

MINUTES of the meeting of the **COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.00 am on 16 January 2013 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, 21 March 2013.

Elected Members:

- * Mr Steve Cosser (Chairman)
- * Mr Chris Norman (Deputy Chairman)
- A Mr Mike Bennison
- A Mr Graham Ellwood
- * Mrs Angela Fraser
- * Denis Fuller
- A Mr David Ivison
- * Mrs Jan Mason
- * Mr John Orrick
- * Mr Michael Sydney
- * Mr Colin Taylor
- * Mr David Wood

Ex officio Members:

Mrs Lavinia Sealy, Chairman of the County Council
Mr David Munro, Vice Chairman of the County Council

Substitute Members:

Mrs M A Hicks
Simon Gimson

In attendance

Mrs Helyn Clack, Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games

64/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Mike Bennison, Graham Ellwood, David Ivison and Colin Taylor.

Margaret Hicks substituted for Mike Bennison and Simon Gimson substituted for David Ivison.

65/13 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 14 NOVEMBER 2012 & 21 NOVEMBER 2012 [Item 2]

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

66/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interests.

67/13 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

There were no questions or petitions.

68/13 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE [Item 5]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: None.

Key Points Raised During The Discussion

1. It was noted that three responses had been received. These responses were in regards to: the Cultural Services Public Value Review (PVR), The Community Partnership PVR, and the Call-in meeting on 14 November 2012 of the decisions pertaining to investment in a proposed Magna Carta Visitor Centre.
2. The Committee welcomed the comments made in the Cultural Services PVR Cabinet response.
3. The Chairman outlined that there were still concerns regarding the implementation of the recommendations of the Localism Task Group and the relationship this shared with the Community Partnerships PVR. Further details were provided when the Committee reviewed its Recommendations Tracker.
4. The Committee was provided with an update with regards to the proposed Magna Carta Visitor Centre. The decision had been taken by Surrey County Council not to invest £5 million. This decision had been made following a consideration of the business case, and the current financial pressures faced by the County Council. The Committee was informed that the Council was still committed to celebrating the anniversary of the signing of the Magna Carta.

5. Members welcomed the decision not to invest in the proposed visitor centre. The view was expressed that the anniversary of the signing of the Magna Carta was important, and that there would be no wish to constrain innovative approaches to how this anniversary is celebrated in Surrey.

69/13 RECOMMENDATION TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 6]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Committee was asked to note that the scrutiny of Trading Standards' Annual Report item had been deferred from March in the Forward Work Programme (FWP). This item would be brought before Committee following the May 2013 elections. The proposals for the Cultural Services Strategy had been added to the FWP as an item for 21 March 2013.
2. The Chairman informed the Committee that a discussion had been held at the Council Overview & Scrutiny Committee (COSC) regarding the Community Partnerships PVR recommendations, and that there were still concerns that the recommendations made by the Localism Task Group were not being fully considered. The Chairman of the Communities Select Committee and the Chairman of COSC would meet with the Leader and the Cabinet Member to discuss these concerns. An update would be provided to the Committee following this meeting.
3. The Committee was informed that the outstanding recommendations in relation to the Fire & Rescue Advisory Group (FRAG) had been completed. The Cabinet Member for Community Safety had shared information regarding FRAG with the Communities Select Committee, and the Members' Reference Group had been disbanded.

Recommendations:

None

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Select Committee Next Steps:

None.

70/13 SCRUTINY OF COMMUNITY SAFETY AND THE ELECTION OF A POLICE & CRIME COMMISSIONER FOR SURREY [Item 7]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Gordon Falconer, Senior Manager, Community Safety, Customers & Communities.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Chairman outlined that the report on the scrutiny of the Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) had been requested following the election of a Police & Crime Commissioner (PCC) for Surrey. Under the current legislation the County Council had a responsibility to scrutinise the CSPs on a regular basis. This had been undertaken by the Communities Select Committee on previous occasions, through an annual meeting with the relevant partners to examine the CSPs. The Select Committee would then issue recommendations following this meeting. The election of the PCC had meant that some consideration would need to be given as to the role the PCC and Select Committee shared in scrutinising the CSPs. However, the requirement for the Committee to scrutinise CSPs continues.
2. The Committee was informed that the report had set out a number of proposals about how the scrutiny arrangements around the CSPs could be carried out in the future. The Chairman explained that following the report he had requested a further note from Democratic Services with more specific recommendations. This note was shared in the meeting and is included as an appendix to the minutes.
3. The Senior Manager for Community Safety, Customers & Communities informed the Committee that the PCC's office had been approached for comment on the report, and the following response was received:

"We would share the view you reflect throughout – i.e. that the scrutiny landscape is complex, that we would want to avoid confusing the lines of accountability of the various parties and, where possible, reduce duplication of effort. The PCC has received a number of invitations already to borough/district O&S committees. However, our view is that the formal route of scrutiny is through the Panel and that any concerns from O&S Members could be fed through their panel representative, Leader, Chief Executive or CSP.

