

MINUTES of the meeting of the **RESIDENT EXPERIENCE BOARD** held at 10.30 am on 16 October 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 Thursday, 19 November 2015.

Elected Members:

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

* = attended
A = apologies

Ex officio Members:

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

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

Apologies for absence were received from Robert Evans and Ramon Gray.

2/15 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 21 JULY 2015 [Item 2]

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

3/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

No declarations of interest were received.

4/15 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

There were no questions or petitions.

Yvonna Lay arrived c10:45am.

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

There were no responses to report.

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

The Board was informed that the November Resident Experience Board would feature the Customer Service Excellence: Highways item. At this meeting Highways officers, Cabinet members and Surrey residents, who have experienced the highways complaints procedures, will be in attendance to discuss their experiences.

The Board was informed of European 'Restart a Heart Day' as an initiative to educate members of the public on how to help restart the heart of someone who has suffered a cardiac arrest, with a particular focus on schools and pupils.

The Chairman gave support for the initiative on behalf of the Board and Members were encouraged to attend and promote resuscitation courses in their constituencies. As an example, St John Ambulance Epsom run regular courses of which some Members have attended and recommend.

It was mentioned by the Chairman that a note of thanks was received from Barbara Musgrave following the Board meeting in July.

7/15 UPDATE ON SFRS WORKSHOP [Item 7]

Declarations of Interest:

None.

Witnesses:

None.

Key Points Raised During the Discussion:

1. The Surrey Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) was thanked for holding the Board workshop on 24 September 2015. The Chairman invited the Board to help develop ideas for further scrutiny.
2. The question of whether the use of drones by SFRS had been investigated was raised. It was noted that SFRS is working with Sussex Police who are in receipt of a Home Office grant as part of investigations of future drone usage for operational purposes. SFRS is also gathering information from international fire services and exploring how technology is used in other parts of the world. Australia and Denmark were given as examples.
3. Other scrutiny topics brought to the board for consideration included: collaboration and transformation plans; income generation schemes; prevention, what strategies are being employed now and what should be employed next?; commercial fire safety; multiple occupancy building inspections; the impact on staff allocation for the care of vulnerable adults; staff progression and training opportunities; and the JECC centre, mobilisation of resources around risk and need, and what this means for Surrey residents and coverage.
4. It was suggested that SFRS would be in a strong position to provide CPR training for Members, and the Chief Fire Officer agreed that this could happen as Fire Officers had received sufficient training from South East Coast Ambulance Service (SECAmb) and would be in a position to train others.

Actions/Further Information to be Provided:

1. In discussion with Democratic Services, for SFRS to consider providing Members with CPR training.

Recommendations:

None.

8/15 DRAFT PUBLIC SAFETY PLAN [Item 8]

Declarations of Interest:

None.

Witnesses:

Russell Pearson, Chief Fire Officer, Surrey Fire and Rescue Service
Sally Wilson, Service Improvement Manager, Surrey Fire and Rescue Service
Stephen Beakhust, Project Specialist, Surrey Fire and Rescue Service
Richard Walsh, Cabinet Member, Localities and Community Wellbeing
Kay Hammond, Cabinet Associate Member, Community Safety Services
Asif Aziz, Surrey FBU
Lee Belston, Surrey FBU
Richard Jones, Surrey FBU

Key Points Raised During the Discussion:

