

MINUTES of the meeting of the **COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.00 am on 21 March 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 Thursday 11 July 2013.

Elected Members:

- * Mr Steve Cosser (Chairman)
- * Mr Mike Bennison
- Mr Graham Ellwood
- * Mrs Angela Fraser
- * Mr Denis Fuller
- * Mr David Ivison
- * Mrs Jan Mason
- * Mr Chris Norman (Deputy Chairman)
- * 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

Co-opted Members:

Substitute Members:

Mr Nick Harrison

In attendance

Mrs Kay Hammond, Cabinet Member

76/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from David Wood, Colin Taylor and Graham Ellwood.

Nick Harrison substituted for David Wood.

77/13 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING: 16 JANUARY 2013 [Item 2]

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

78/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interests.

79/13 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

There were no questions or petitions.

80/13 RECOMMENDATION TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 5]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Committee was informed that the Chairman of the Police and Crime Panel (PCP) had responded to an item brought to Select Committee on 16 January 2013. It had been agreed that where the Communities Select Committee feel the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) should be challenged on an issue, there should be a method by which this can be brought to the attention of the PCP. To support this process the Panel has agreed that a standing item be added to future agendas of the PCP to allow formal consideration of any matters referred from the Communities Select Committee, or the Local Committees of the Boroughs and Districts. A response to the item had also been received from the office of the PCC. The Committee agreed to note that both responses were satisfactory.
2. The Committee was asked to note that consideration of the cultural services strategy had been postponed until after the elections as the strategy was still being drafted.
3. The Chairman informed the Committee that the item looking at the recommendations for Epsom & Ewell and Reigate & Banstead emergency response cover had been added to the agenda given the interest on the issue shown by the Committee at its last meeting.

4. The Chairman asked Members of the Committee to let the Scrutiny Officer know of any items they would like considered for the Forward Work Programme for the coming year. The Committee was asked to note a list of possible future items for scrutiny in 2013/2014 included in the papers.

Recommendations:

None

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

81/13 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE [Item 6]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses: None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. It was noted that a Cabinet response to the Select Committee's recommendations on Extracting Value from Customer Feedback had been received.
2. It was noted that the Cabinet generally welcomed the Committee's recommendations. The Head of Customer Services would be addressing the Committee's recommendations in a report to Cabinet in September 2013. The Committee agreed to continue monitoring this issue very closely and for it to be added to the Forward Work Programme.

82/13 SCRUTINY OF FINALISED MID TERM FINANCIAL PLANS AND EXISTING DIRECTORATE STRATEGY [Item 7]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Yvonne Rees, Strategic Director for Customers and Communities

Mark Irons, Interim Head of Customer Services and Directorate Support

Russell Pearson, Head of Fire and Rescue, Chief Fire Officer

Peter Milton, Head of Cultural Services

Ian Treacher, Trading Standards Policy and Operations Team Manager

Jane Last, Programme Manager and Lead Manager for Community Safety and Partnership

Kay Hammond, Cabinet Member for Community Safety

Liz Lawrence, Head of Policy and Performance

Andy Tink, Senior Principal Accountant

Toby Wells, Deputy Head of Youth Support Service

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Chairman outlined that prior to the County Council considering the budget in February 2013, the Communities Select Committee had a budget workshop in November 2012 to help understand key budget pressures, proposed allocation and spend within the directorate and input into the thinking at this stage. Now the County Council have agreed to the proposed budget, the Select Committee are being given a detailed account of the MTFP, to give Members the opportunity to discuss any issues they feel need to be drawn to the attention of Cabinet. The Chairman also explained that the Committee were considering the Customer and Communities Directorate priorities which were in the process of being refreshed.
2. The Strategic Director for Customers and Communities explained how the Directorate priorities for last year had been revisited in order to see what was still relevant and where there was room for improvement when considering draft priorities for 2013/14. The priorities had been revisited, taking account of changes at the local and national level. The Strategic Director informed the Committee that she understood the need for both the Directorate and the Council to respond to such changes in order to have a comprehensive set of priorities going forward.
3. The Committee was briefed by the Strategic Director on the priorities for 2013/14. The key differences for 2013/14 included removing delivery of the Olympic experience but still recognising the lasting impact of the Olympic legacy. Although the Public Value Review (PVR) for the Directorate has come to an end, the Directorate would continue to look for improved effectiveness and efficiencies. The Committee was informed that the Directorate had refined the Customer Services priorities in order to increase resident engagement and drive forward Customer Services excellence. The Strategic