It will be interesting for us to hear the outcome of the committee's discussions and whether they choose to invite the PCC. Another option might be to co-opt the PCC to the committee (which is permitted in the legislation) so that he could play a role in scrutinising the CSPs. "

4. The Chairman expressed the view that although having the PCC as a co-opted member of the Communities Select Committee was an interesting approach, it would present a conflict of interests if the

Committee wished to call the PCC as a witness in relation to the CSPs.

5. Members stated that they felt the PCC was active in his role and praised his engagement with the community. However, it was felt that there needed to be a lapse of time to see how the processes embedded in respect of the relationships between the various bodies involved in CSPs. The creation of the PCC's Police and Crime Plan would create a greater clarity over the strategic direction of the PCC and its relationship with the CSPs. The scrutiny of the PCC and the draft Police and Crime Plan was being undertaken by the Police and Crime Panel (PCP). The Committee was told that in 2014 the timescales for the development of the PCC's Police & Crime Plan and the CSPs' Single Strategic Assessment would be more closely linked.
6. The Committee discussed the potential danger of adding a further level of scrutiny to the role of the PCC and the CSPs. The Senior Manager for Community Safety, Customers and Communities expressed the view that the Committee currently has the advantage of a county-wide overview in relation to the CSPs, and this had the significant benefit of ensuring comprehensive scrutiny.
7. The Committee questioned the future funding arrangements of the CSPs. It was outlined that the funding was being allocated to the PCC from 1 April 2013, and it would be divided among the 11 CSPs under his direction. It was not currently clear how this funding would be allocated but there would be an overall reduction of 15% to the total budget. The Committee, as part of its scrutiny, could consider whether the investments in the CSPs were good value for Surrey. The Committee queried who undertook monitoring of the PCC finances. It was clarified that this was carried out by central government.
8. Members raised a question as to the setting up of the Community Safety Lead Member's Group. It was explained that this had been done following recommendations made by the Committee to the Cabinet Member for Community Safety.

Recommendations:

- a. That, as part of its scrutiny of the Community Safety Partnership, the Communities Select Committee ensures that appropriate links are made with the Single Strategic Assessment and the priorities of the Police & Crime Commissioner.
- b. That any issues or concerns identified by the Committee from its scrutiny of the Community Safety Partnership which fall within the remit of the Police & Crime Commissioner be reported to the Police & Crime Panel, to inform its own scrutiny of the work of the Commissioner.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Select Committee Next Steps:

The note and recommendations from Democratic Services to be sent to the PCC and PCP for comment.

The Committee will review the scrutiny arrangements for Community Safety Partnerships in July 2013.

71/13 SURREY FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE UPDATE: 2011-13 ACTION PLAN REVIEW AND 2013-16 ACTION PLAN PROPOSALS [Item 8]**Declarations of interest:**

None. However, Simon Gimson informed the Committee that he was a member of the Fire & Rescue Advisory Group (FRAG).

Witnesses:

Gavin Watts, Area Manager Operational Development
Paul Carey-Kent, Senior Finance Manager, Change & Efficiency
Sarah Mitchell, Strategic Director for the Fire & Rescue Service

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Chairman of the Select Committee observed that there were concerns that a number of the savings outlined in the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) were considered "red risk" by the Fire Service. It was explained that these savings were reliant on a number of changes related to shift-patterns and the movement of resources. The question was raised as to how these savings would be made if the changes could not be made.
2. The Strategic Director for the Fire & Rescue Service explained to the Committee that the savings required of the Fire Service presented a challenge in the current economic climate. However, there was work being undertaken to look at how the Service could operate differently. This included a number of opportunities for income generation but also considered new skills and career development paths for staff.
3. The Committee was informed by officers that the Public Safety Plan and the savings it outlined were predicated on a number of changes in relation to shift-patterns and properties, these changes were in the process of being implemented and were considered time-critical. The intention was to ensure that the on-call contracts were finalised by the end of the year, and this would allow for the implementation of the whole-time duty system. The Committee was told that the Fire Brigade Union was supportive of the changes.
4. The Strategic Director expressed the view that any changes within the Fire Service relied on a successful relationship between the Service and its staff, and that they were looking at how Fire Services in other authorities had managed change in order to find effective ways of implementing the proposals.

