towards the continuation of co-responding.
15. Officers were queried whether the trial would be sustainable without funding. Members were advised that, by opting to continue co-responding the Council could jeopardise the prospects for additional funding from central government, and that it could be to the Council's advantage, in the long term to await a decision from the NJC with regards to any changes to the firefighters role map in July 2017.
16. In an effort to reduce costs, the SFRS recognised it was not cost effective to have pumps on call for every occasion and using smaller multi-role vehicles would be more appropriate and were available across the Service.
17. Members agreed a letter should be drafted to the NJC with regards to the strain both services might face without funding if co-responding were to continue and consider this when making their decision.

#### **Recommendations:**

- The Board supports the continuation of Immediate Emergency Care Responding and, providing that there remains no substantial negative effect on SFRS's core service and the financial pressures can be met, supports Option 1 to be presented to Cabinet on 28 February 2017.
- That the Board writes to the LGA Employers Representatives in support of co-responding, seeking additional funding for the scheme until a decision on the results of the NJC pilot is made in July 2017.

#### **Actions:**

None

There was a break from 11.22am to 11.26am – need to add this as a comment in the minutes.

**Witnesses:**

Roger Childs, Group Commander, Surrey Fire Rescue Service, Head of Training and Development

**Declarations of interest.**

None

**Key points of discussion:**

1. Officers produced a presentation for the Board on the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (Surrey Fire Rescue Service) Training and Development, giving Members a general summary of the approach, skills and progression delivered and met by firefighters.
2. Members were informed that the Service also provides commercial training which generates income, and were exploring options to share a lease with SECAMB for a training facility in Wray Park, a measure that could produce savings for both organisations.
3. It was noted that there was a range of resources across the organisation for training already in use; and example of which was trainers going out to fire stations and providing on duty training. This eases the pressure off extraction rates by having firefighters remain on duty while undergoing training. The Officer explained that extraction rates meant arranging cover for an on call firefighter while on training.
4. Members also commended the refresher cycle, which illustrated training being delivered annually, or met after 2/3/5 years, ensuring standards were being maintained. The Board proposed that this information to be publicised to promote awareness.
5. Officers outlined that training was adapted and provided as appropriate for the role and required skill set, which varies as personnel progress up through the ranks of the Service.
6. It was noted that the average age of SFRS firefighters was 42 and there were no concerns with the ageing workforce as firefighters were checked by Occupational Health with a strict physical fitness test. It was highlighted that there was a quick turn over in recognising where standards were not being met and delivering additional training where necessary.
7. The Cabinet Associate for Community Safety Services informed the Board that another element of training provided to the SFRS was joint emergency training on major incidents.
8. The Board noted that all Fire and Rescue Services manage their own training and where possible share facilities for cost efficiencies.
9. Members were informed that a number of training programmes were open to the public, therefore if residents or Members wanted a better insight on this area to consider attending.

**Recommendations:**

The Board recommends that Surrey Matters runs an article on the work and training for Surrey Fire and Rescue Service firefighters, and the support this provides businesses in Surrey.

**Actions:**

Circulate training link to Members.

**9/17 SURREY FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE - FIRE AND ROAD TRAFFIC COLLISION PREVENTION [Item 9]****Witnesses:**

Iain Houseman, Area Commander, Surrey Fire Rescue Service, Protection and Prevention

**Declarations of interest:**

None

**Key points of the discussion:**

1. The Officer introduced the report by highlighting that Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) have a statutory duty to educate and advise people who reside, travel and work in Surrey on prevention of fire and road traffic collisions.
2. The Board were informed that the SFRS have been working with the Drive Smart Board, taking on a multi-agency approach to deal with road traffic collisions.
3. It was highlighted that Surrey has a growing and ageing population and a road network that carries twice the average number of vehicles. Statistics from Surrey indicate that there are 679 killed or seriously injured (KSI) casualties on Surrey roads in 2015.
4. It was noted that minor injuries was also included in the KSI category and the statistics tabled at the meeting today did not include pedestrians (these statistics are attached as Annex A)
5. In carrying out prevention work, the Officer informed the Board of the various programmes that are delivered, these include the Safe Drive Stay Alive, Ride it Right and Biker Down. Through this work, the SFRS Prevention Team has successfully raised £1.4 million in sponsorship and were seeking to raise furthermore sponsors to ensure the prevention work is maintained.
6. Members were informed that casualty figures have significantly dropped across the 10 years since prevention work was established. However due to the legacy of the Olympics being held in Surrey in

2012, and the continued annual Ride London event, there has been a 200% rise in pedal cyclists KSI.

7. The Officer identified road users, including pedal cyclists, who were wearing head phones, electric cars being very silent, and Surrey's complex road network as contributing factors to collisions and casualties.

*Mary Angell left the meeting 12:15pm*

8. There was a further discussion around the programmes used to deliver prevention campaigns and the Officer indicated that, Ride it Right was gaining traction however more support was.
9. It was highlighted that the Safe Drive Stay Alive programme was very successful and had been recognised with national awards. It was explained that the drop in attendance in 2013/14 was due to the introduction of an attendance fee, which had been subsequently addressed in later years. The Officer stressed that it was important to promote awareness and attract further sponsorship so secure the programme to continue.
10. A Member queried whether the launch of the Pokémon Go app had presented a problem in Surrey, as there had been reports in the media that individuals, whilst trying to catch them all, were running out onto roads to catch virtual Pokémon. The Officer assured the Board that these reports were not a reflection on incidents in Surrey, and were not reflected in Surrey's statistics.
11. The Board noted concerns raised by Members regarding pedal cyclists not using dedicated cycle lanes and going through red lights, and queried what work was being done to educate and monitor the issue. The Cabinet Associate for Community Safety Services advised that the Drive Smart Board were targeting cyclist with campaigns to advertise and raise awareness surrounding these concerns.

**Recommendations:**

That the Board supports the activities of the SFRS Prevention Team.

**Actions:**

None

**10/17 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 10]**

The next full public meeting will be held on Thursday 9 March 2017, in the Council Chamber, County Hall.

Meeting ended at: 12.38 pm

---

**Chairman**