Director expressed the view that the Health agenda was significant when considering the priorities for 2013/14. The Strategic Director also noted that domestic abuse remained in the priorities and was an issue the Committee may wish to consider more closely.

4. Members queried what Services were doing to improve resident engagement, The Interim Head of Customer Services and Directorate Support explained how the Service had adopted a new framework. When considering the framework the Service had placed an importance on trying to understand who the customer was and training staff so they were better aware of this. The Customer Excellence Standards framework tests organisations to see whether they meet the required standard put in place. If organisations meet this standard, this will be celebrated whilst a development programme will be put in place for those who fall short of this. The Interim Head of Customer Services and Directorate Support reinforced the message that the Service aims for excellence in Customer Services and would be rolling out the Customer Excellence Standard in E&I to begin with
5. The Committee was informed that leading on from the Community Partnerships PVR, Local Committees had the opportunity to understand how to engage better with residents. The Interim Head of Customer Services and Directorate Support commented that residents wanted more online engagement. The feedback from residents also indicated the need to improve web pages and social media when engaging with residents.
6. Members raised questions over whether or not Skype could be considered as a means of engaging with residents. The Interim Head of Customer Services and Directorate Support explained how iPads had greatly improved the way Members did business and had provided new opportunities for the way we work. New ways to engage with residents would be considered as part of the Communications Review, headed by the Head of Communications.
7. The Committee raised a question as to why Parish Councillors were not involved in Local Committees. The Interim Head of Customer Services and Directorate Support explained that one of the objectives of the Community Partnerships PVR was to create flexibility on who attends Local Committees. The Officer went onto explain how it was not possible for both the Parish and Borough Councillors to vote at a meeting but agreed with Members that it would be constructive to have an officer liaising between the Parish and Committee.
8. The Committee raised concerns over the amber indicators on the total pressures and changes section of the budget for fire station reconfigurations. The Chief Fire Officer explained to Members the difficulty of quantifying relocation pressures until a site for relocation was available. The Chief Fire Officer commented that for example once a site for the Elmbridge fire station had been confirmed it would be clearer where savings could be made.
9. Members asked what areas were being explored to raise income for Surrey Fire and Rescue. The Chief Fire Officer stated that the Service was in the process of making a business case for increasing income

streams. The Chief Fire Officer stated that currently the Service was looking at the option of taking fallback calls from other Fire Services. The Service was also considering telecare operations for the ambulance service, fire training for residential care homes and contingency services as means of generating extra income.

10. At a previous meeting Members of the Committee raised concerns over sprinklers being installed in care homes for the vulnerable. This issue was raised again, to which the Chief Fire Officer stated that the Service was in a dialogue about fitting sprinklers in SCC owned care buildings with the support of Adult Social Care. Although there had not been any change to legislation regarding the fitting of sprinklers in care homes, the Chief Fire Officer stated that the Service is always looking for ways to lead by example.
11. Members raised concerns over the use of [Specialist Group International (SGI)] contingency crewing and where the costing for this was in the fire budget. The Cabinet Member for Community Safety confirmed that under 2004 fire legislation, the Council has a duty to provide contingency crewing , and that this had been approved by Cabinet. The Cabinet Member for Community Safety stated that she is waiting on an update from the service covering proposals for funding this service in future years.
12. The Committee highlighted concerns over an additional £0.4m which had been added to fund a new legacy team. The Strategic Director for Customers and Communities stated the funding for this team was for a finite amount of time and was as a result of the success of the Olympic Games and the need to create a legacy. The Strategic Director for Customers and Communities agreed to provide a more detailed note on the work of this team to the Committee.
13. The Head of Cultural Services informed the Committee that Community Partnered Libraries (CPL) had made an overall saving for the financial year. The Committee questioned what the savings from the CPLs would be used for. The Head of Cultural Services stated that the savings would be used for refurbishment of the libraries and the possibility of opening libraries on Sundays in retail areas such as Woking and Dorking.
14. Members of the Committee commented on Trading Standards “TS @lert” which they felt was very positive and beneficial to residents. The Committee was informed that the “TS @lert” was a new way of alerting residents and businesses to potential trading standards related problems. A Member raised concerns over ‘legal highs’ as an increasing problem in the County. The Trading Standards Policy and Operations Team Manager explained that addressing the issue of “legal highs” was a potential problem for the whole country and Home Office remain concerned about the issue. The Committee was informed that Trading Standards were working with Surrey Police and Hampshire Trading Standards and Police to try to ensure residents of Surrey remained protected
15. Members of the Committee raised questions over the Community Safety Grant of £0.4m being assigned to the PCC for administering