5. The Committee was informed that various innovations were being considered in relation to income generation. It was felt that the partnership with the Isle of Wight Fire Service had proven successful, and work was currently in place to consider how collaborative partnerships could assist with making savings in areas such as procurement. The Committee raised a question regarding the potential income generated from delivering training. Officers informed the Committee that the possibility of this was being explored and would be developed in the future.
6. The Senior Finance Manager, Change & Efficiency outlined that the savings set out in 2012-2017 MTFP had not been met due to issues with the timing of the changes required. However, it was the case that these had been reviewed for the 2013-2018 MTFP. The Committee was informed that the plan had taken into consideration the key drivers in making future savings and the revised plan had a realistic set of expectations around when savings would be achieved. This included phasing the property savings over three years, and ensuring that any savings from income generation were structured towards the end of the MTFP.
7. The Committee raised a question as to the Fire Services' ability to meet its response standard. The Area Manager, Operational Development, explained to the Committee that the response standard was being met as had been set out in the Public Safety Plan. It was felt that this demonstrated that the methodology by which the response standard was modelled was sound. The Committee was informed that the same model had been used in preparing the consultation for the changes proposed in Reigate & Banstead and Epsom & Ewell.
8. Members asked for further details regarding the creation of a new post for the development of sponsorship. Officers informed the Committee that this post was already in place, and had been in response to the success experienced in gaining sponsorship for the "Safe drive, stay alive" events. The role was a specialist one that looked at expanding out these sponsorship opportunities, as well as identifying and applying for grant-funding. The Committee heard that, though this sponsorship had previously only been for special events, there was now an opportunity to think more innovatively about how sponsorship could be developed.
9. The Committee asked for further information about the volunteering framework and how it was being integrated with the Fire Service given the increases in volunteering. Officers explained that the successful integration of volunteers into areas such as Public Safety Messages and Home Fire Safety Messages events had freed up resources elsewhere. The increase in Wild Fire Wardens had also proven to have a positive impact through better informing the public.
10. The Committee raised concerns about the recent announcements regarding fire station closures in London. Officers explained that there was no anticipated impact within Surrey in relation to the proposed closures. The Area Manager, Operational Development went on to

explain that Surrey Fire Service had regular conversations with neighbouring Fire Services around cross-border mobilisations and the likely impact of any fire station cuts. It was highlighted that the proposed changes outlined in the public consultation documents had been partly in response to changes outside the County, and that the Fire Service were confident they could adapt in response to such changes.

11. The Committee asked for further details on how the property moves were coordinated with Assets & Regeneration. Officers explained that colleagues were aware and supportive of the time-critical factors in property moves. The Committee was also informed that the Fire Service were robust in challenging proposed moves that would not be suitable for them and the delivery of their services.
12. The Committee raised the question of the use of specialist vehicles in rural areas. The Area Manager, Operational Development, explained that there were intentions to expand the fleet of specialist vehicles to meet such demands.
13. Members were invited to comment on the individual proposals for both Epsom & Ewell and Reigate & Banstead.
14. In reference to Epsom & Ewell, concerns were expressed that the north of the borough was left vulnerable by the proposals, which were protecting the majority at an increased risk to a minority. Concerns were also raised about the risk presented in low income or densely populated areas, in particular where there were old high-rise flats. The increased response time for second engines was felt to pose a significant risk in the eventuality of a serious incident taking place in such areas.
15. Officers outlined that assessments had indicated that while areas of denser population attracted more incidents, these were often not critical. The assessment had also indicated critical incidents, requiring two engines or more, were spread across the County. The assessments had also indicated that social deprivation did not correspond to an increased risk of fire in Surrey, unlike many metropolitan areas. The Committee was informed that joint work was being undertaken with Adult Services and Children's Services to ensure that those seen as being at an increased risk were being supported.
16. In reference to Reigate & Banstead, Members felt the plan would not be able to meet the requirements of the response standard. Dissatisfaction was expressed with the communications received from Property Services when sites were under consideration for potential development. Some Members felt that Banstead was left vulnerable by the proposals being suggested. The Committee raised a question as to the implementation in Horley and requested further information about the interim cover for April 2013. Officers explained to the Committee that the conversations with Property Services were robust around what was required by the Service.