1. A presentation on the draft Public Safety Plan was delivered to the Board by the Chief Fire Officer, outlining the target of the Public Safety Plan in the context of the current safety plan that runs until 2020. The presentation covered why collaboration was required between the emergency services and gave example of where collaboration has been effective already in Surrey.
2. The timeline for the Public Safety Plan was discussed, particularly around the consultation period. It was agreed that changes to the timeline were necessary, though as there are no substantial changes to service provision, the consultation period may not need to be as long. The suggested period is 6 weeks and officers requested Member feedback on this proposal, which was positive. The method of consultation was debated, covering topics such as how best to engage with as many residents and businesses as possible; accessibility to older residents, and for face to face consultation, the time of day and locations. The Member Reference Group would discuss these issues in more detail and take this further.
3. The Chairman raised a desire to take the Public Safety Plan consultation to all 11 boroughs and districts in Surrey in an effort to highlight the document to as many residents as possible and increase awareness of what SFRS does. SFRS officers agreed to help facilitate this.
4. It was noted that the language of the Public Safety Plan required further attention as jargon and service specialist phrasing slips in. Members expressed that as a Public Safety Plan, further information and mention of prevent, protect and response is required.
5. Members discussed the pilot Telecare system currently being run in Elmbridge where suitably trained on-call firefighters respond to incidents. It was reported that the pilot scheme is going well and the trial has been extended.
Approximately 700 incidents have been attended so far on behalf of South East Coast Ambulance Service (SECAmb) since January, mainly breaking into homes where the resident needs medical attention. The scheme is considered by SFRS as a good example of where their collaborative efforts are making better use of resources; adding value to SFRS and upholding 24/7 facilities in Surrey, improving outcomes for residents. The scheme supports the SFRS prevention strategy as well as acting as a channel of communication between relevant agencies – the Service also has the support of 150 volunteers. The discussion around Telecare response and other emergency medical services provided by SFRS officers also brought attention to potential health and safety issues around working hours.
6. A discussion around future funding was held with a view of how Government innovation funding grants could be used to help future recruitment for SFRS. It was noted by the Board that the available grants could not be used in this way as they were one-off grants designed for transformation and improvement project work.

Actions/Further Information to be Provided:

1. To include further information on what happened next regarding case study on p30.

2. Member Reference Group for SFRS Transformation and PSP to discuss best approach to public consultation.
3. Performance and Finance Sub-Group to look at additional duties being carried out by SFRS and how it effects core services, and what additional financial burdens these additional services put on the SFRS budget.

Recommendations:

1. That the Board notes the draft Public Safety Plan for 2016-2025.
2. That the Board agrees the proposed alterations to the Public Safety Plan timeline (supported by the MRG) regarding later consultation and cabinet dates.
3. Members of the Board to engage with the consultation on the Public Safety Plan and to promote to residents and groups the summary document that will be provided.

A short break in proceedings 12.10pm-12.20pm.

9/15 DISCUSSION OF 'ENABLING CLOSER WORKING BETWEEN THE EMERGENCY SERVICES' CONSULTATION [Item 9]

Declarations of Interest:

None.

Witnesses:

None.

Key Points Raised During the Discussion:

1. SFRS, Cabinet and the Board are in agreement that collaboration between Police and Fire Service is a good thing. Discussions highlighted that collaboration was already taking place between the services already thanks to collaborative work with Surrey and Sussex Police Forces, SECamb and East and West Sussex Fire and Rescue Services. However concern was raised around the governance of the Fire Service under the Police and Crime Commissioner.
2. Members believe that the PCC role is still very new and that it may be too early to know whether this direction was suitable at this time.
3. Surrey County Council will be responding as a Fire Authority w/c 19 October 2015.

Actions/Further Information to be Provided:

1. Members to send ideas or comment directly to the Cabinet Associate.

Recommendations:

1. 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.

**10/15 CABINET MEMBER AND ASSOCIATE CABINET MEMBER PRIORITIES
[Item 10]**

Declarations of Interest:

None.

Witnesses:

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

Key Points Raised During the Discussion:

1. The Cabinet Member outlined his approach to improving resident experience and explained his priorities, which include improving customer service and encouraging departments and services to strive to attain the Customer Service Excellence Award, with particular attention of improving communication.
2. The Cabinet Member explained how he is keen to promote the Tower Award for Surrey staff, which is awarded each month and is working to increase volunteering in the county.
3. It was noted that the joined up Trading Standards service with Buckinghamshire was developing well through its increased resource and is a good example of collaboration. The Cabinet Member also committed to visiting as many libraries as possible and noted that he would be taking a keen interest in the service budgets across his remit.
4. Members commented on encouraging volunteering and ensuring that it is tailored to what the customer needs, and not necessarily what the customer wants. A Member also suggested a cash incentive for the Tower Awards if possible. It was also expressed that some customers have experienced difficulty in accessing advice on making complaints to Trading Standards and that improvements could be made.
5. Members also highlighted the excellent work of the registration team who managed to reschedule weddings at short notice following the fire at Clandon Park.
6. The Cabinet Associate outlined her responsibilities in supporting the Cabinet Member in his role. She noted that everything they do must link into the corporate strategy and that collaboration is a high priority at the moment. The Cabinet Associate chairs the Drive SMART board and takes a particular interest in road safety, and will be reviewing this campaign and forward planning.

Actions/Further Information to be Provided:

1. That the Cabinet Member and Cabinet Associate Member report back on progress in six months.

Recommendations:

None.

11/15 WELFARE REFORM TASK GROUP UPDATE [Item 11]

Declarations of Interest:

None.

Witnesses:

None.

Key Points Raised During the Discussion:

1. Due to time constraints, it was agreed that this item be deferred to the November meeting.

Actions/Further Information to be Provided:

None.

Recommendations:

None.

LUNCH BREAK 1pm - 1.30pm

12/15 ANNUAL SCRUTINY OF SURREY'S COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIPS [Item 12]

Declarations of Interest:

None.

Witnesses:

Louise Round, Chair of East Surrey Community Safety Partnership
Kamini Sanghani, Partnerships Director, Kent, Surrey & Sussex Community Rehabilitation Company (KSS CRC)
Joanna Grimshaw, Anti-Social Behaviour Manager, Surrey Police
Louise Gibbins, Community Safety Officer
Superintendent Clive Davies, Surrey Police
Camilla Edmiston, Community Safety Officer, Woking Borough Council
Cllr Beryl Hunwicks, Woking Borough Council
Cllr Charlotte Morley, Surrey Heath Borough Council
Jane Last, Lead Manager, Community Safety Partnerships
Gordon Falconer, Community Safety Unit Lead Manager
Keith McGrory, Community Safety Officer, Spelthorne Borough Council
Jeff Harris, Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey
Sarah Haywood, Senior Partnership Policy Officer (Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner)
Helen Harrison, Public Health Principal, Commissioning and Performance.
Simon Moore, Assistant Chief Fire Officer, Surrey Fire and Rescue Service
Richard Walsh, Cabinet Member for Localities and Community Wellbeing
Key Hammond, Cabinet Associate Member for Community Safety Services

Key Points Raised During the Discussion:

1. The Community Safety Unit Lead Manager introduced the report, explaining that legislation requires the Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) to be scrutinised each year and that the Resident Experience Board fulfills this function giving an overview of county issues and priorities. The structure chart on page 79 was also explained. It was noted that the election of the Police and Crime Commissioner has had an effect on CSPs, and has changed the way the partnerships worked. Funding now comes from the main Police budget. Work of the CSPs is assessed annually, and takes into account crime data in the county. Using this information, action plans for each CSP are drawn up and assessed during the year.
2. The Chairman inquired about the link between the CSPs and the Community Safety Board, and how far the CSPs take into account the strategic direction that it sets. The Community Safety Unit Lead Manager explained that the strategic plans were developed in conjunction with the CSPs.
3. The Chairman asked about the relationship between the Community Safety Board and the CSPs and what gains the CSPs get from the Board. The Chair of East Surrey CSP noted that they adopt the Surrey-wide priorities, such as domestic abuse and substance abuse, and take a balanced view of taking local action versus a county-wide direction.
4. Members questioned the public perception of low level anti-social crime increasing and the resources being put into zero-tolerance by the Police and Crime Commissioner, whereas the statistics actually show that violent crime is on the increase and queried what the CSPs attach importance to. The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner responded that zero-tolerance doesn't just apply to 'low level' crime, and that crime recording has changed in the past few years.
5. Members also asked about the Community Safety Board and questioned how representative it is, given that 6 people attend, representing 6 boroughs. It was replied that the districts and boroughs had agreed to move from all 11 being represented, to 3 representing clusters of CSPs, and 3 councillors, who are charged with communicating with other CSP representatives. The Cabinet Associate Member noted that her Lead Members group gives an opportunity for districts and boroughs to feedback experiences.
6. The Vice-Chairman asked about child sexual exploitation and made the point that this can happen at any age, and asked about the Community Safety Board's work on this. The Community Safety Unit Lead Manager stated that this topic area is owned by the Children's Safeguarding Board, and that they have strong links with the CSPS and Community Safety Board. Another Member noted that a useful presentation on the issue is available to districts and boroughs. The Chair of East Surrey CSP noted that there are issues around the transition age of 18 that are being looked at by the Child Sexual Exploitation Strategy Group. It was noted that Annex 6 contained further information on work that districts and boroughs are doing.
7. The Public Health Principal was invited to share the experiences public health has with the CSPs, and noted that they work closely with partners around substance misuse and the drug and alcohol strategy, mental health and domestic abuse, reporting into the Community Safety Board.