and justifications for maintaining current levels of staffing within the SCC team. The Programme Manager and Lead Manager for Community Safety and Partnership said this grant had reduced a lot in recent years and much of it focused on domestic abuse and drugs and alcohol. The PCC will continue to fund work on domestic abuse and drugs and alcohol work would be moving over to Health and Wellbeing in March. The Committee agreed that this item should be revisited in the future.

16. The Committee raised concerns that no staff headcount had been included in the budgeting for Directorate Support. The Interim Head of Customer Services and Directorate Support stated that there had been a centralisation of resources two years ago. Combining resources had resulted in efficiencies and creating a clear career structure for staff in directorate support. The Interim Head of Customer Services and Directorate Support explained that there were 60 employees in the team. Two thirds of which were administrative staff and the other third was a service development team. The Strategic Director for Customers and Communities commented that without the directorate support team the frontline team could not function as they do.

Recommendations:

None

Actions/further information to be provided:

The Strategic Director for Customers and Communities to provide Members of the Select Committee with details of the legacy team and their work around developing a new tourism and legacy strategy.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

83/13 SCRUTINY OF CONSULTATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EPSOM AND EWELL AND REIGATE AND BANSTEAD EMERGENCY RESPONSE COVER LOCATIONS [Item 8]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Russell Pearson, Head of Fire and Rescue Service, Chief Fire Officer

Ian Thomson, Area Manager - Operational Assurance, Fire & Rescue

Sarah Mitchell, Strategic Director for Adult Social Care

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Chairman of the Committee introduced the report, stating that the public consultation regarding the changes to the emergency response cover in Epsom & Ewell and Reigate & Banstead had been undertaken. A report with recommendations had been produced by officers which will be taken to Cabinet on 26 March 2013 for a decision.
2. A Member of the Committee raised concerns over the public consultation, which they felt had not been conducted thoroughly enough. A Member expressed the view that there had been a lack of publicity around the consultation. The Cabinet Member for Community Safety stated that originally the consultation period was to end in February 2013. However, because the need to engage with the public was a high priority and as there was a high level of interest in this matter, this was extended to March 2013. Drawing upon the Consultation report, the Cabinet Member for Community Safety explained how the public had been consulted extensively through a number of different arenas including surveys and public meetings.
3. The Head of Fire and Rescue Service added that the timetable for the consultation and proposed changes were a direct result of West Sussex Fire and Rescue Authority's decision to relocate their fire engine at Horley and terminate their agreement to provide cover in that area.
4. A Member of the Committee raised concerns over where the second fire engine in Epsom & Ewell and Reigate & Banstead would be located. The Head of Fire and Rescue explained how a number of sites were under consideration. Meetings were taking place with the Property team to discuss proposed sites but legal issues meant the process was taking longer than expected. The Head of Fire and Rescue stated that the service was committed to keeping Members informed of proposed locations for the new fire stations.
5. Some Members commented on the length of the Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) which accompanied the report. Some felt that the Assessment was very long and questioned the amount of officer time which had been spent putting the EIA together. The Cabinet Member for Community Safety stated the importance and critical nature of EIAs under statutory guidance.
6. Some Members of the Committee raised concerns over the number of residents who may be at higher risk in a fire situation as a result of the proposed changes and queried the accuracy of some of the data in the EIA. Questions were also raised over the links between areas of deprivation and higher fire risks. The Head of Fire and Rescue commented that every effort had been made to compile accurate data for the EIA. The Head of Fire and Rescue agreed to invest resources in capturing any issues that may have been missed. The Area Manager for Operational Assurance highlighted that fire incidents were not linked