17. The Area Manager, Operational Development, informed the Committee that he recognised the concerns of individual Members, and that the Fire Service was looking at ways to manage potential risk. The view was taken that central to developing a resilient Fire Service was effective mobilising systems and control staff, with fire station locations being a less significant factor. The plans were intended to ensure that coverage could be more effectively mobilised across the County. Officers outlined the safeguards in place in case of a critical incident, these included cross-border mobilisations. It was stated that standard operating procedures for cross-Service collaboration was currently being developed by Surrey Fire Service.
18. The Committee was informed that the plans for interim cover in Horley had been developed intentionally to be “light touch”, ensuring that spending was not being embedded in the long-term. Officers had been meeting with colleagues in Horley to discuss the timings in relation to when this interim cover would be required from.
19. The Committee raised concerns about Members not being informed of public engagement exercises in relation to the consultations. It was recognised by Officers that Members were vital in any consultation, and that there would be individual consultations with the Members affected by the proposals as well as visits to the relevant Local Committees.

Recommendations:

None.

Actions/Further Information to be provided:

None.

Select Committee Next Steps:

The Committee will receive a further update, particularly in respect to income generation and the delivery of the Public Safety Plan in 2013.

72/13 EXTRACTING VALUE FROM CUSTOMER FEEDBACK [Item 9]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Mark Irons, Interim Head of Customer Services and Directorate Support

Helyn Clack, Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Committee was presented with a report outlining how customer feedback was currently gathered and used by Customer Services. The Chairman introduced the report by saying that he was concerned that the report indicated that customer feedback was not being used regularly in policy development. The Committee went on to discuss this and expressed support for using customer feedback within policy

development. It was highlighted that it was an invaluable resource and that it could be used to inform a wide number of initiatives.

2. The Interim Head of Customer Services stated that the Customer Service Excellence Framework was intended to take a more systemic approach to using customer feedback. It had been implemented in Shared Services and the response from officers had been positive, saying that the framework provided a useful means of ensuring customer feedback was being used regularly.
3. The Committee discussed the Contact Centre's role in collecting and responding to customer feedback. One Member stated that residents had reported that they felt they were being kept from speaking directly with the relevant officers. The view was expressed that more could be done to track and feedback on complaint resolution, particularly when Members were acting as a mediator. It was stated that part of the work around the Customer Service Excellence Framework would ensure that the complaint resolution information was being captured and fed back more effectively.
4. The Committee discussed the need to ensure that complaints data was being regularly scrutinised. It was felt by the Committee that any such form of scrutiny should be undertaken in a public forum. It was highlighted that complaints data is shared with Members via a quarterly report available on the Member's Portal.

Recommendations:

- a) that this report should be drawn to the attention of the Cabinet to consider the appropriate course of action to address the highlighted concerns.

The Cabinet may wish to consider:

- i. how the Council could be better shaped to ensure customer feedback is routinely used in policy design and service delivery;
 - ii. in line with the Leader's initiative "Think Councillor, Think Resident", what arrangements could be put in place to assure Members and residents that public concerns are being noted and used by the Council; and
 - iii. periodically examining customer complaints and feedback at Cabinet meetings.
- b) That Customer Services undergo the evaluation process to achieve the Customer Service Excellence Standard as outlined in their report.

Actions/Further Information to be Provided:

None.

Select Committee Next Steps:

None.

73/13 OUTCOMES-BASED FUNDING FOR VOLUNTARY, COMMUNITY AND FAITH SECTOR INFRASTRUCTURE IN SURREY [Item 10]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Mary Burguieres, Lead Manager for Policy and Strategic Partnerships, Policy & Performance

Helyn Clack, Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games

Present:

Lavinia Sealy, Chairman of the County Council

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Committee queried whether all the Voluntary, Community and Faith Sector (VCFS) infrastructure groups listed within the report had service level agreements in place with Surrey County Council. It was confirmed that this was the case.
2. The Committee raised a question as to the processes in place to address issues when outcomes were not being delivered against the performance frameworks in place.
3. It was recognised that the tripartite nature of the funding of VCFS groups required a common performance framework to be agreed by the three partners: Boroughs & District Councils, NHS Surrey and Surrey County Council.
4. The Committee was informed that a single set of outcomes and measures were in the process of being developed. These were being shared with the VCFS infrastructure organisations to ensure they are achievable. It was indicated that mergers would be a possible way of managing concerns about performance.
5. The Chairman of the Council praised the report particularly in respect of the level of consultations undertaken. She expressed some concerns regarding the next financial year, the Compact and its current level of funding. It was also highlighted that there was a need to reflect the different ways VCFS groups worked and engage more with partners. Officers informed the Committee that NHS Surrey had confirmed that they would maintain their level of funding in 2013/14 without any changes.

Recommendations:

That the outcomes-based approach to delivery of VCFS infrastructure in Surrey for 2013-14, which has been developed in discussions with the Portfolio Holder, the VCFS and partners, be endorsed.

Actions/Further Information to be Provided:

None.