8. The Partnerships Director, Kent, Surrey & Sussex Community Rehabilitation Company, noted that probation colleagues regularly attend CSPs and are working with them on community payback projects.
9. Superintendent Davies commented that the combined CSPs are good, as one meeting can provide more oversight, particularly on big issues such as child sexual exploitation. The police find it useful getting all partners in the same room and using it as a forum for checking whether intelligence and data is reflected on the ground.
10. The Assistant Chief Fire Officer noted that the CSP model reduces some of the demand on officers' time and welcome the engagement with and exposure to other agencies, particularly around collaboration. This reduces the risk of different agencies working in silos, which is helpful as fire and rescue have similar vulnerabilities to take on board as the police do.
11. The Chairman questioned whether the merger in the East of the county sets an example for other areas to follow. In response it was explained that the East Surrey CSP came about as a coalition of the willing and would require individual CSPs to want to do this, which at the moment none do. A Member mentioned that there is a potential for a loss of accountability with joint structures and explained that good communication would be required to reassure partners.
12. Members asked about the Community Safety Fund and what attributes to the increase in incidents of domestic abuse. The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner explained that the Police and Crime Commissioner had a discretionary £50,000 for community safety funding, and this now sits within the policing budget. This is scrutinised by the Police and Crime Panel and the Police Audit Committee. A bid from the Home Office and Ministry of Justice for £100,000 to spend on domestic abuse prevention is allowing substantial investment in this area. The Lead Manager for Community Safety Partnerships explained that the increase in domestic abuse reporting is partly because of increased confidence in reporting, following historic underreporting. There has also been an increase in successful prosecutions. Furthermore, £200,000 has been made available for education projects around healthy relationships and support to children in schools.
13. Members questioned why the Runnymede Safety Partnership funding was withdrawn and it was explained that it was not withdrawn, but money that was previously given to Community Safety Partnerships now is available to be bid for from the Police and Crime Commissioner's fund. The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner offered to make available information on what bids have been successful.
14. Members noted that a lot of resident complaints concern cars, and asked what could be done about antisocial driving and parking. Officers responded that the Community Safety Board doesn't have the remit to act on this. The Joint Enforcement Teams have had some success in this area however. It was also noted that Safe Drive Stay Alive, a driving safety awareness project run by Surrey Fire and Rescue Service, helps to combat some of the issues of anti-social and dangerous driving among younger drivers.

Actions/Further Information to be Provided:

1. The Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner offered to make available information on what community safety fund bids have been successful.

Recommendations:

1. 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. Gordon Falconer is to oversee this.
2. 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.
3. That the Cabinet Member:
 - a. 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.
 - b. 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.
 - c. 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.

13/15 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 13]

The next full public meeting will be held at 10.30am on 19 November 2015 at the Ashcombe Suite, County Hall.

Meeting ended at: 3.05 pm

Chairman