to deprivation but the report had found that older people were more likely to be vulnerable.

7. The Committee recognised that the proposed changes did diminish the second fire engine response times in Epsom & Ewell, and some concerns were expressed about the impact this would have in the area. However, the Committee generally accepted that on average this borough would continue to have one of the best response times in the County. The Committee noted that the proposed changes would improve the cover and average response times in Reigate and Banstead. Therefore, the majority of the Committee felt that these proposals were an appropriate response to the changes in Horley as it provided equitable cover taking the County as a whole.
8. The recommendation to endorse the Service's proposals was voted on by the Committee. The majority of the Committee voted to endorse the proposals. There was one vote against the proposals

Recommendations:

- a) That Cabinet approves the proposed changes to the emergency response cover in the boroughs of Epsom & Ewell and Reigate & Banstead.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

84/13 SCRUTINY OF THE SURREY YOUTH JUSTICE STRATEGIC PLAN [Item 9]

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Toby Wells, Deputy Head of Youth Support Service

Kay Hammond, Cabinet Member for Community Safety

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Deputy Head of Youth Support Service introduced the report and explained the 'Restorative Justice' approach. The approach looks at working with those directly affected by crimes, rather than going through the legal justice system. The approach can be quicker and enables the victim to better understand what has happened to them. Rather than excluding the offender, the approach brings them back into the community. The 'Restorative Justice' approach has reported greater levels of satisfaction by victims and lower levels of reoffending.
2. Members of the Committee expressed their satisfaction with the 'Restorative Justice' approach and the work of the Youth Support Service. Some Members went onto say that although the Youth Support Service was providing support for young people from the age of 13 they felt intervention was needed at a younger age. The Cabinet Member for Community Safety explained that 4 years ago Surrey had a fragmented Youth Service, but all the services had now been integrated into a Youth Support Service. The Committee was informed that the Youth Support Service had a Youth Engagement Scheme in place which aimed to prevent offending at a young age. Local Committees also had the opportunity to put money into schemes which aim to prevent offending at a young age.
3. The Committee raised a question as to how the Restorative Justice Approach links into the Surrey Police Crime Commissioners 'zero tolerance' agenda. The Deputy Head of Youth Support Service commented that the Police Crime Commissioner's approach was not to ignore bad behaviour but to challenge it where necessary. It was commented that the Restorative Justice approach was about challenging bad behaviour and challenging why crimes were committed in the first place and what could be done to prevent these from happening in the future.
4. The Deputy Head of Youth Support Service recognised that parenting was a factor in young people offending. The Youth Support Service was looking into risk and protective factors, for example alcohol abuse and further investing in youth groups.
5. Members raised concerns over lower level offending statistics for young people in Surrey, especially in regard to anti-social behaviour. The Deputy Head of Youth Support Service stated that a great deal of Government focus and resource was being put into anti-social behaviour. There were more concerns over adults receiving Anti Social Behaviour Orders rather than young people.
6. Members of the Select Committee raised concerns over the branding of the 'preventative service' for young people and the negative connotations this had and whether or not this could be rebranded as a 'support service'. The Deputy Head of Youth Support Service made note of Members' comments and explained that this would be something the Service would consider to change in the future.
7. The Committee recognised that Surrey had one of the lowest levels of offending in the country but questioned whether lower levels of offending were being recorded for Looked After Children (LAC) in Surrey. The Deputy Head of Youth Support Service stated that there

were exceptionally low numbers of LAC in the criminal justice system. The Youth Support Service had a consortium of services looking into the figures, especially Surrey's LAC that were placed out of the county. The Deputy Head of Youth Support Service agreed that the Committee would be provided with figures relating to offending amongst LAC once these were available.