Select Committee Next Steps:

The Communities Select Committee will receive a performance report on the implementation of the new VCFS framework in September 2013.

74/13 OLYMPIC GAMES COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS AND LEGACY [Item 11]

Declarations of Interest:

None.

Witnesses:

Rhian Boast, Programme Lead for Legacy
Susie Kemp, Assistant Chief Executive

Helyn Clack, Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games

Key Points Raised During the Discussion:

1. The Committee was invited to provide comments or raise any questions they may have in relation to the Olympics Cost Benefit Analysis report. It was queried what methodology had been used to calculate the figures in relation to generated income. It was outlined by officers that this was based on an industry-wide standard that had been used to calculate generated income for a number of other major sporting events in the UK. It was confirmed that the figures took into account what had been invested by the County Council.
2. Members asked whether the estimated staff costs included the costs of redeployment of staff from pre-existing roles. The Committee was informed that the figures in the report were for additional and short term staff, and overtime costs for staff working on the event day. The view was expressed that it would be difficult to quantify the comprehensive staffing costs for the games across the organisation.
3. Some Members raised concerns over the impact of the Olympics on the Council's services, with particular reference to Highways and the delivery of its work programme. The Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games highlighted that the Council had made a commitment to deliver the Olympics events as part of their "business as usual", and had done so with the limited resources available to worldwide recognition. It was also highlighted that the games were delivered in Surrey within budget, and had proven to be a big success. The Committee was informed that any outstanding highways works planned for 2012/13 were either underway or due to be undertaken, and had been budgeted for.
4. The Committee was delivered a presentation on the Olympic legacy and how Surrey County Council was intending to develop it. It was highlighted that the public response to the Olympics had been very

positive, with over 500 resident's providing feedback. Of these 500 responses only 4 were complaints. The Committee heard that a number of residents wished for Surrey to host similar events more regularly. Officers explained to the Committee that Surrey County Council intended to develop a strong lead in developing the Olympic legacy for the county with partners.

5. The Committee was informed that some key areas for improvement had been identified. These included a need for a greater co-ordinated focus between the different sectors involved, and a greater clarity as to the common objectives for those sectors.
6. The Committee heard that amongst the objectives for securing an Olympic legacy was developing Surrey's economy, particularly its rural economy, encouraging a greater focus on health and well-being, seeking to host similar major events in the future, build vibrant communities, and focus on Surrey's cycling infrastructure.
7. Officers outlined the intention to raise the profile of countryside tourism and the Surrey brand. It was noted that this could be achieved by encouraging cyclists, walkers and other groups to visit the County. Some Members raised concerns that these interest groups often came into conflict with local priorities, in particular the impact such tourism can have on the landscape. It was queried how much the plans to develop an Olympic legacy reflected local wishes. Officers acknowledged that there was a need to find an appropriate balance, but at the same time highlighted that there were many benefits to the local economy and businesses.
8. The Committee was informed that the Olympic events had highlighted that a number of people wished to volunteer for community events, and that work would be undertaken to streamline the volunteering process in order to facilitate this. Another key area being developed was cycling, and an investment strategy was being discussed as a means of responding to the rise in its popularity.
9. Officers outlined that one of the key successes of the Olympics team was the School Games project. Members stated that they would like to see businesses being matched with local sports clubs and groups in order to encourage local investment in sports.
10. The Committee discussed the role of Surrey County Council in securing an Olympic legacy for the county. Members expressed both enthusiasm and a desire to see a sustainable legacy for Surrey. However, they also expressed concerns that there had not been enough consideration as to whether the County Council was the appropriate organisation to lead such work, given the existence of other organisations undertaking similar work in this area. The Cabinet Member for Community Services and the 2012 Games expressed the view that some areas of the work would require the Council to take the strategic lead, and clarified that the intention was to maintain a small team responsible for undertaking this role in terms of the legacy. The implementation of the plans would be on a local basis. Officers were commended by Members for their work on the Olympics.

11. It was outlined to the Committee that the Olympic Legacy was linked in with a number of key developments; these included the Cultural Services strategy, the Countryside Management strategy, and the Economic Growth strategy. The Committee was informed that work would be undertaken to ensure that these separate strands interlinked to ensure a comprehensive plan to develop the Olympic legacy. The Committee stated that there would need to be further opportunities to have more detailed discussions about the implementation of these various aspects of the Olympic legacy.

Recommendations:

None.

Actions/Further Information to be Provided:

None.

Select Committee Next Steps:

75/13 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 12]

The Committee noted that the next meeting would take place on 21 March 2013 at 10am.

Meeting ended at: 1.15pm

Chairman