8. Drawing upon the experiences within their own wards, Members of the Committee recognised that offending rates increased and decreased throughout the year. The Committee posed the question as to whether resources were available if offending increased. The Cabinet Member for Community Safety commented that the Youth Support Service does not have infinite extra resources to deal with significant increases in offending but commented that initiatives like the Troubled Families Programme could help ease additional pressures. The Cabinet Member for Community Safety recognised the long term investment in the Surrey Family Support Programme, along with the expertise the team held.

Recommendations:

- a) The Committee support the Youth Justice Strategic Plan 2013/14

Actions/further information to be provided:

None

Committee Next Steps:

None.

**85/13 THE GOVERNANCE OF SURREY'S COUNTY SPORTS PARTNERSHIP
[Item 10]**

Declarations of interest: None.

Witnesses:

Martin Cusselle, Head of SOLD (Surrey Outdoor Learning and Development)

Campbell Livingston, Partnership Manager- Active Surrey

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. On 12 July 2012, the Communities Select Committee was briefed on the purpose of Surrey's County Sports Partnership (CSP) and asked for a further report addressing the Council's future governance options for sport in Surrey.

2. Members of the Committee commented that it had been suggested in the previous report provided to the Committee that Surrey's CSP wanted to move towards independent governance, while the current report to Committee suggested retaining the hosting arrangement by Surrey County Council. The Head of SOLD said the team had been doing work nationally and with stakeholders, to look at the benefits of independent governance arrangements. Overhead costs had been estimated at £50,000 -£60,000 for the CSP to run independently, and this had informed the decision to remain under the governance of the Council. The Head of SOLD informed the Committee that Sport England were the prime funding body and any overhead costs and capital required for change would need to come from them.
3. Members of the Committee raised concerns over the new Executive Board that had been set up to oversee the CSP's performance. The Head of SOLD commented that 9-10 people sat on the board, with representatives from SCC, strategic groups in Surrey and 5 open places which would be open for election. People who sat on the board would be elected or chosen through a skills based approach. The intention of which would be to involve a wider range of stakeholders. The Committee asked for further detail regarding charitable body status and whether this would be a future possibility. The Partnerships Manager for Active Surrey commented that taking on charitable status would utilise more staff time thereby reducing frontline delivery, but also recognised that taking this approach could increase sponsoring opportunities.
4. Members of the Committee commented on the £150 million 'sports premium' funding for primary schools which would provide all schools with 17 or more primary aged pupils a lump sum of £8000 plus a premium of £5 per pupil per year. The Committee asked Officers if they had any influence on how these funds could be used. The Partnership Manager for Active Surrey stated the plan going forward would be to approach Primary Phase Councils and directly approach schools with information on the various options available to schools such as teacher training, buying in coaching providers or sharing of resources between schools.
5. The Committee questioned whether Option A was the unanimous view of the Review Group and whether the CSP had an alternative plan if for example the Council could not continue with its current hosing arrangements. The Head of SOLD confirmed there was 100% support from the Executive Board and stakeholders for Option A, and that that Option A did not prevent the CSP from choosing Option B or C in the future.
6. The Committee raised concerns over the Council's priorities not clearly being linked to the Sports Partnership objectives. The Partnership Manager for Active Surrey agreed that the links between the Council's priorities and those of the Sports Partnership needed to be strengthened and clarified. The Head of SOLD commented that work was being done with Partner organisations to enhance the Sport Partnership's objectives. Links were also being made with the Health and Wellbeing Board, especially with regards to obesity levels in young people. The Head of SOLD stated that Sports England as the

prime funder frequently looks at the service's objectives to ensure they qualify for funding.

Recommendations:

- a) That Option A, for the County Sports Partnership to remain with Surrey County Council, be supported.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Committee Next Steps:

None.

86/13 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 11]

TBC

Meeting ended at: 12.40 pm

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank